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YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 5, 1986.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
  • are a U.S. Citizen,
  • are at least 18 years of age on election day,
  • are a resident of California, and
  • are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don't want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you "Decline to State."

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, such as this one, you can only choose among the candidates of your party.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Senator, State Assemblymember, County Central Committee, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your polling place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters' Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don't know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can't help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 3, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I've written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a "write-in". If you want to and don't know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

Q—Can a worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
  • Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
  • mailing in the application sent with this voters' handbook (see enclosed card).

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

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
  • your home address,
  • the address where you want the ballot mailed,
  • then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail by absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 3, 1986.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS CONCERNING VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

A 如有錯誤，請向助理員換取消票。
B 第一步
C 第二步
D 第三步
E 第四步

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

STEP 1
USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

STEP 2
BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE Stub OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.
Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

STEP 3
HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.
Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfore con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

STEP 4
AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE Stub SHOWING.
Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

D 第三步

E 第四步
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO UNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escribe el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SI" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borraduras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

選民須知:

選民在選舉時的任何其他候選人；選在選舉上標註所指之候選人名打孔。如果有兩個或以上候選人競選同一職位，選在選舉上標註所指之所有候選人中，選擇你要投票的候選人打孔，但不要超過你選舉的規定人數。

選舉合格的非候選人，選在非候選候選人選舉信封所提供的預定位置上標註候選人所選擇的候選人的姓名。

選舉任何提案，選在選舉上標註所指 "YES" 或 "NO" 手段打孔。

選票上若有錯誤污點或缺損者，選票作廢。

如果你在選舉上打孔錯誤，導致候選人或選舉信封被取消了，所有候選人或選舉信封的選票作廢，應把該選票送給選舉區的選舉員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

TO COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA

請在下頁開始投票
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(GOBERNADOR) Governor</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOM BRADLEY</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor, City of Los Angeles Alcalde, Ciudad de Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUGH G. BAGLEY</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK L. THOMAS</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EILEEN ANDERSON</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singer and Dancer Cantante y Bailarina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES &quot;CHUCK&quot; PINEDA, JR.</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Hearing Officer Oficial de Audiencias Estatales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(VICEGOBERNADOR) Lieutenant Governor</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEO T. McCARTHY</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor Vicegobernador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(SECRETARIO DE ESTADO) Secretary of State</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARCH FONG EU</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State of California Secretario de Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>GRAY DAVIS</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Legislatura de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN GARAMENDI</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Senator, Businessman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senador Estatal, Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALISTER McALISTER</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assemblyman, 18th District, California Legislature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asambleista, Distrito 18, Legislatura de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California State Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tesorero del Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney General, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procurador General, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominee</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Member, State Board of Equalization</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote for One</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLIS</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization, Second District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERT DE LOTTO</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraiser/Broker/Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasador/Intermediario/Agricultor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States Senator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote for One</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT J. BANUELOS</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Technician</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Técnico de Comunicación</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Scientist-Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profesor-Especialista en Ciencias Políticas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES GREENE</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Senior Legislature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro, Legislatura Superior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIAN LANTZ</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultor de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN CRANSTON</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senador de Estados Unidos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| U.S. Representative | **SALA BURTON**  
Representative in Congress 5th District  
Diputada en el Congreso | 158 |
|           | **ANDREW KLEIN**  
Consultant  
Consultor | 160 |
|           | **MICHAEL MOBERG**  
Certified Public Accountant  
Contador Público Certificado | 162 |
|           | (WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. | 164 |
| State Senator | **LOUIS J. PAPAN**  
Member of the Legislature  
Miembro de la Legislatura | 169 |
|           | **JIM GONZALEZ**  
Mayor's Special Assistant  
Asistente Especial del Alcalde | 171 |
|           | (WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. | 173 |
| Member of the State Assembly | **ART AGNOS**  
State Assemblyman  
Asambleista Estatal | 178 |
|           | (WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. | 180 |
Member, County Central Committee

Vote for no more than 10

SAL ROSELLI
185

GARY O'ROURKE
Union Warehouseman/Almacenero Sindicado
186

REEVA OLSON
Union Representative/Representante Sindicado
187

CONNIE O'CONNOR
Incumbent/En posesión del cargo
188

GUIDO E. NANNINI
Horticulturist/Horticultror
189

DEBRA A. BARNES
Health Care Director/Director de Cuidados de la Salud
190

CLEVE JONES
Incumbent/En posesión del cargo
191

SIMEON WHITE
Program Administrator/Administrador de Programas
192

GEORGE WONG
Incumbent/En posesión del cargo
193

ALICIA CHAO-WAH WANG
Incumbent/En posesión del cargo
194

JIM WACHOB
Incumbent/En posesión del cargo
195

JORGE A. PORTILLO
Machinist/Maquinista
196

LINDA POST
Incumbent/En posesión del cargo
197

STEVEN M. KREFTING
Environmentalist, Dan Consultants/Especialista en Medio Ambiente, Consultor de Información
198

JIM LANDOWE
Communications Marketing/Especialista en Mercadeo de Comunicación
199

LOUISE A. MINNICK
Criminal Justice Specialist/Especialista en Justicia Criminal
200

MARILYN MILLER
Financial Planner/Planificador Financiero
201

THOMAS MOORE
Deputy Sheriff/Delegado del Alguacil de Policía
202

LEONEL MONTEREY
City Commissioner/Miembro de la Junta Municipal de la Ciudad
203

KEVIN MALONE
Community Organizer/Organizador Comunitario
204

GARY H. SUEN
Fuerter/Peletero
205

PATRICK C. FITZGERALD
Incumbent/En posesión del cargo
206

RUSS FIELDS
Computer Programmer/Programador de Computadoras
207

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

208
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Project Advisor</td>
<td>DANIEL NUSBAUM</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessors</td>
<td>JEANNE BAIRD</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>SAM DUCA</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $850,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>COMMUNITY PARKLANDS ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for acquiring, developing, improving, rehabilitating, or restoring urgently needed local and regional parks, beaches, recreational areas and facilities, and historical resources.</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>WATER CONSERVATION AND WATER QUALITY BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $150,000,000 to provide funds for water conservation, groundwater recharge and drainage water management, and clarifies language in the Clean Water Bond Law of 1984.</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>DEPOSIT OF PUBLIC MONEYS IN CREDIT UNIONS. Authorizes Legislature to provide for deposit of public moneys in any credit union. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect. Legislation already approved implementing measure could result in greater interest income to state and local governments.</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. Provides exception to property tax limit when acquisition or improvement of real property approved by two-thirds of voters. Fiscal Impact: By itself, measure has no fiscal effect. No increase can occur in local property tax rate unless bond issue is approved by two-thirds vote. State costs for tax relief programs could increase. State income tax revenues could decline as taxpayers deduct greater amounts for property tax payments.</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>ALLOCATION OF VEHICLE LICENSE FEE TAXES TO COUNTIES AND CITIES. Requires allocation of Vehicle License Fee taxes to local governments. Fiscal Impact: Measure would have no direct fiscal effect. Prevents Legislature from changing the law to take vehicle license fees away from counties and cities. Measure would not prevent state reducing other forms of aid to local governments or changing existing formula for dividing vehicle license fee revenues between counties and cities.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>LEGISLATORS' AND JUDGES' RETIREMENT SYSTEMS. Limits retirement allowances for persons entering Legislators' and Judges' Retirement Systems after January 1, 1987. Fiscal Impact: Minor savings to state in future years if rate of inflation exceeds increase in salaries paid to current officeholders.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NÚMERO</td>
<td>VOTO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fiscal Impact</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>NONPARTISAN OFFICES. Prohibits a political party or party central commit-</td>
<td>No direct</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tee from endorsing, supporting, or opposing a candidate for nonpartisan office.</td>
<td>state or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiscal Impact: No direct state or local government fiscal impact.</td>
<td>local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. DISASTERS. Base-year value of property damaged or destroyed</td>
<td>Local property</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by disaster transferable to comparable replacement property in same county.</td>
<td>tax revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiscal Impact: Local property tax revenues would decrease by an unknown</td>
<td>would decrease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>amount. County assessor and tax collectors would have nonsignificant higher</td>
<td>an unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>administrative costs. State would replace revenues lost by school and</td>
<td>amount.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community college districts. State income tax revenues could increase due to</td>
<td>State would</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lower property tax deductions on replacement properties. These state costs</td>
<td>replace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and revenues cannot be estimated.</td>
<td>revenues lost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>MULTIPLE DEFENDANTS TORT DAMAGE LIABILITY. Plaintiff’s non-economic damage</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recovery limited to defendant’s liability based on defendant’s percentage of</td>
<td>savings to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fault. Fiscal Impact: Substantial savings to state and local governments.</td>
<td>state and local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Savings could be several millions of dollars in a year, varying significantly</td>
<td>governments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from year to year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>COUNTY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1986. This act</td>
<td>savings could</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement</td>
<td>be several</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of county correctional facilities and the performance of deferred maintenance</td>
<td>millions of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thereon pursuant to a bond issue of four hundred ninety-five million dollars</td>
<td>dollars ($495,000,000).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lawsuits and judgements against the City?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>without the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval, and to permit his</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agents to sign contracts for him?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>PROPPOSITION C HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THE BALLOT BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATUALES

CARGOS NO PARTIDARIOS. Prohíbe a un partido político a o a un comité central de un partido político patrocinando, apoyando o permitiendo a un candidato a un cargo no partidario. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo a los gobiernos estatal o locales.

262 SI 贷成
263 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE DESASTROSA. El valor en año base de propiedad inmueble dañada o destruida por un evento puede ser transferido a propiedad inmueble en reemplazo comparable en el mismo condado. Impacto Fiscal: Los reembolsos provenientes de impuestos locales a la propiedad disminuirían en una cantidad desconocida. Los tasadores y recaudadores de impuestos del condado tendrían pequeñas cantidades administrativas más altas. El estado reembolsaría los reembolsos que los distritos escolares y de colegios de educación superior dejarían de percibir. Los reembolsos del impacto estatal a la renta podrían aumentar debido a menores deducciones en el impuesto a la propiedad en las propiedades de reemplazo. Estos costos y reembolsos estatales no pueden ser calculados.

266 SI 贷成
267 NO 反對

RESPONSABILIDAD CIVIL DE MÚLTIPLES PARTES DEMANDADAS EN JUICIOS DE AGRAVOS INDEMNIZABLES. Limita la indemnización que puede recibir el demandante por daños no económicos a la responsabilidad del demandado basándose en el porcentaje de la culpabilidad del demandado. Impacto Fiscal: Aumentos sustanciales para los gobiernos estatal y locales. Los daños podrían ser alguna cantidad de dólares anuales, que varían significativamente de año a año.

273 SI 贷成
274 NO 反對

ACTA DE BONOS PARA DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA INSTALACIONES CORRECCIONALES DE CONDADO DE 1986. Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelación, y reemplazo de instalaciones corregionales de los condados y la ejecución del mantenimiento diferido en las mismas. El acta ha sido emitida en un monto de tesorería de cien y cinco millones de dólares ($150,000,000).

273 SI 贷成
274 NO 反對

PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONTADO

“¿Debe la Ciudad establecer una oficina de administración del riesgo y un despacho de investigación y administración de demandas, para estudiar y reducir el riesgo de pleitos y sentencias contra la Ciudad?”

278 SI 贷成
279 NO 反對

“¿Debe autorizarse al Comprador a firmar contratos por menos de $50,000 sin la aprobación del Jefe Administrativo y a permitir que sus agentes firmen contratos en su lugar?”

281 SI 贷成
282 NO 反對

OFICIALMENTE ELIMINADA

正式撤消
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VOTER SELECTION CARD

PRIMARY ELECTION
JUNE 3, 1986

POLLS ARE OPEN
FROM
7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.

Fill out this card and take it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>293</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR CANDIDATE SELECTION
VOTER SELECTION CARD

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>County Central Committee*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>5.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td>6.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>7.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>8.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate</td>
<td>9.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td>10.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. Public Inst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to your sample ballot for the number of County Central Committee members to be elected. The number varies with each district.

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR PROPOSITIONS.
PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

288 SI 贷成
289 NO 反对

292 SI 贷成
293 NO 反对

296 SI 贷成
297 NO 反对

300 SI 贷成
301 NO 反对

303 SI 贷成
304 NO 反对

307 SI 贷成
308 NO 反对

310 SI 贷成
311 NO 反对
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT — An official list of candidates and propositions.

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

VOTE BY MAIL — See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

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

MEASURE — Another name for proposition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

COMPENSATED ADVOCACY — Compensated means being paid for doing something; Advocacy means speaking or writing on behalf of someone else. Proposition F concerns the issue of compensated advocacy.

RISK MANAGEMENT — This field covers two areas: (1) deciding on when it is better to buy insurance and when it is better to be self insured or uninsured, then shopping for the insurance; (2) identifying hazardous conditions on one’s property and seeing that they are corrected so that liability and damage claims will be avoided. Proposition A concerns risk management.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.
2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).
3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.
Risk Manager; Claims Investigation

PROPOSITION A

Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgments against the City?

YES 278
NO 279

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Consultants hired by the Chief Administrative Officer are available to City departments that have questions about “risk management”, such as how to keep damage claims to a minimum and how to find the best insurance rates. In some cases, the departments use these consultants. In other cases, the departments make their own decisions. When damage claims are filed, some are handled by the City Attorney’s Office and some are handled by City departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would amend the City Charter to create an Office of Risk Management, under the Chief Administrative Officer. The office would set risk management guidelines for all City departments, boards and commissions. Proposition A would also establish a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration in the City Attorney’s Office. The bureau would be responsible for investigating, evaluating and processing all damage claims made against the City, except those claims made against the Public Utilities Commission and the Police Department. The bureau would also have the power to investigate potential suits against the City and to make settlements within dollar limits to be set by ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer and a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want damage claims and risk management decisions to continue to be handled the way they are now.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

“Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not affect the cost of government. However as a result of its potential future application and the exemption of certain employees from the civil service provisions of the Charter, costs may be affected in an amount presently indeterminate.”

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 10 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 71
VOTE YES ON A

Last fiscal year, over 6,400 claims and law suits were filed against the City, costing us more than $10 million in settlements. I believe that it is time to change the way we handle our claims, secure insurance, prevent risks and settle legitimate claims against the City.

Last summer, we appointed a task force of citizens, under San Francisco Bar President Jerry Falk, to make recommendations on how to streamline our procedures and save money at the same time. The present system is very slow, costly, and inefficient.

Currently, all claims are investigated by the department involved. The City Attorney cannot act on any claim until the department is ready. This results in delay and duplication of effort and increased costs. A centralized and accountable Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney would be more efficient, cost-effective, and professional. It would enable the City to settle many claims quickly, before litigation is begun, saving the City the costs of defending itself in court and lowering the average cost of settling a case.

This can be accomplished without creating new jobs by simply moving into one office the city positions presently scattered throughout the government.

Vote "Yes" on A. Reduce the cost of City government.

Adoption of this measure would also formally establish responsibility for Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer, where it has been unofficially since 1978. With this strengthened authority, the Risk Management Office would be responsible for the gathering of claims data on a City-wide basis, the creation of incentives for both reducing the possibility for injuries and damage and the number of claims for each department, the coordination of insurance purchasing and specific suggestions to avoid and reduce risk.

This amendment is presented with the recommendation of the Mayor's Task Force on Claims and Judgments, the Chief Administrative Officer, City Attorney, the President of the San Francisco Bar Association, and the President of the Lawyers' Club of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Each year the City spends almost $10 million to settle damage claims. It is estimated that the overall costs to the City for all risk-related activities exceeds $125 million a year. It is time for action to be taken to reduce these huge expenditures. This charter amendment is designed to do just that.

Claims Investigation and Adjustment

Right now, the City's claims investigation process is decentralized and largely unorganized. Each department investigates its own claims. Investigators may or may not be specially trained for their duties. There is no uniformity of investigation procedure or claims reporting. In only a few departments do investigators contact injured parties within days of an accident in order to settle the claim quickly and economically.

This amendment will create a claims investigation and adjustment bureau in the Office of the City Attorney. Claims investigation and adjustment activities will be centralized, economized and made much more efficient. The new bureau will be able to respond immediately to accidents and claims, providing quick compensation to deserving persons while at the same time producing a prompt, professional investigation. This reform is greatly needed.

Risk Management

Presently, there is no overall plan for the management of the City's risk exposure: insurance purchasing, avoidance of industrial accidents, gathering data on accident patterns, etc. Again, risk management as a function is fragmented among the various City departments. As a consequence, departments cannot develop the necessary expertise to manage themselves to reduce risk-related costs.

This measure will establish a risk manager under the Chief Administrative Officer. For the first time, overall City planning will be possible in order to control risk. Departments will be told what activities are producing injuries or damage and advised on corrective measures. Private industry has been utilizing risk managers of this type for years. It is time that the City did the same.

This amendment will reduce the cost of government and insure a more efficient delivery of City services to all San Franciscans. We urge you to give it your unqualified support.

Board of Supervisors

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

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This charter amendment was proposed by a citizens’ task force appointed by Mayor Feinstein. Its mission was to propose ways of reducing the number and financial costs of claims and lawsuits against the City.

The amendment has two principal features. The first is to centralize within the City Attorney’s office the investigation of claims filed against city departments. This will allow for improved training and supervision of the investigators, who presently are scattered throughout city government. The result will be more efficient, cost-effective and professional investigation of claims. By improving the quality of claims investigation, the City can identify those claims which have merit and attempt to reach early—and less costly—settlements. Meritless claims will be denied with greater confidence that if suit is filed it can be defended successfully.

The second major feature of the amendment will establish a Risk Management office under the Chief Administrative Officer. Risk management is a concept widely used in private business. Risk managers are professionals skilled in reducing the overall cost of claims. The Risk Manager would be responsible for coordinating the City’s insurance program, data collection, and correcting problems within the City which lead to claims. The Risk Manager would review those claims which have been filed against the City. Where it appears that an unsafe condition or practice has led to a claim, the Risk Manager would suggest to the affected department that corrective measures be taken. Reports to the Mayor and to the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors of the recommended corrections and the actions taken would ensure that the various departments will be responsive.

The City cannot eliminate claims and lawsuits against it. But it can limit its exposure by managing the claims process more effectively. This measure will reduce injuries and reduce claims, and that is good for everyone.

Jerome B. Falk, Jr.
Chair, Mayor’s Task Force on Claims and Judgments Against the City

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN
KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, May 31, 1986
12 Noon State Senate, Assembly, Congress and State Propositions
1:00 Proposition A—Risk Management & Claims
1:15 Proposition B—Purchaser & Contracts
1:30 Proposition D—Civil Service
2:15 Proposition E—Balboa Reservoir
2:30 Proposition F—Compensated Advocacy
3:00 Proposition G—Apartheid
3:20 Proposition H—AIDS
3:30 Propositions I, J—Embarcadero Freeway
3:50 Statewide Candidates

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

Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchaser must get the approval of the Chief Administrative Officer before signing certain contracts for more than $15,000. Only the voters may change that dollar limit. The Purchaser must personally sign every contract that comes through his office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would raise the limit on contracts requiring the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval to $50,000. It would also allow the Board of Supervisors to change that limit by ordinance. Proposition B would also permit the Purchaser to name certain people in his office to sign contracts on his behalf.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval only on contracts for more than $50,000. You also want the Purchaser to be able to name certain people in his office to be able to sign contracts on his behalf.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to require the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval on contracts for more than $15,000. You also want him to sign all contracts himself.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 3 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON B!

The City's Charter requires that a permanent, non-elected City official, the Chief Administrative Officer, review all purchases and contracts above $15,000. Of course, CAO approval of major contracts is very important. But, due to inflation, the number of contracts that have to go to the CAO for approval is always increasing. Today there are too many documents requiring CAO approval. This slows down the purchasing process, occupies staff time — and ultimately costs the City money. Proposition B will raise the CAO approval level to $50,000, and help the City to improve the efficiency of its purchasing operations.

The City's budget includes more than $250 million for purchases on tens of thousands of contracts. At the current $15,000 review limit, the CAO must approve thousands of documents every year — a costly, time-consuming process. In the long run the City loses money because of the inordinate length of time required to complete all the paperwork.

An adjustment must be made to remove the smaller contracts from this cumbersome process. Review and approval of contracts under $50,000 should be under the responsibility of the City Purchaser, a highly trained and experienced professional, who reports directly to the CAO. By changing the present $15,000 to $50,000, it will be possible for the CAO to give each document that comes to him the attention it requires. And, by placing its orders and paying its bills faster, both the City and businesses will benefit — especially small business and those owned by minorities and women.

Proposition B will allow future adjustments to the limit to be made by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility will ensure the City's ability to adjust to inflation and changes in the market.

This amendment comes to you with the recommendation of auditors, controllers, bankers, and others who exercise top fiduciary responsibility within their own organizations.

VOTE YES ON B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will make essential changes to update the purchasing and payment procedures under the Chief Administrative Officer. These measures are necessary and desirable because they will save the City money by significantly increasing our management efficiency.

Right now, the City loses because it takes too long for contracts to be reviewed and payments okayed, which means that early payment incentives go unutilized. The CAO has to approve every contract greater than $15,000 — and with City purchases last year over $250 million, the paperwork logjam is vast and overwhelming.

An increase in the review limit from $15,000 to $50,000 will make an adequate adjustment for inflation — $50,000 now is only about $15,000 in 1967 dollars. Proposition B will also enable the City Purchaser, who reports to the CAO, to maximize potential savings through early payments by designating appropriate personnel to approve contracts up to $50,000. These “Good Business” amendments are consistent with private sector practices and should be incorporated by the CAO in the City's best interests.

Finally, Proposition B will give the City the ability to respond quickly to changes in the market place by allowing changes in the CAO review limit by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility is necessary to ensure that in the future we will not lose money because of institutional rigidity. Control is maintained with the necessity of Board action and Mayoral approval to adjust the review limit, and this same feature will allow for change when desired.

Vote yes on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

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

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?

YES 288
NO 289

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the civil service system of the City of San Francisco. The structure of the civil service system and certain rules governing its operation are written into the Charter and can only be changed by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would make major changes. A Department of Personnel Administration would run the Civil Service system and would be able to change rules with Commission approval. Major features of Proposition D are described below. The complete charter amendment is printed in this voters’ handbook.

Department of Personnel Administration

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Certain civil service rules governing the general operation of the system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs, are written into the Charter and carried out by the Civil Service Commission. Only the voters can change these rules.

THE PROPOSAL: A department of Personnel Administration would be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. A Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor would run the Department. Certain rules governing examination, selection and appointment would be taken out of the Charter. The Personnel Director would be able to change these rules with the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

Civil Service Commission

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the general operation of the civil service system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs. The Commission also hears and decides appeals on civil service matters.

THE PROPOSAL: The Civil Service Commission would no longer be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. The Commission could investigate the operation of the system, approve rule changes proposed by the Personnel Director, and hear and decide appeals only on claims of job discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest.

Employee Relations

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors appoints an Employee Relations Director to negotiate contracts with City employees; the Board approves all contracts.

THE PROPOSAL: The Mayor or his or her agent would negotiate with City employees; the Board of Supervisors would still approve all contracts.

What your vote means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing civil service system.

CONTROLLER’S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE
Controller's Statement on "D"

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not directly affect the cost of government, as it removes many civil service policy setting functions from the Charter and an independent Civil Service Commission and transfers responsibility for personnel matters, including labor negotiations, to the Mayor.

"As a product of its inherent flexibility and possible future application, costs could be affected or savings realized in amounts presently indeterminate but probably substantial."

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative Charter amendment rewriting the civil service provisions of the Charter had qualified for the June ballot.

Robert Bradford, Jonathan Bulkeley, Lee Munsen and Mary Hilton, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 36,049 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 25,027 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

POLLs CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy
(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. Consistent with the City's and County's affirmative action goals, no applicant or employee shall be selected, appointed, reduced in rank, removed or in any way favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, union activities, political affiliation or sexual orientation.
(b) The purpose of the civil service system is to obtain for the city and county the best qualified persons to fill city and county positions in a timely and economical manner, using professional, fair and equitable personnel selection and personnel management practices with consideration of the following merit principles:

1. Recruiting, selecting and advancing employees on the basis of their ability, knowledge, skills and performance relative to the work to be performed.
2. Establishing equitable and adequate compensation, as provided elsewhere in this charter.
3. Training employees, as needed, to promote productivity and high quality performance and to facilitate career development.
4. Retaining employees during good service and separating employees for good cause.
5. Assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration, with proper regard for their privacy and constitutional rights; and assuring equal employment opportunity, based on the person's ability to do the job.
6. Assuring that employees are protected against coercion for political purposes and are prohibited from using their official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the outcome of an election or a nomination for office.
(c) This charter does not limit the power of departments, agencies, or other subdivisions of the city and county in their exercise of management prerogatives including but not limited to:

1. Directing employees in the performance of their duties;
2. Hiring, promoting, transferring and assigning employees from those qualified;
3. Classifying positions in accordance with Section 3.663 (k);
4. Disciplining employees;
5. Laying off employees because of lack of work, lack of funds or other reasonable cause; and
6. Determining the mission of its departments and divisions, and its budget, organization, the number of its employees, and the numbers, types, classifications and grades of positions or employees assigned to an organization unit, work project, shift or tour of duty, and the methods and technology of performing its work.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. No person shall in any way be favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, age, religion, national origin or other non-merit factors.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in subsection (a) or any other provisions of the charter, it shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, consistent with a policy of acquiring qualified personnel the service of the city and county, to encourage the hiring of blind persons. It shall further be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that no otherwise qualified blind person shall be discriminated against in examination, re-examination, appointment, re-appointment, waiver of eligibility for appointment or re-appointment, promotion or demotion in any class, subclass or position in the civil service unless eyesight is indispensable for the performance of the duties of the class, subclass or position. It shall be the duty of the commission to classify, and from time to time it may reclassify, places of employment in the civil service, the duties of which may be efficiently performed by qualified blind persons and to conduct appropriate examinations which will fairly test the capacity of blind persons as well as sighted persons to perform such duties.

2.203 Employee Relations Director

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3.510 of this charter, the employee relations director shall be appointed by the board of supervisors and shall hold office at the pleasure of said board.

3.102 Employee Relations

It shall be the duty of the mayor to meet and confer with employee representatives on behalf of the city and county and all its constituent boards, commissions, departments and agencies as required by applicable law. These duties may be performed by a designee of the mayor who shall serve at the pleasure of the mayor. Nothing herein shall limit the mayor from contracting for the performance of these duties.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the mayor shall submit all memoranda of understanding or ordinances to be enacted pursuant to Article VIII of this charter herein to the Board of Supervisors for its approval or rejection. 3.660 Commission; Composition; Meetings

There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county shall have the general powers and duties set forth in section 3.661.

The civil service commission shall consist of five members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and this charter section as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following. The respective terms of the commissioners who shall hold office on the effective date of this section as amended shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date. Thereupon, the mayor shall appoint...
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Vote YES and join 34,000 San Franciscans who signed petitions to get this crucial reform on the ballot. "D" clears the way to modernize Civil Service so that it is fair and efficient. The present system is a 50-year conglomeration of rules that tie the City’s hands —

— A protest by one applicant can hold up hiring for an entire job classification for months — even years.

— Often tests cannot be given frequently enough to maintain current tests of qualified employees. This leads to delays and temporary appointments that make hiring top candidates all but impossible.

— Appointments to jobs are restricted to the top three names on a list even though more than three people have the same score!

— Many provisions are out of date. Some deal with hiring during the Korean War. Others limit our ability to carry out affirmative action.

"D" would remove archaic rules from the Charter so they could be changed as the times require — subject to meet and confer and public hearings. Job tests could be expedited; hiring and promotions speeded up; opportunities opened to women and minorities.

Specifically, Proposition D:

1) Creates a Department of Personnel Administration at no additional cost. Like other U.S. cities, day-to-day administration would be the responsibility of a director, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Supervisors.

2) Makes the Civil Service Commission the oversight body to set policy and hear appeals. Rulings would have to be within 60 days, eliminating endless delays.

3) Moves the office of labor relations from the Supervisors to the Mayor, who must make the tough-minded decisions to balance the budget. Never again could the Board give labor $27 million for “comparable worth.”

This reform is the product of years of work with SPUR, League of Women Voters, Chamber of Commerce. Members of the Board of Supervisors could have put the reform on the ballot last year but bowed to some labor leaders, and 34,000 San Franciscans had to do the job for them.

Proposition D will enable City government to work better for you. Vote YES.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON ‘D’

Proposition D is a complex proposition with a simple goal: remove the archaic restrictions on the hiring, promotion, or firing of city employees and bring San Francisco’s personnel system into the modern age.

Archaic is the only way to describe a system that keeps equally qualified people from competing for a job, and that takes months — sometimes years — to fill vacancies.

For example, if 50 people score equally high on a competitive examination, shouldn’t they all have a chance for any job for which they are eligible? Not under the current system, which requires complicated tie-breaking rules not at all related to a person’s qualifications or abilities.

Or what about being able to hire the best person available for a given job? Currently, eligibility lists are frozen for two years and every person on each list, including the lowest-scoring, must be offered a job before the highest-scoring person on a more recent list. Private businesses couldn’t function saddled with such absurdities.

Proposition D cuts through the red tape. It creates a modern personnel department, with a director responsible for carrying out rules to ensure fairness and efficiency. Accountable to the Mayor, the director would be selected from a list provided by the Civil Service Commission, and subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.

The Civil Service Commission remains an independent body, with the right to approve new personnel rules and hold hearings on abuses. Also under ‘D’, negotiations with employee unions would be under the Mayor, subject to approval by the Supervisors, providing checks and balances in balancing our budget.

With greater accountability and continued checks and balances, Proposition D will open the way to more efficient government in our City.

Bill Maher, Supervisor
Louise Reine, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON ‘D’

Proposition D is a necessary reform to the City’s Civil System. As the City’s Chief Administrative Officer for almost ten years, I have found that quality employee hiring is difficult and the process causes long delays.

The current system is:

• inflexible. The City cannot hire and promote the most qualified persons.
• inefficiently administered by a commission. Other large
cities do not have such a bureaucratic process.

- antiquated. Civil service rules represent practices of the 1950s rather than the 1980s.

The new system:

- allows the Mayor to appoint an effective personnel director, who controls administration and procedures.

- allows efficient procedures to be developed with review of the Civil Service Commission.
- eliminates cumbersome and dated rules and practices.
- expedites City hiring and promotion procedures.

I urge a Yes vote on Proposition D.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

It's 1986 and we're still trying to manage City business as if it were 1932. As heads of City departments, charged with the daily responsibility of putting out fires, fighting crime, maintaining hospitals, parks, libraries and providing other essential services, we know from bitter experience about shortcomings of the existing Civil Service System.

Enacted with the City Charter in 1932, the system is founder-
ing in red tape. Outdated rules are the subject of endless challenges. Tests are put off; vacancies go unfilled; promotions delayed; any appeal, however groundless, stops the process in its tracks.

Proposition D would take old procedures out of the Charter so they could be changed in an orderly process by the Civil Service Commission, which also would hear appeals.

Day-to-day administration of the tests—the content, scoring, all the myriad details of managing a complex system, would be put into a modern, highly professional personnel office. Tests would be speeded up. Hiring would keep pace with need. Promotions would be on the basis of competence. High performance would be the standard. Discipline could be imposed with

working rights fully protected, and women and minorities would be assured equal opportunity.

Proposition D will help improve management and the quality of City services. Vote Yes on D.

Frank Jordan, Chief of Police
Enner Condon, Fire Chief
Den Birrer, Director, Public Works
Mary Burns, General Manager, Recreation & Park
John Fratz, City Librarian
Eugene Gartland, Director, Port
Marvin Geistlinger, Purchaser
Wilbur Hamilton, Executive Director, Redevelopment Agency
Claire Isaacs, Director, Arts Commission
Ray King, Director, Parking Authority
Dean Marcet, Director, City Planning
Grant McKinnon, Director, Human Rights Commission
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, PUC
Joyce Ream, Director, Aging
Ed Sarsfield, General Manager, Social Services
Thelma Shelley, Managing Director, War Memorial
Moiro So, Executive Director, Community Development
Louis Tarpen, Director of Airport
Dr. David Wendel, Director, Health Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The hiring practices outlined in San Francisco City Charter have been virtually unchanged since 1931, a severe handicap in running a modern city. Proposition D is designed to streamline the charter and ensure that the rights of present City employees and candidates for City jobs are protected, while improving the hiring process itself. The initiative also builds management accountability in the city system.

Proposition D Is More Fair, More Efficient,
More Economical

The day-to-day personnel functions, including hiring, will be consolidated under a Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. Decisions of the Director of Personnel on examination content and administration are final, unless a decision is stayed during the appeal process by an unanimous vote of the Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D will make it easier to modernize the many archaic Civil Service rules and procedures now included in the Charter, while maintaining a strong and independent Civil Service Commission to safeguard the merit system and protect the rights of City employees. Many detailed rules will come out of

the Charter and will become personnel regulations. These regulations can then be modernized, but only through a process which includes public hearings and meet and confer sessions with the union involved. In addition, the Civil Service Commission must approve any changes or new regulations governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfer, resignation and terminations.

Proposition D Will Improve Performance And
Public Confidence

The openness and fairness of the proposition will benefit everyone. Well-qualified job candidates will have a better chance of being hired, and well-qualified job holders will have a better chance of being promoted. This means generally better job performance in all departments, resulting in higher employee morale and more public confidence in city government.

Submitted by
Louis Hop Lee, President
Civil Service Commission
Lee Munson, Member Civil Service Commission and
Treasurer, San Franciscans for Fair and Efficient Government

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Cities can survive only with strong management. The greatest budgetary restraint must be exercised to assure that full value is received for each tax dollar spent.

With firm limits on what it can spend and faced with a possible loss of Federal funds next year, the City must be managed with the greatest possible efficiency.

Essential to greater efficiency is the need for Civil Service reform. As members of City Commissions, we constantly confront the torturous delays and confused rules that gridlock the present system. The present system simply can’t respond to the City’s personnel needs.

Qualified applicants become frustrated and seek employment elsewhere. Promotions are blocked. Morale suffers. Temporaries fill in; overtime mounts. The ability to plan is crippled; management is weakened.

Proposition D would put the system on a business-like basis. A personnel department would handle day-to-day administration. The Civil Service Commission would be the watchdog to assure the integrity of the merit system.

This streamlined system would replace what is now inflexible and cumbersome. Testing could be accelerated; hiring made more efficient and promotions made on time. The result would be greater efficiency and elimination of costly waste.

Vote Yes on D.

Jerry E. Berg, President, Board of Permit Appeals
Henry Berman, President, Fire Commission
Mo Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Hector Chinchilla, Rent Board
Rev. Harry Chuck, Housing Authority
Dr. Arthur Coleman, President, Port Commission
Owen Davis, Police Commission
J. Edward Fitchell, Airports Commission
H. Welton Flynn, President, Public Utilities Commission
James Foster, Health Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation & Park Commission
James Fussell, President, Housing Authority
Anne Haisled, Port Commission
Tommy Harris, Recreation & Park Commission
Tom Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Walter Jabe, Public Library Commission
Jeffrey Lee, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Philip Lee, President, Health Commission
Bruce W. Lilienthal, Small Business Advisory Commission
Jacqueline Nemirovski, President, Arts Commission
Toby Rosenblatt, President, Planning Commission
Dr. David Sanchez, President, Police Commission
Joan San Jule, Housing Authority
John Patrick Short, President, Parking Authority
Marjorie G. Stern, President, Public Library Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D contains civil service reform measures urged by the League of Women Voters since 1969.

Proposition D will:
— Modernize the City’s outdated personnel system by creating a Director of Personnel, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors
— Preserve the principles of merit through policies set by the Civil Service Commission
— Create a more responsive Civil Service system at no additional cost to the taxpayer

EFFICIENCY AND FLEXIBILITY

Proposition D transfers authority for day-to-day management of the City’s personnel system from the Civil Service Commission to the Director of Personnel. This will:
— Prevent hiring delays
— Ensure only the most qualified individuals are hired and promoted
— Provide City managers with more administrative flexibility

FAIRNESS FOR EMPLOYEES

Proposition D will:
— Safeguard the rights of City workers
— Protect gains made in hiring women and minorities
— Retain the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit appeals board
— Retain the ability of the City’s unions to negotiate working conditions
— Create a system that can respond quickly and fairly to the needs of City workers

Proposition D will bring the Civil Service system into the 20th century by making the Mayor accountable for the management of a system employing more than 25,000 people. Hiring by merit is still guaranteed by the Charter. Please join us in voting for this Reform!

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
Esther Marks, Past President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote Yes on Proposition D the Civil Service Modernization Initiative.

Prevent abuse of a system that was intended to serve the public and protect against favoritism. Prevent situations like this: an employee failed to report to work for a week without explanation; he was telephoned, notified by certified mail and a message left under his door; he was terminated 13 days later; he did not appeal the termination and the civil service commission up-
Civil Service

held the termination. Two months later, the employee petitioned the commission for reinstatement. The employee got his job back, not because the process of termination was wrong but because the commission had a long standing objection to using "absent without leave" as a reason for firing.

The quality of public services is dependent upon the effectiveness of the staff who deliver them. The primary role of the civil service commission should be to facilitate recruitment and retention of the best available personnel. It must protect against favoritism and must assure that everyone has an equal and fair chance at employment.

The present system does not do that. We feel this initiative will make the system work better, for the managers, for the employees and for the public.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco government is huge, with a budget of more than $1 billion per year and 25,000 employees. It is expected to solve serious problems. This requires that the City have the ability to hire and promote talented people to do the job.

The present civil service system is so tied up in red tape that jobs remain vacant for six months to a year, and all too often someone who is not capable of doing a good job is hired. Your taxes are being wasted, and you are not receiving the quality of services you need and deserve.

Proposition D will modernize San Francisco's civil service system. It separates the personnel department from the Civil Service Commission, and puts the department under the Mayor where it belongs. The Mayor is responsible for balancing the budget and delivering city services as efficiently as possible. She cannot do this unless she can find capable people to do the job. That is the task of the personnel department in any organization.

Proposition D will also insure that the independent Civil Service Commission has sufficient authority to require the personnel system to be fair in its treatment of City employees. The Commission will be able to issue subpoenas and require testimony of witnesses on investigations it conducts. Should it find that discrimination has occurred, it can issue orders that must be obeyed.

Most major American cities, and virtually all cities and counties in California, have the kind of civil service system that will be established by Proposition D. San Francisco's present system is still mired in the past. It hobbles the ability of the City to deliver services and spend your tax dollars as efficiently as possible.

SPUR has not placed a statement in the Voter's Handbook for any other issue over the past 15 years. We feel that Proposition D is so vital for San Francisco's future that we are making this appeal for your support.

Vote "YES" on Proposition D.

SPUR—The San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Reform Initiative, will give San Francisco citizens the HIGH PERFORMANCE GOVERNMENT necessary to meet the many challenges of the future. Proposition D corrects the outdated and inflexible requirements originally written in San Francisco's City Charter in 1931. It will eliminate the problems which prevent San Francisco's personnel system from operating with efficiency the City's voters and taxpayers deserve:

Proposition D insures City jobs will be filled from current lists of the most qualified employees.

Proposition D prevents ungrounded appeals from delaying for years the appointment or promotion of qualified employees.

Proposition D eliminates the repetitive tasks currently monopolizing the Civil Service Commission meetings and directs the Commission to serve as an appellate body to protect the City's good employees.

Proposition D centralizes the day-to-day operation of the civil service system and makes the Director of Personnel responsible to the Mayor.

Proposition D simplifies the budgetary process by making the Mayor the City's chief labor negotiator, responsible for setting working conditions within the City's financial capacity.

Proposition D is the result of years of painstaking review by the most experienced, able and respected management experts in San Francisco. It is a plan intended to move City government out of the 1930s and equip San Francisco to enter the twenty-first century without being burdened by the red tape of the past.

After ten years of commitment to improving our City, the Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee is convinced adoption of Proposition D is one of the most important issues facing the voters. CHANGE IS LONG OVERDUE. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by,
The Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee

David Anacher
Jerome Anderson
Richard Blum
Charles Chapman
Arthur Cooke, Jr.
Benton Dial
James Edgar
Ruben Garcia

Robert Hayden
Walter Headley
John Jacobs
Michael McGill
Ellen Newman
Roy Nordman
Frank Titum

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D has been endorsed by the San Francisco Council of Human Resource Managers, the association of over one hundred personnel managers in City government.

Proposition D strengthens merit system principles. Civil Service commissioners will have more time to enforce and protect these principles rather than being bogged down in the day-to-day activities of administration.

Proposition D will help bring about improved methods and practices in personnel administration and should result in a more competent and effective workforce which the citizens of San Francisco have a right to expect.

Alvin W. Schaaf
Personnel Director
Recreation and Park Department
Martha Ramirez
Personnel Officer
San Francisco Port
Edward M. Gazzano
Personnel Director
Department of Health
James Horan
Senior Personnel Officer
Department of Social Services
James Ilincich
Personnel Director
San Francisco International Airport

Andrea R. Gourtine
Manager, Bureau of Personnel & Training
Public Utilities Commission
Mori Noguchi
Senior Department Personnel Officer
Mary Smith
Senior Personnel Officer
Laguna Honda Hospital
Thelma Poteet
Senior Personnel Officer
San Francisco General Hospital
John Burke
Personnel Director
Controller's Office

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will assist the Department of Public Works by streamlining the Civil Service process.

• Under the current system, the duration of eligible lists from 2 to 4 years hampers the Department from hiring graduates of colleges and universities on an annual basis. Consequently, many excellent candidates are not entered into the Civil Service System. Passage of the proposition will improve the quality of the pool of applicants and thereby the quality of public service given by the Department.

• The establishment of a Personnel Director to administer the day-to-day tasks of the system will speed up the decision making process to the advantage of employees and management alike.

• The proposition still calls for checks and balances in that the Commission will continue to hear appeals on discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest. The Commission will act as a watchdog while leaving the general administration to the Personnel Director.

The initiative will make for an improved system for employees, management and the citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Donald Birrer
Director of Public Works

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Passage of this amendment will update our civil service system. These changes will make it comparable to other merit system agencies. Some of these changes are

(A) removal of administrative details from the charter which inhibit timely and effective personnel actions.

The following subjects will be placed in personnel regulations:

• Protests of written questions and answers
• Protests of tentative employment lists
• Promotional examinations

(B) allows continuous up-dating of employment lists.

(C) allows equitable treatment of job candidates with same test score.

(D) realigns responsibilities: the Civil Service Commission dealing primarily with compliance and adjudication activities

(continued)
while the Personnel Department administers the day-to-day operation of the merit system.

Equally Important the amendment retains important merit system provisions dealing with:
- Employee salary setting procedures
- Positions subject to merit system examinations
- Public hearing and meet and confer requirements
- Penalties for examination fraud
- Seniority, meritorious service and applicable educational credits for promotional examinations in the Police/Fire De-

partments
- Termination of unsatisfactory employees
- Disciplinary suspensions
- Conflict of interest
- Creation of positions
Proposition “D” merits a ‘YES’ vote.

John J. Walsh
General Manager Personnel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Initiative, is a long-overdue reform to streamline antiquated hiring practices in San Francisco’s fifty-year-old charter. Proposition D will ensure that the best and brightest job candidates are chosen to serve our city, thus promoting excellence in job performance and helping to eliminate incompetence. This initiative builds management accountability in the city system, while giving the Civil Service Commission the independence to protect the rights of women and minorities.

A Better, More Efficient System at Less Cost
Proposition D consolidates personnel functions, including hiring, under a new Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. The Director has final authority over content of examinations given city job applicants, so more flexibility is possible in finding truly qualified candidates.

Proposition D redefines the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit systems appeals board and policy-setting body. The merit principles are spelled out in the Proposition. This allows the Commission to protect the rights of women and minorities at no cost to the public.

More Fair to Everyone
Proposition D greatly improves the city charter. Well-qualified job candidates have a better chance to be hired and well-qualified job holders have a better chance to be promoted. The public is rewarded with the better job performance, efficiency and friendliness one expects from good government employees. All of these improvements are at no additional cost to the taxpayer.

Submitted by
James W. Haas

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service System, as presently constituted, (vintage 1932!), is uncivil, and there is nothing “systematic” about it! It’s pure, unadulterated municipal lunacy and chaos! Remarkably, BOTH Management and Labor despise it. It certainly is NOT producing the best qualified persons to fill City jobs!

Let’s follow Mayor Feinstein’s recommendations. If this operation doesn’t dramatically improve, there are always FUTURE ELECTIONS where additional, more Draconian changes can be considered by the voters.

As matters now stand, it is far better to light a candle than just sit and curse the darkness! Any changes will be an improvement! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

For more than a half-century, San Francisco Mayors have abided by the employee examination, hiring and promotion policies administered by a strong and independent Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D is a deceptive and dangerous scheme that would give future Mayors and top-level bureaucrats the power to ignore competence and reward political loyalty.

Proposition D would take key Civil Service employment rules out of the City Charter and make them subject to wheeling and dealing by City Hall politicians.

There’s an old saying — “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.”
Civil Service has worked well for more than 50 years. Proposition D is unnecessary, ineffective and even counter-productive.

It’s not just deceptive, it’s dangerous.

Joseph L. Alioto
Former Mayor of San Francisco

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

Time and time again, different groups have put various propositions on the ballot to weaken our Civil Service System and reintroduce political patronage into City employment practices. And every time the voters have wisely rejected these schemes, no matter how cleverly they have been disguised. Proposition D is just another power grab by bureaucrats at the top in City Hall.

We’ve said NO! loud and clear in the past. Let’s say NO one more time.

Submitted by:
TAXPAYERS FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT
Thomas Scanlon
City Treasurer, Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “D”!!!!

During the eight years while a member of the Board of Supervisors, I fought hard to reform the Civil Service Commission and to bring working conditions and city workers’ pay equitable to both workers and taxpayers. I fought to insure an independent Civil Service Commission that would remain just that— independent and free from political influence and political patronage of particularly the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

I am truly saddened by the Mayor’s insistence in bringing this disastrous Proposition “D” before the voters. Some of the Supervisors rejected this misguided measure for what it is; an unwise consolidation of authority to hire, fire and promote city workers by the Mayor and newly created personnel officer.

My efforts to bring pay equity to both taxpayers and city workers were continually squashed by then Supervisor Feinstein and Supervisor Molinari. Finally, in 1975, shortly after a disastrous city strike, I was able to place on the ballot, for voter approval, a measure that almost eliminates the power of the Mayor and Supervisors to manipulate the pay of city workers. This measure was overwhelmingly passed by the voters that year and we have not had any labor unrest since that date.

Vote No on “D”!
“D” stands for disaster. It will undo many of these reforms. Also, right now, the City is almost broke, thanks to the manipulation of Mayor Feinstein and her chief ally Supervisor Molinari.

If “D” passes the cost of operating our city government will increase in the next 24 months by not less than $60,000,000.

Contrary to the provisions of Proposition 13, property taxes would be increased, thus forcing up rents.

Vote No on “D”.

Don’t weaken our Civil Service Commission, whereby least deserving city employees could be promoted because of connection or clout.

Vote No on “D”.

We now almost have more problems than we can handle. We don’t want our city turned into another Chicago, wherefor for nearly half a century a corrupt political system flourished under Mayor Richard Daley.

John Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We join San Franciscans for Fair Employment in opposing the Civil Service Initiative, Proposition D.

This measure will severely hamper the well-being of the San Francisco Fire and Police Departments. These departments are two of the finest in the Country and have consistently protected life and property in a professional manner. They must continue that tradition with a civil service system based on MERIT and not political patronage.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Andrew C. Casper
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Keith P. Colden
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

William F. Murray
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Thomas J. Cahill
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired

Donald M. Scott
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Our present Civil Service system was designed to keep corruption out of government. It has generally served that purpose well. This proposition would dismantle that system and in my opinion open the doors to nepotism, favoritism, patronage and corruption. Better a city government that is bureaucratic than one that is corrupt. Vote NO on D.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is an attack on the merit system and an attempt to return patronage to the Mayor's office by eliminating the authority of the Civil Service Commission and its built in checks and balances.

The present Civil Service system is not perfect, but corrections can be made within the Charter without destroying a system that has worked for over 50 years and has been free from fraud and corruption.

This proposition will do nothing to improve the caliber of police performance and could have the opposite effect.

I urge you to vote NO on PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by
The San Francisco Police Supervisors and Investigators Association

Don Goad, Captain SFPD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D could be a dangerous first step toward weakening the independent, impartial administration of our City government.

Proposition D would transfer power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor. The Director's decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline and certification would be final. The Commission would have no right to hear examinations or disciplinary appeals.

With the transfer of duties and responsibilities from the Commission to the Mayor's appointed Personnel Director, the Mayor would have control over personnel functions. Currently, commissioners have independent status and can be dismissed for cause. The Personnel Director could be dismissed at will.

The Merit System could be replaced by a patronage system. Proposition D could open the door to rules permitting the Personnel Director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his or her position on the list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Proposition D is NOT a reform package. The checks and balances for efficient City government would be lopsided, with too much power in the hands of unknown future Mayors.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
John L. Molinari, President
Harry G. Britt
Richard Hengisto
Willie B. Kennedy
Wendy Nelder
Nancy Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Beware of PROPOSITION D!

Powerful special interest groups are attempting to remove key City employees from the independent and impartial Civil Service system in the name of "reform".

They want instead to make these employees answerable directly to future Mayors and politically-appointed Personnel Directors and department heads.

PROPOSITION D got on the ballot because the Chamber of Commerce and such companies as Pacific Bell and PG&E paid a professional southern California campaign firm, $70,000 to collect signatures.

They're trying to destroy the merit system and replace it with an old-fashioned patronage system.

Department heads will be able to ignore examination scores and reward loyalty rather than competence in promotions and hiring.

Don't let the Chamber of Commerce, big business and their allies in the City bureaucracy dictate who's hired, fired and promoted among public employees.

PROPOSITION D is not just deceptive, it's dangerous!
Vote NO on PROPOSITION D!

Libby Denebeim
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Ron Huberman
Vice-Chairman, Democratic Central Committee
Jim Wacob
Democratic Central Committee
Roberto Esteres
President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Rick Pacurar
President, Harvey Milk Lesbian Gay Democratic Club
Walter L. Johnson
Exec. Secy., S. F. Labor Council
Michael Bernstein
Member, S. F. Labor Council
Sallie Roselli
Member, S. F. Labor Council
John Mehring
Member, S. F. Labor Council
Nancy Walker
Member, S. F. Labor Council
Harry Britt
Member, S. F. Labor Council
Carole Migden
Member, S. F. Labor Council
Jack Morrison
Member, S. F. Labor Council
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D places too much power in the hands of ONE. Proposition D will provide for a personnel director to be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. The Mayor now appoints five members of the Civil Service Commission who also serve at her pleasure.

You work for years to climb the civil service ladder and then somebody comes along with an idea to cut you off at the pockets.

Proposition D will lock in all the employees employed in the Mayor’s office and will control the appointments of any new staff by the next Mayor elect in 1987 and years thereafter.

Like controlling your estate from the grave.

Vote NO on D.

Marguerite Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service Merit System has served our City well, giving San Franciscans an equal opportunity. It has helped us obtain employment and earn promotions based on objective examinations.

The Civil Service Merit system replaced the old patronage system that rewarded political loyalty more than competence.

Now the supporters of PROPOSITION D want to create a new Personnel Director, accountable only to the Mayor, and give department heads the absolute power to decide who works for the City and who gets promoted.

If PROPOSITION D passes, equal opportunity would give way to opportunity based on membership in the bureaucratic “establishment”.

Keep our Civil Service Merit System strong and free from the political abuses of the past.

Vote NO on D!

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly

Ben Tor
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board

Joanne Miller
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board

A. Richard Cerescu
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board

Dr. Sodonia Wilson
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board

Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, President

S. F. Community College Governing Board

Julie Tang
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board

Alan S. Wong
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board

Henry Der

Albert Chang

Rudy Meraz

Robert “Bob” Morales

Yori Wada

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Can you imagine studying for a civil service examination, being rated at the top of the eligible list and never receiving the promotion? That’s exactly what Proposition “D” will do should the electorate adopt this amendment.

The civil service merit system has defects, but to totally eliminate the system and replace it with a patronage system where promotions are based on who you know, rather than what you know is scandalous.

Civil service was put in place to prevent scandal and the “favor seeking” individual from getting a paid position because he/she happened to support the right elected official.

Proposition “D” will allow one person, chosen by the Mayor, to decide who will be promoted, hired and fired. This is awesome power for one single individual to have at any level of government.

Our current Mayor may choose a fair person for this position, but will future Mayors be as careful? As each new Mayor assumes office, the civil service system will again change. The potential to favor one individual or group over others is great.

Proposition “D” has a great potential to diminish the quality of services we now provide to our citizens, as the future of how people are hired and promoted in the San Francisco Police Department is completely unknown.

It’s true our promotional system is fraught with delays and delays frustrate us all, but Proposition “D” is not the answer. Proposition “D” will only add to our existing problems. Several years ago, our citizens elected a Charter Commission to streamline city government and make civil service work more efficiently. The voters eventually rejected those proposals. The checks and balances that make our government stable were no longer present. It simply went too far.

Proposition “D” goes even further. It brings about a system of patronage and should be defeated lest we want to engage in “free-wheeling and dealing” of civil service jobs and promotions.

We urge a strong No vote against Proposition “D”!

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS’ ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry, President

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

The purpose of the Civil Service Commission is to ensure that the merit system would be the only criteria in any examination process.

If Proposition D passes, all authority concerning examinations would be taken from the Civil Service Commission and given to a Personnel Director, who is appointed by the Mayor. This Personnel Director would have the authority to hire and fire at his discretion, with no appeal available. This proposition is contrary to everything the Fire Department and all City employees have strived for over the years.

The Civil Service Commission in its present form was instituted to prevent any possibility of a patronage system, where one person has complete control.

This proposition would do nothing to improve your Fire Department. If you are satisfied with the work and make up of the San Francisco Fire Department in its present form, "Vote No On Proposition D". You will be doing a service for the San Francisco Fire Department, and the people of San Francisco.

Submitted by the San Francisco Fire Chiefs' Association
John Flaherty, Battalion Chief SFFD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is bad government and bad politics, changing our independent civil service system into a system dominated by the Mayor:

. . By shortening the six year terms of Civil Service Commission to conform to the Mayor's four year term of office.

. . By transferring most of the Commission's powers to a Personnel Director who serves solely at the Mayor's pleasure.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D fails to offer enough new and improved procedures to cure the current defects in the civil service system. Charter sections and civil service rules are repealed without specific known replacements.

Proposition D transfers power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created personnel director appointed by, and to serve at the pleasure of, the Mayor. The director's decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline, and certification would be final. The commission would have no right to hear examination or disciplinary appeals.

There are hidden costs with Proposition D because the new Personnel Administration Department will employ a personnel director, and other employees "as may be necessary to carry out (its) functions and duties."

The Merit System could be replaced by an old style Patronage System. Proposition D could open the door to rules which permit the personnel director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his/her position on the civil service testing list.

Keep politics out of employment services. Vote NO on Proposition D!

Alice B. Toklas, Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Roberto Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Police and Fire Commissions would lose functions as a result of the personnel director's new power. The director's unlawful employment discrimination policy would be binding upon department administrators. The director's procedure for employee dispute resolution must be used by all department heads and appointing officers.

Proposition D is not the answer. The checks and balances for efficient city government would be lopsided.

I urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, 17th Assembly District
Sala Burton
Congresswoman
Art Agnos
16th Assembly District
Milton Marks
State Senator

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Balboa Reservoir Development Ban

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission declared Balboa Reservoir South (located across Phelan Avenue from San Francisco City College) surplus in 1984 and made the site available for low, moderate and market rate housing. In July 1985, a City-community advisory committee chose a developer to build 203 single-family homes on the 13 acre site. Construction has not yet begun.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would prohibit granting new building permits and would revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site (Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1) between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit granting any new building permits and you want to revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to allow building permits to be granted for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

Controller's Statement on “E”

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

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

How “E” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for a three-year ban on development of the Balboa Reservoir site had qualified for the June ballot.

Sidney Kass and Jesse David Wall, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 12,430 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 10,012 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 77
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Having been responsible for providing leadership at City College from 1947 to 1977, we cannot stand by and see this site converted to housing. We must speak out. Such a move would preclude forever the logical and much needed campus expansion to what was once our West Campus. We left that site reluctantly to make way for water storage. If it is no longer required for that purpose, let us return it to City College.

Thousands of San Franciscans—high school graduates, dropouts, veterans, re-entering women—representing all of the city’s diverse ethnic groups, have been prepared for transfer to four-year colleges, profitable careers, and have had their lives enriched at the City College of San Francisco. Without City College’s open door and easy access, many would have been deprived of these opportunities.

Its 56 acre campus originally housed 3,000 students. Now it serves over 23,000. This campus, compared to other community colleges, can be best described as cramped, inadequate, and second rate. The condition of the campus is to be contrasted with the excellence of its programs—which are recognized as among the best in the nation.

Lou Batmale
Chancellor 1970-1977
Louis G. Conlan
President 1947-1970

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION ‘E’

We question:
1. Why no EIR was required when the proposed development could have a substantial impact.
2. Whether the future needs of City College for classrooms, housing, and parking have been considered.
3. What the impact on taxpayers is with below market land sale and construction financing by bonds.

This moratorium will permit adequate study of these issues. Vote YES on Proposition ‘E’.

Bruce Bonacker, President
Board of Directors, Glen Park Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don’t let a developer make a mint on land across from the most overcrowded college in the Bay Area! Parking is already an impossibility for residents near City College...adding 200 homes to this land would make the situation much worse.

It’s simple: a college which can’t find room for more students at a time when more people are returning to education doesn’t serve the community.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This land is being sold at much less than its true value. The development wouldn’t do much to ease the City’s housing crunch, but it would undercut the future of City College and the peace of mind of the neighborhood.

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

You’d probably be upset. We certainly are. Please help us protect our neighborhood. Please vote YES on proposition E.

Westwood Park Residents: Edna Tooker
Minnie Dorwin Eugene Eden
Donna Nicoletti Robert Armstrong
Pauline Armstrong
Joel Martinez
Richard & Lisa Patterson
David Bean
H. Bezzene William Burke
Richard Bohel
Clyde Theriot
Danae Manus
Esma Manus

Sunnyside Residents: Ellen Wall
Melissa Volunted
David Wall
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let the greedy developers take this potentially picturesque open space. A yes vote means you want more time to consider its future use. All we ask is time to think and plan.

John Barbegelata
Former member, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Suppose there was a publicly owned open space across the street from the main U.C. Berkeley Campus. Can you imagine for one moment that it would be passed into private ownership? Vote Yes on E for Equality and Excellence in Education

City College Students:
William Lew, Student
Tim McGuire, Student Council Member
Joseph Goldstein, Student Council Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

In 1952, the "Experts" said we needed reservoirs. They felt so strongly that they condemned the City College West Campus, destroyed the buildings, and constructed the reservoirs—all at taxpayer's expense.

Now, in 1986 with more demand for water, the "Experts" say the reservoir is no longer needed. What is the concerned taxpayer to believe?

When in doubt, the city should hold on to the expensive things already paid for.

Stop the reservoir giveaway. Vote YES on E.

Taxpayers for Preserving the Reservoir.
Richard Patterson
Dorice Murphy
Lucille Carson
Daniel Gutierrez
Franz Wise
Bernhard Scholand
Ruth Hanson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This is a Planning issue.
We have been accused of trying to stop housing for poor people. Not true. In the first place, the price levels are certainly middle income and above, but our main objection is that this badly done plan is damaging to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as to the over-crowded community college across the street.

WHAT WE WANT
Even our critics point out that we originally SUGGESTED housing for that site, but they don't talk about what else we suggested. We want two levels of parking under a City College Library, Bookstore, and Auditorium, with housing on top. Furthermore, let the housing be TRULY affordable—for students and seniors. We are trying to stop the bureaucrats' subsidized middle income housing project because it makes our dream impossible.

We ask for three years to give the neighborhood and the college a chance to produce a better plan.

SNaP (Sensible Neighborhood Planning Committee)

Helen Crizer, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council, representing 17 neighborhood associations in the area of the surplus reservoir property in question has voted to endorse the three-year stop of private construction on the old West Campus of City College.

Dr. Louis Batmale, Chancellor of City College from 1970-1977, has persuaded us that City College needs the lands.

Juanita Raven, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Be a sport.

Give City College a vote of support.

City has 23,000 students and badly needs a library. The only place to put it is in the reservoir site. City College has walked closely with San Francisco for five decades. The reservoir site has always been understood to be reserved for City College.

Until now, whenever someone wants it for housing. Housing is important, but it can be anywhere in town. But a City College library can only be located at the College.

Vote yes to support a book — and a reader.

Reading, studying, writing and research make up our town also.

It is hard to understand criticism of City for wanting to keep this area for a library. Sure, housing sites are at a premium — but even more so a library site for City which is one of the largest schools in the Nation.

Some people blast City for wanting a library because of the need for housing. Housing is needed. But some of those very same people want a big battleship stationed here that will bring in 15,000 new family members.

The educational and cultural growth of San Francisco mandates living space for the City College library.

If this measure gets a no vote, it means there will be no site for a Library. This is the last chance. Vote YES to help out a book — and a reader.

State financing, when approved, will construct this building.

It is the top building priority at City College.

A YES vote here means there will be time to think about the use of the site. During that three-year period, cooler heads may realize this is the only site for a Library. If the housing goes in there will be no library there.

Vote yes for a book, for a good school and a better City.

John Riordan, Board of Governors
San Francisco Community College District.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Sunnyside Neighborhood Association is not against housing, but we are trying to stop a hasty and short-sighted plan. We are asking for this moratorium to get time for a better plan that will answer a variety of needs and benefit the entire city as well as our community.

This is a planning issue.

The release of the reservoir property as surplus by the water department came as a surprise to our neighborhood. The June 1984 “Residence Element” of the city’s Master Plan did not even list the land as surplus. By 1985 major decisions were being made for use of the land without adequate neighborhood input.

There were some meetings attended by a few people carefully selected for their zealous pro-housing views or potential financial gain. The resulting plan has gone out of control. Now it benefits only the developer and the lucky few who will get houses on free land.

Proposition E is not an attack on housing.

Please help us save our neighborhood against poor planning by voting YES on Proposition E.

Joe Mahoney, President
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Miraloma Improvement Club urges a YES vote on Proposition E.

B. Sullivan
Dale Jones
Homer Bradford
Kathryn A. Small
Harry Small

Mr. & Mrs. Henry Taylor
Betty Woo Suen
Susan Piscitelli
Dale Brown

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION E

All the talk in the world can’t change the fact that City College has fewer acres of land relative to its student population than any college in the Bay Area.

Enrollment at City College is INCREASING, as is the enrollment of the San Francisco public schools from which City College draws most of its students. It is obvious that City College needs and deserves the reservoir land. The three-year moratorium will give time to produce a better plan which will have input by faculty, students and alumni who know the college’s needs and want to support it.

Sid Kass
Susie Langdon Kass
Phil Kass
City College Student

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The homeowners of Westwood Park, a neighborhood adjacent to the Balboa Reservoir, support the ballot initiative calling for a 3 year development moratorium. We believe that the City and City College should take additional time to determine their needs and how they might be met by using the Reservoir. In the event that City College does not need this property, we support its development as open space or as single family detached housing.

Westwood Park Association
Don C. Swander
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Let's not aggravate the traffic problem around City College before we first develop solutions for the existing problems. A three-year moratorium only buys our neighborhood and elected officials time to find solutions; it doesn't say no to housing. A YES vote is a vote for prudent development. A YES vote helps to preserve the family character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ken Hoegger
Realtor and community Activist

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As representatives of the students of City College, we understand first-hand, the intense need to reserve a site for future school expansion. Preservation of the Balboa Reservoir, a site directly adjacent to the campus, is particularly crucial. The facilities that CCSF requires, such as a library and an auditorium, are essential to the main structure of the campus. Unlike classrooms, it would be unreasonable to build an auditorium or a library on an off-campus site, since these facilities are integral to the main function of the school.

Associated Student Council of City College
Jack Lee, Vice President of Associated Counsel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Local 2121 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, representing City College faculty, urges a yes vote on Proposition E. While this project provides short-term employment for a few, we are more concerned about the thousands of students who would benefit from planning and development that would better serve the community and the college.

Yes on E for continued excellence in community college education.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is twice as crowded as any community college in northern California. It needs a much larger library, bookstore and auditorium, and more parking.

The college has always expected to use the empty SOUTH reservoir for educational needs. That land is finally surplus. Neither the college Governing Board nor the Chancellor attended the Mayor's planning sessions for the property and the faculty was not informed. When the 12.3 acre site was offered to a developer for $36,900 for subsidized housing, the Chancellor said, "We are at a crossroad and the correct path is for the Board of Supervisors, with the Mayor's support, to deed this surplus land to City College so that the college may continue to serve the city effectively for the next 50 years as it has for the past half century." The Mayor refused. Now only Board member John Riordan supports the correct path.

The Water Department says it may need the NORTH reservoir now used for student parking. If that crisis occurs, the Chancellor says, "We'll deal with the situation then." How, if the south reservoir is gone?

(continued)
When land is available other community colleges finance large projects through alliances with civic, athletic and cultural organizations, and through property sales. New methods for public funding are being developed. The faculty would like three years of careful study to unravel misunderstandings and poor management, and to find the best way to be a good neighbor.

Ken Crizer
Lene Johnson
Madeline Mueller
Julia Scholand
Steering Committee,
City College Faculty for Responsible Development

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College needs land now for desperately needed facilities, one of which is a library. City College has an enrollment of 23,000 students but our library has seating for 450. There are other possible locations for new housing, but City College can’t be moved. Give us an opportunity to plan a development for the community and the college.

Annie M. Young
City College Library Faculty and Staff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty and staff members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco’s community college for our students’ needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco’s community college for our students’ needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Darlene Alloro
Mary Allen
Tom Angeloff
Robert Balestrieri
Don Banen
Diana Bernstein
Joe Berry
Anna Britton
Thomas Brendel
James Bristol
Richard Bronzel
Laurent Brunschil
Philip Brown
Barbara Cabral
John Callen
John Caris
Frank Cerrato
Rosemary Clark
Perry Close
Karl Common
Walter Critts
George Crippen
Patricia Davis
Guy DePino
Edward Dieruff
Sharon Edwards
Larry Ernst
Mary Erwin
Kwey Fang
William Finke
Terry Greenfield
Robert Griffin
Michael Guthrie
Mary Hanna
Yen-Kuang Ho
Peter Hoch
Ronald Hochste
Myrna Holden
Katherine Holdum
Michael Hulbert
Edward Hunt
Frank Ingersoll
Elaine Johnson
Wendy Kaufman
Jo Kennedy
Mercedes Kow
Rosalind Kwok
Don Labbert
James Lalas
Steve Levinson
Sue Light
Gary Ling
Amellia Lippi
Dave Lubbert
Leon Ley
Deumane Macalou
Marion McManus
Patricia Madigan
Michael Malachowski
Mary Mari
Maria Mariani
Sylvia Marshall
Valerie Meenan
Jose Mejia
Margit Michelmayr
Deanne Milan
Cindy Moody
Thomas Munro
David Myhr
Deborah Nagle
Glenn Nance
Herbert Naylor
William Neff
Dennis Pionkowski
Francine Podenski
Theresa Poydasss
Solomon Raja
Mary Ritter
Mary Ritter
Fariborz Saniee
Marvin Schininger
Fred Schneider
Earl Scriver
Andy Seal
Ken Shen
Robert Struckman
Moshiu Tam
Edward Taylor
Pierre Thiry
Barbara Thomas
Clare Thompson
Willie Thompson
Mary Thurber
Robert Tricaro
James Trunier
Joanne Tumminia
George VanBuzay
Cherie Werzel
Austin White
Joan Wilson
Rosalie Wolf
Christina Yee

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Water Department has begun a resource study of water use, due for completion in two or three years. The study may well indicate that one or both reservoirs will be needed. The American Water Works Association states that reservoirs should be used in pairs. This is particularly important because it is the only reservoir at an elevation of 305 feet.

The Mayor twisted the arm of the Water Department to declare one of these reservoirs surplus before the water resource study is completed. Don’t let her get away with this kind of political manipulation.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Kurt Common
Ken Crizer
Ed Dierauf
Herb Naylor
CCSF Engineering Professors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The South Balboa Basin has been unused since college leased buildings, including a large auditorium, were torn down on that site thirty years ago. We hope that three years of thorough planning would explore the possibility of returning a part of that property to the college for the development of a multi-purpose medium-sized auditorium which could be shared with community groups.

Joseph Alessi
Mary Argenti
Neyde Azevedo
John Bischoff

Robert Bezina
Mack Crooks
Bob Davis
Helen Dilworth
Franz Enciso
Richard Esterman
Richard Fenner
Lawrence Ferrara
Ted Fleming
Peggy Gorham
William Grothkopp
David Hardiman

Judy Hubbell
Charles Hudspeth
Sieglinde Isham
Baruch Klein
John Kongismark
Joshua Law
Steven Lopez
Jerry Mueller
Madeline Mueller
Marvin Tartak
Frank Townsend
City College Music Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition E. This moratorium is necessary because there are too many worthy uses for this land to make a hasty and potentially very costly decision. Only through careful planning can the limited land available for development be best used.

Nicolas Alexander
Paul Hewitt

Robert Kaar
James Korck
Dock Lee
Chelsee Liu
William Maynez
Annette Rappeleyea
Oleg Reuci
David Wall
City College Physics Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, as Physical Education Instructors, have always been committed to a diversified program for our students and community. The reservoir space is a natural land resource for a Multi Educational and Cultural Center.

Your YES vote on E will allow us the freedom to explore ways that this property could most constructively benefit all.

Gail Barton
Curtis Decker
Brad Duggan
Tanako Hagihara
JoAnn Hahn
Daniel Hayes

Lene Johnson
Grover Klimmer
Paula McCullum
Art Octavio
Louise Scarrus

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, full-time faculty of the Computer and Information Science Department of City College, urge a YES vote to postpone the decision until additional planning and surveys can be conducted. The current proposal would negatively impact the College's enrollment.

William Beaver
Ronald Cerruti, Chairman
Kirk Gibson
Howard Granger
Frank Holden
Michael Kelly

George Lany
Horbert Laidley
Charles Metzler
Charles Miller
Marilyn Schnake

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

A YES vote on Proposition E helps STOP a scheme to GIVE AWAY $12,300,000 worth of City land for $1,800,000 (or less) to a Redwood City real estate developer.

A YES vote will SAVE taxpayers $550,000 per year. The housing project will produce $240,000 in taxes, but supplying City services will cost $790,000 per year.

The Controller's cost estimate does NOT account for the $12,300,000 land value, since land sale below value is NOT technically a cost of government. The Controller also is NOT permitted to assume that the housing project will be constructed, since construction has NOT yet been ordered by the Board of Supervisors.

The plan does NOT restrict housing sales to moderate-income first-time buyers. The plan only restricts use of tax-subsidized funds. Any person favored by the developer or politicians can buy these dwellings and get the benefits of the public land giveaway.

The houses are made "affordable" by giving away the land far below market value, by City-backed low interest, and by cutting construction corners.

The real beneficiaries of the subsidized housing project are the financiers (NOT the project dwellers). Bondholders receive 9.6% average tax-free interest, which is equivalent to 24.6% taxable interest at 61% maximum tax. The developer and bond establishment receive $5,340,000; this is $26,300 (or 22.40%) for each $117,400 unit.

The City loses $51,700 worth of land GIVEN AWAY for each unit.

Vote YES on Proposition E for good fiscal management.

William Marquardt
Financial Analyst, SNAP
Helen Crizer, Treasurer, SNAP

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of College</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Campus (acres)</th>
<th>Area/1000 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City College of SF</td>
<td>22,624</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laney College, Oakland</td>
<td>9,805</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot College, Hayward</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa College</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of San Mateo</td>
<td>13,820</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>11.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Marin</td>
<td>6,663</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given these facts, why does the Governing Board not try to get the old West Campus back? Why don't they support this moratorium to delay the land grab?

The Governing Board is under political pressure from City Hall. They have been threatened with the loss of the north reservoir parking lot and funding for special projects. Forgive them.

Vote Yes on E.

Friends of City College
David Newton
Glen Simpson
Jack Baker
Thomas Velasquez
Tillie McCullough

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The student population at City College is increasing. This semester's enrollment is up 1,265 students over last semester.

The enrollment in the San Francisco public schools has been increasing by 1,218 per year for the last three years. City College draws most of its enrollment from public schools in San Francisco.

Obviously, City College will have a larger enrollment in the future years, and will be in desperate need of space if we do not give it back its old West Campus.

Please reserve this public land for the college.

Please vote YES on E.

Barbara Holman

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON E

In 1981, I launched a six-point program to expand San Francisco's housing supply and the voters had approved a City policy to add 20,000 new housing units within five years. This Proposition would destroy a major portion of the effort to build affordable, single-family housing in our city.

The Balboa Reservoir Site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now a site for development of 203 new single-family homes, most with three bedrooms and two baths. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed as other homes built under the City's program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom could not afford homeownership. It is believed that these new homes will sell rapidly.

The Balboa Reservoir site is one of the few sites large enough to accommodate a substantial number of new homes. Please do not let a few people stop a major opportunity for new housing. Vote no on Prop E.

Not only would Proposition E halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site, but the 9.8% fixed-rate, 30-year mortgage money set aside for the housing would also be lost.

Nothing constructive is accomplished by this measure—it does not provide additional land or facilities for City College. As a matter of fact, City College has neither plans nor money to use the property. Further, the Community College Board of Directors, the governing body for City College, has voted overwhelmingly to oppose the initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No on E.”

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the site of the unused Balboa Reservoir and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost.

These homes are desperately needed for San Franciscans who can't afford to buy in the city where the average house is selling for over $160,000. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

The homes would be built on land that belongs to the City. Over two years ago, it was declared surplus and available for housing. It is not part of City College, and City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

We urge you to vote no on Proposition E if you want more affordable housing for San Franciscans.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

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

The 203 affordable owner occupied single family units slated for the southern portion of Balboa Reservoir are part of the 1988 total. Our progress in addressing the City’s housing shortage will be curtailed if this ill-advised initiative is approved. SUPPORT OWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Housing production is essential to check rising prices and to maintain our social, economic, and ethnic population diversity. AS A SAN FRANCISCO VOTER, YOU CAN BE PART OF OUR HOUSING PROGRESS BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

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

WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT THE CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY HOUSING BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

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

Proposition E would halt construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. We need more housing in San Francisco, not less. Please join me in voting "NO" on Proposition E.

Doris M. Ward, Member
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

A critical issue facing San Francisco today is the lack of housing middle class San Franciscans can afford.

That is why I have joined these neighborhood associations to support the Balboa Reservoir neighborhood housing proposal. Those participating in the development of the proposal includes:

O.M.I. Community Association
Dorado Terrace Association
Outer Mission-Ingleside
Political Action Committee
Greater Ingleside Community
Mount Davidson Manor
Ocean Avenue Merchants Association
Ingleside Terrace Association
The San Francisco Open Space Committee
City College of San Francisco

From early in 1985 I worked closely with these neighborhood groups in the discussions between city government and community leaders concerning the development plans for this desperately needed new housing at the unused Balboa reservoir site.

These are the reasons you should vote no on proposition E.

1. The neighborhood housing proposal that this initiative seeks to stop is the result of months of hard work by the largest coalition of neighborhood associations ever to join together to plan a housing development in San Francisco.

2. The housing at the Balboa Reservoir site was designed with the involvement of the coalition of neighborhood associations to enhance the surrounding community.

3. The governing Board of the Community College District has made clear that they have no plans for the site and no ownership rights to it. City College does not oppose the construction of this development and opposes this initiative.

4. Self-proclaimed “Friends” of City College want to stop the proposal in order to preserve the site for future faculty parking. A clique of City College staffs involved in a neighborhood association pose as community opposition to this development even though representatives from this organization, the Sunnydale Neighborhood Association, had helped plan and support the proposal.

5. By masquerading as concerned neighbors these self-appointed “friends” of City College hope to prevent the construction of 204 critically needed units of housing and pull off one of the biggest land grabs in San Francisco’s history.

Don’t be fooled. Vote no on proposition E.

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Residence Element of the Comprehensive Plan of the City and County of San Francisco assesses the City’s housing needs and lays out specific steps to meet those needs. This document was adopted by the City Planning Commission in 1984 after extensive public review at neighborhood meetings and public hearings, and consideration of the detailed Environmental Impact Report.

The first objective of the Housing Element is “to provide new Housing for all income groups” in locations appropriate for residential development. To meet this goal, development of housing is to be aggressively pursued and encouraged on surplus, underused and vacant public land.

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

If you want more affordable housing in San Francisco vote no on Proposition E.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Susan J. Bierman, City Planning Commissioner

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

Vote NO on E.
Proposition E deprives San Franciscans of one of their last real chances to become homeowners at an affordable price. At the South Balboa Reservoir we have City-owned land on which 203 units of three-bedroom, two-bath homes can be built at low prices which average San Franciscans can afford to pay. These homes need to be built now, not in three years. In three years the low interest rates on mortgages and the bond financing will be gone. Two hundred families will have lost the opportunity to become homeowners, and the City will have lost the opportunity to ease the tight market in rental housing.

Nor does this ill-conceived initiative help City College in any way. City College does not need this land. Speculation that the College may at some future date find a use for the land is not founded on fact. The College may never be able to build on the reservoir. Their enrollment has dropped by over 4000 students in the last few years.
This initiative is designed to confuse you. It will make our housing shortage worse for three long years. If you support affordable housing in our City, Vote NO on Proposition E.

Bill Maher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Balboa Reservoir site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now planned for development of 203 new single family homes. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed — other homes built under this program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom would not otherwise be able to afford home ownership.
San Francisco has the most expensive housing in the nation where last year the average home sold for over $160,000. Housing is difficult to produce because the obstacles are great — little land on which to build, high construction costs and uncertain interest rates.

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost. The initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional land or facilities for City College. The Community College Board, the governing body of City College, in fact recently voted to oppose this initiative.
If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.

John L. Molinari

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

In 1980, the voters of the City and County of San Francisco approved a measure making it City policy to add 20,000 new units of housing within five years. In 1984 in an effort to satisfy this objective, the Board of Supervisors adopted a policy encouraging the expansion of the City’s housing supply. Making surplus City-owned land, such as the site at Balboa Reservoir, available for affordable housing was an important part of that policy. A proposal to build 203 homes on the unused Balboa Reservoir site was advanced to help implement the pro-housing policy.
Approval of Proposition E would HALT construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.
The Balboa Reservoir homes would be built on land currently belonging to the City and County of San Francisco. The property IS NOT part of the City College, and City College has neither plans or money to buy the property and convert it for City College use.

The only debatable issue is the future of affordable housing on the Balboa Reservoir site.
As we are all aware, San Francisco has the most expensive homes in the United States. The average cost of a home is $152,000. Not many can afford such prices. However, the housing proposed for the Balboa Reservoir will give many more citizens the opportunity to become homeowners. The homes to be built will be sold to first-time buyers at prices ranging from $83,000 to $145,000.
Other homes built in San Francisco under the direction of similar affordable housing programs have been snapped up quickly by San Franciscans. Without the program, most would not have been able to purchase the home and become homeowners.
Again, if you desire to preserve the construction of more affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site, vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Willie B. Kennedy
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

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

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

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

Stop these self-serving no-growth obstructionists! Please vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Prop E would halt affordable housing construction at the Balboa Reservoir site. Many gay people need affordable housing, too, and we join with other community groups urging you to vote NO on Prop E.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Robert Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E, if approved, would block the construction of 203 badly needed single-family homes on the south portion of the Balboa Reservoir in San Francisco. Sixty percent of these homes would be available for purchase by moderate and middle income families at purchase prices between $80,000 and $120,000. They would be constructed on surplus public land and financed by the sale of mortgage revenue bonds to enable the developer to sell the homes at below market prices.

A neighborhood group headed by two city college faculty members is responsible for placing Proposition E on the ballot. The group contends that the land which is intended to be used for the project should be made available instead to City College for the construction of new teaching facilities even though enrollment at City College is declining and the City College Board has voted 6 to 1 to oppose the initiative.

Like many other areas of the country, San Francisco suffers from a shortage of housing. Purchase prices here are among the highest in the nation. The use of surplus public lands and revenue bond financing provide a means for making single family homes available to a broad spectrum of families at affordable prices.

The Balboa Reservoir project is supported by the leaders of 8 neighborhood groups in the area surrounding the location of the proposed project and by a majority of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, as well as by Mayor Dianne Feinstein. We urge you to encourage the construction of this type of housing in San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition E.

San Francisco Board of Realtors
William L. Jansen, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

SAVE OUR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS!
BERNAL HEIGHTS SAYS, "VOTE NO ON PROP E!"
We are residents of Bernal Heights in San Francisco. We've worked hard to build affordable family and senior citizen homes in our neighborhood.

We need more affordable housing in our City to survive. The real issue in Prop E is affordable family housing — a "yes" vote prevents the construction of 203 family homes. That's crazy! Join us in preserving what's best in our City. Vote "no" on Prop E!

Sylvia M. Yee, Bernal Heights Community Foundation Board of Directors***
Frank Hutchins, BHCF Board*
Mary Lou Bertolotti, BHCF Board*
Lela Havenor, BHCF Board*
Elizabeth Egger, BHCF Board*
Sister Janet Simons, BHCF Board*
Stephen Antonaras, BHCF Board*
Lorenzo R. Dill, BHCF Board*
Barbara Bugor, BHCF Board*
Margaret C. Randolph, Northwest Bernal Block Club*
Maureen Lamb, WWBBC*
Tim Molinare, BHCF Planning & Dev't Committee*
Buck Bugor, BHCF P & D Committee*
***Organization for identification purposes only.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco Needs Affordable Housing — Vote No on Proposition E

Everyone agrees that San Francisco needs affordable housing. The questions are how and where that affordable housing can be built.

The Balboa Reservoir housing development, to be built on the site of a reservoir built thirty years ago and unused since that time, answers those important questions for more than 200 San Francisco first-time homebuying families by providing:

— 203 new affordable three-bedroom, single family homes
— 9.8% fixed-rate financing
— A mix of 30% low-income, 30% moderate-income and 40% market-rate first time buyers
— A convenient site that has been declared “surplus” by the City and “available for development of affordable housing”

The Balboa Reservoir housing development is a small but significant step in the effort to generate affordable housing in our City.

Thousands of San Franciscans from every community, neighborhood group and viewpoint agree that the Balboa Reservoir development is good for San Francisco. Virtually every elected official, including the Governing Board of City College also agree.

All these San Franciscans ask you to say “yes” to affordable housing and “NO” to Proposition E.

San Francisco Coalition for Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar, Executive Director

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The viable plan for affordable single family housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site is being threatened by Proposition E. If Proposition E passes, 203 single family homes will be lost to the citizenry of San Francisco at a time when they are greatly needed.

The facts about the proposed housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site argue strongly against Proposition E. All 203 homes will be for first time home buyers. One-third of the homes will be available to households earning $27,000. Another third of the homes will be available to households earning $36,000. Adequate parking will be provided within the development itself, thus answering any concerns that traffic in the area will be congested.

City College has no need or plan to use South Balboa Reservoir for its facilities. City College's priority is to develop its existing campus. South Balboa Reservoir should therefore be used for one of the City's greatest needs: increased and affordable housing which is available to lower and middle income families.

As homeowners who live in the vicinity of South Balboa Reservoir, we welcome its planned use for single family housing and feel it will become an integral and contributing part of the community. We therefore urge you to vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Submitted by:
Stephen Graham, Chairman of the Housing Sub-committee of the Citizen's Committee for Community Development
Roderick A. McLeod, Vice-Chairman of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing is a group of neighbors which consists of many of the renters of Westwood Park and Sunnyside neighborhoods as well as owners and renters of Ingleside which are the closest neighbors to the Balboa Reservoir along with some of the students and teachers of City College.

We strongly support the Balboa Reservoir for housing. We believe that the Balboa Reservoir is an ideal spot for housing.

Our neighborhood wants homes in the South Balboa Reservoir.
Vote No On Prop. E.

Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughney
Submitted by Patricia Vaughney

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

As Merchants as well as residents of Ocean Avenue, Greater Ingleside and San Francisco, we support the Development of the Balboa Reservoir as housing.

A Traffic Survey has stated that there will be minimal impact on the existing patterns of traffic by this development.

Additional City College Parking is being considered on another location off I-280 to keep the college congestion away from the neighborhood's streets.

City College has 44 more acres in which to expand and existing buildings at City College have viable means to expand.

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

We believe that housing on the Balboa Reservoir is the most viable solution to develop a vacant piece of property that is directly adjacent to our stores on a Transpreferential Street.

Affordable housing is in great need in San Francisco and is as much needed here as anywhere. We want to help provide this need. Vote No on Prop. E.

Ocean Avenue Merchants Assoc.
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughey
Submitted by Patricia Vaughey

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction on much-needed affordable, single-family housing at the long vacant south Balboa Reservoir site. This proposition would also block a major housing development that would bring jobs into an area of the city that has little industry or private business.

Sale prices for these units are set at $80,000, $120,000, and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the San Francisco housing market, where the average home is selling for $160,000. Construction of these homes will help all young, first-time home buyers and will require only 5% down, instead of the 20% down payment on houses bought with conventional home mortgages.

This plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by nine nearby neighborhood organizations. If Proposition E is approved and this project is blocked, more young adults will purchase their first home in Vallejo or some other outlying area, further draining San Francisco of the young families that every growing community needs.

San Francisco residents will gain apprenticeships, jobs, contracts and subcontracts from this development.

This plan calls for 2 and 3 bedroom, family-sized houses, with space for another bedroom which can be finished when needed.

Each house will have 2½ parking spaces in front and would not cause parking problems in the area. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

City College of San Francisco has no plans to buy the property, has no money for institutional expansion, nor any mention of this land in any master plan. Some supporters of this proposition are motivated by racist notions and have said they fear that this development will become another “Geneva Towers.” This type of thinking is similar to support for apartheid practiced in South Africa and must be defeated by progressive San Francisco voters. Property values will increase, instead of a decrease as a result of this project.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition E.

Larry Ukali Johnson-Redd — President, O.M.I. Pilgrim Community Center Inc.
Maria Campbell-Casey — Program Director, Bay Area Engineering Societies Committee for Mangower Training, Inc.
Clara Mills-Bradford — Program Director, O.M.I. Senior Center
John C. Jackson
Linda Rose-Gipson
Jon Still — Secretary, Young Adult Committee
Kenneth Butler

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Affordable Housing Alliance — Mitchell Omerberg, Director
Bay Area Urban League — Gregory Best, Field Representative
Bernal Heights Community Foundation — Andre Lennell Daye
Community Educational Services — Dorothy Chen, Executive Director
Japanese Community Youth Council St. Francis Square Apartments, Inc. — Sandra Mayor-Jenkins, Secretary
Minority Contractors Association of Northern California — James Haugabook, Secretary, Board of Directors
National Community Congress — Dr. Eddie C. Welbahn
Parkmerced Residents Organization, Inc. — Ricardo A. Collejo, Esq.
Potrero Hill Neighborhood House — Enola Maxwell
San Francisco Building Trades Council — Stan Smith
San Francisco Housing & Tenants Council — Joseph Lacey
San Francisco Tenants Union — Jim Faye
Rev. Amos C. Brown — Local Pastor & Community Servant
Greg Day — Chairman, Citizens Committee on Community Development
Polly V. Marshall — Commissioner, San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
Regina A. Snead
Jim Wachob — San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Michael E. Willis, AIA — Fleming Corporation

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

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Greater Ingleside Political Club — Frank Noto, Treasurer
Housing Conservation and Development Corporation — Louie Lawson, Board of Directors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Bayview Baptist Minister Fellowship — Rev. N. B. Mills, President
Bread of Life Missionary Baptist Church — Rev. S. A. Bailey
Cosmopolitan Baptist Church — Rev. A. Ray Gentile
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Raymond M. Howard Sr.
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Carole Nelson
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Cornelius P. O'Reilly
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Paul G. Theiss
Old St. Mary's Housing Committee — Charles Gale, Chairman
St. Peter's Housing Committee — Tessa Rouwerlo

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: With certain exceptions, City officers, including elected officials and commission members, may represent clients before City boards and commissions other than their own, and be paid for their services. State legislators may represent clients before City boards and commissions, and be paid for their services. Any person may contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would prohibit City officers from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay. This proposition would prohibit State legislators from appearing before City boards, commissions and departments on behalf of clients for pay. City officers would be prohibited from discussing with these officers and legislators matters that the City is deciding. Proposition F would also prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit City officers and State legislators from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to allow City officers and State legislators to represent clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to allow any person to contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “F” Got on Ballot

On February 26 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for limitations on compensated advocacy and campaign contributions had qualified for the June ballot.

Quent Kopp, Marth Gillham and Cheryl Arenson, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 9,400 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,986 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF proposition F

The purpose of Proposition F is to cut campaign contributions
by large contributors (and thus reduce campaign spending) and
eliminate undue influence by officeholders retained as paid
lobbyists for projects requiring City approval.

Let's take a minute to analyze the untrue arguments against
Proposition F.

- The opponents claim that Proposition F will force half the
City's Commissioners to resign. In fact, Proposition F does not
force any Commissioners to resign. It simply says they can't be
a paid lobbyist and a City Commissioner at the same time. Does
a commissioner value making money by lobbying more than
public service?

- Some have also alleged that Proposition F will prevent duly-
elected union leaders from serving as City Commissioners. No
it won't. Proposition F prohibits "compensated advocacy" —
that means lobbyists hired by an organization, not members of
the organization itself. Proposition F does not apply to salaried
employees of labor unions, corporations, or non-profit agencies.
Moreover, Section 8.105 of the Charter precludes it specifically
from applying to any member serving as a representative of any
profession, trade, business, union or association on any board or
commission which requires membership of representatives of
specific professions, trades, businesses, unions or associations.

- Another untrue argument against Proposition F is that it
prohibits City officials only from discussing pending issues
with other City officers or State Legislators who are also acting
as paid lobbyists in a matter and doesn't stop those officeholding
lobbyists from writing City officials about their clients' objectives.
That's not so. Proposition F applies to all such lobbying,
written or oral. (The dictionary defines "discuss" as "to exam-
ine by means of speech or writing.")

End government decision-making by "insiders" and reduce
the influence of money on local campaigns.

VOTE YES ON F.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
San Franciscans for Good Government

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

In all our years of observing San Francisco City government,
we have found one maxim to be true time after time: a good idea
gets copied, especially among politicians.

For no sooner did Quentin Kopp promise to bring Proposition
F to the voters than did Mayor Feinstein come up with an infor-
mal, administrative version of her own. Fine, you say (and the
Mayor says), then why vote Yes on Proposition F?

(1) The Mayor's remedy of asking City Commissioners who
also act as lobbyists before City agencies to resign is nothing
more than a hand slap, and is good only as long as she is mayor.
It's not binding on future mayors and could be changed without
any vote of the Board of Supervisors, let alone the people of San
Francisco. Proposition F prohibits this kind of conflict-of-
interest, and it will be the law, no matter who is mayor.

(2) The Mayor's action did nothing to state legislators who
can also act as lobbyists before City Boards and Commissions,
nor did her action stop the law or business partners of City Com-
missioners from picking up the slack in big-money lobbying.
Proposition F will stop these practices in their tracks.

(3) What about the other half of Proposition F, which reduced
the campaign contribution limit to $500 so that all San Francisc-
cans can enjoy equal access to City officials, not just the ones
with the big bucks? The Mayor can't do anything about this, and
she hasn't. Only a Yes vote on Proposition F will reduce the
weight of big money and ensure our full voice in City elections
and City government.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. If it's important enough for the
Mayor to copy part of it administratively, it's important enough
to do the job right and make it a law.

John J. Barbagelata
Harry Aido
June Cahn
Dorothy Partridge

Robert Arenson
Rudolph Lohnes
Janet Wentworth

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF proposition F

The worst and most persistent problem in American politics is
that politicians and political races can be "bought". Reducing
the size of campaign contributions will be a step forward in
reducing the role of money in elections. Vote yes for more honest
government.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

RESTORE to the people their rightful and equal power as individual voters by reducing the monetary clout and influence of private interests who make the laws and the policies as City officials and Commissioners or State legislators.

TELL the special interests that their money and influence can no longer interfere with representative government.

TELL the special interests that the voters will no longer tolerate the influence-buying which comes with large campaign contributions.

TELL the special interests that this measure will encourage highly talented citizens to serve San Francisco honestly and responsibly.

VOTE YES ON F.

Cheryl Arenson
Anne Renfrew
David Pacheco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

"Government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

These noble words from Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, cast in bronze at the entrance to City Hall, seem to have escaped the attention of some City officials who pass by them every day. For in San Francisco City government, Lincoln's simple formula for representative government would read quite differently: "Government of the powerful, by the lobbyists, and for the wealthy."

Government of, by, and for the privileged few is bad government. Government of, by, and for all the people is good government. It's as simple as that—as simple as Lincoln first put it.

Proposition F, the Good Government Initiative, will help San Franciscans maintain control of their government and will prevent undue influence by City officeholders.

To reduce undue influence, Proposition F outlaws the practice of City Commissioners and State Legislators representing special interests for pay before City Commissions and Boards. City Commissions should render their decisions deliberately and impartially, not swayed by the political clout of the lobbyists appearing before them, or by any political favors those lobbyist/politicians might promise. "I'll scratch your back if you scratch my back" bargains do not belong in government. And until such backroom bargains are made illegal, City government will not belong to the rest of us either.

Proposition F also reduces the maximum amount that anyone can give to a local candidate from $1,000 to $500. If large contributors and other special interests can't give as much money, they can't buy as much influence with elected officials. And the lower the contribution limit, the less campaign spending and the more City government will be responsive to all San Franciscans.

You can "buy back" City government from the privileged and powerful with the most precious of all political commodities: your vote.

VOTE YES on Proposition F.

Mary Lohneis
Peter Fatooh
Judith Thorson

Babette Drefke
Daniel Jordan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F, an initiative of the people, is needed to protect the voters and the integrity of the legislative process from being corrupted by the power of money and influence. It prevents City officials and State Legislators from lobbying the City on behalf of high-powered special interests. It also lowers the campaign contribution limit from $1,000 to $500, thus reducing the influence of those same special interests over our elections and elected officials.

The bogus argument that the Mayor won't be able to find qualified people to serve on City commissions if Proposition F is adopted ignores the plain fact that there are 700,000 people in San Francisco, a pool of civic-minded citizens more than large enough to accommodate the 250 commission appointments available in our City government. For example, there are plenty of architects to fill the one architectural appointment on the Art Commission, just as there are plenty of non-lobbyist business people and lawyers available to serve on other commissions.

Thousands of San Franciscans, not just the "insiders", are ready, willing, and able to serve the public.

Proposition F deserves your vote. Restore integrity to City government. Restore the confidence of the citizens of San Francisco in that government. Let's have no more Wilkes Bashford situations.

VOTE YES ON F.

Oscar Suto
Martha Gillham
Marguerite Harrent

Leonel Monterey
Tony Kilroy
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE “NO” ON F

This proposition disguises itself as “good government” but, in reality, would drive good people out of government. It is so cruelly drawn — so sweeping in its implications — that it would bar from government almost anyone with even a remote business or community tie to government.

It would purge from City commissions anyone who “directly or indirectly” receives compensation from any “interests” with an issue before any City agency. Effectively, this could discriminate against employees from community and neighborhood groups, civil rights organizations, non-profit corporations, labor unions, merchant and business groups, as well as architects, lawyers and other professionals.

Actually, there currently are no commissioners who represent any clients before any City agency. All who are appointed in my administration sign a statement saying they will not advocate for any paying client before any official body of the City while they are commissioners. This proposition simply is not necessary.

Proposition F also would lower the limit for any individual campaign contribution from $1000 to $500. Although this sounds good, it would permit a wealthy person with various businesses and numerous family members to contribute many thousands of dollars through different sources. This would encourage “hidden” contributions. We must strive for disclosure of contributions, not a system which drives contributions underground. Candidates must be able to raise funds enough to put their message before the voters. Reducing the contribution limit can be a tactic to discourage persons from challenging incumbents.

Vote no on Proposition F.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition F purports to achieve a noble objective: The removal of “influence peddling” from City Hall. In fact, Proposition F is so poorly-crafted, it may have exactly the opposite effect on City government. It is not a “good government” initiative. It is bad legislation.

Proposition F provides no definitions and no standards for the public to judge whether City officials comply with its restrictions. Its uncertainties will be chaotic and lead to endless, needless lawsuits.

A measure similar to Proposition F was rejected by the Board of Supervisors because no public hearings were ever held on the legislation. If the public had had a chance to comment on this initiative, it might not have the critical shortcomings, deficiencies and uncertainties that now warrant its rejection by responsible San Franciscans.

In the coming months, the Board will review good government measures that are comprehensible, effective and, most important, certain. Proposition F is a misguided disaster.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

This should properly have been titled the “SINK WILLIE BROWN ORDINANCE”! The “meat of the coconuts” is in Section 4.

Supervisor Kopp’s intentions are good, however this sloppily drafted and incomprehensible measure succeeds in “burning down the barn” to eliminate a couple of rats!

Under this proposal, to avoid any potential INDIRECT conflict of interest, (which is undefined!), one would have to be a destitute, unemployed welfare recipient to qualify for service on any City Board or Commission! The Mayor has already solved this “hired advocacy” problem with the “conflict of interest” affidavits she demands IN ADVANCE from any prospective appointee.

Quentin’s proposed $500.00 campaign contribution limit is an “inside joke” and he, of all people, knows it! It merely obliges a heavy contributor to have his wife, children, business associates, or friends send in SEPARATE $500.00 checks if he wants to contribute more than $500.00 to a politician’s campaign.

These proposals require additional City employees for enforcement and wind up doing far more harm than good. Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O’Keefe, Sr., President

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

Union members and labor officials have legitimate reasons for meeting with City officers. It is unfair and wrong to lump them in the same category as special interest lobbyists, yet that's exactly what Proposition F does. Working people deserve representation on City boards and commissions. VOTE NO!

Walter Johnson
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council
LeRoy King
James Elliott
Keith Eckman
Reeva Olson

Jeff Greendorfer
Stan Smith
Larry Griffin
Steve Rubatz
Terrence Ryan
Jack Bogg
Tony Margovich

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

If you want to ban business owners and executives from serving on City boards and commissions, then vote for Proposition F.

If you think board members of non-profit corporations and employees of community agencies have nothing to contribute to City government, then vote for Proposition F.

If you believe union members and labor officials should not have a voice at City Hall, then vote for Proposition F.

But if you share our belief that these individuals have legitimate concerns and expertise that is valuable in running major City departments, then join us in voting NO on Proposition F.

Proposition F is a simplistic, sloppily-drafted, meat axe approach to a problem already resolved by Mayor Feinstein's ban on commissioners lobbying on behalf of private clients.

Proposition F is not good government and it is not reform. Proposition F is bad legislation. VOTE NO.

Hon. Amy Meyer
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Walter Jhee
Hon. Bruce Lilienthal
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Yoshiho Nakashima
Hon. Jean Kortum
Hon. Thomas Horn
Hon. Henry Berman
Hon. Robert McCarthy
Hon. Richard Guggenhime
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Hon. Patrick McGrew
Hon. Kirk Miller
Hon. Melvin Lee
Hon. Jerry Berg
Hon. Bonnie Gibson
Hon. Mary Noel Pepys
Hon. Mark Baell
Hon. Tim Carrico
Hon. Jo Hanson
Hon. Kevin Malone
John Sanger
Tom Moore

Hon. Eugene Friend
Hon. Phyllis Lyon

Donald Dieter
Jim Wachob
Anne Daley
Linda Post
Lynne Williams
Todd Dickinson
Peter Hanson
Herbert Kurlan
William Scoorits
Van Hart
Iris Fiallet
Noam Rand
John Schmidt
James Moch
Thomas Karwaki
Wendy Goldberg
Joseph Schwartz
Belle Lazarus
Antonio Barrios
Bruce Barrett
Charles Howell
Walter McGuire
Sharon Duvall
Joyce Maunderi

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

We're sympathetic to the need for political reform. But it's a complicated problem, and Proposition F just isn't the way to go.

Frankly, we can't tell who is and isn't affected by this measure. While a handful of people sometimes might abuse their positions, that's no reason to question the integrity of so many solid citizens who give tirelessly to public service. Proposition F is simply the wrong approach. Please join us in voting NO.

William E. McDonnell
Frances May McAteer
N. A. Sapunar
Caroline and Michael Figoni

Martin D. Murphy
Eugene C. Payne III
Suzanne B. McCarthy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Concerned about elected officials spending $400,000 to run for supervisor and 1 million on a mayor's race? Then vote NO on Proposition F.

That's right. NO.

Proposition F isn't going to do anything about campaign spending. Prop F simply limits the size of contributions, reducing the current limit from $1,000 to $500. Supervisors can and will continue spending outrageous sums on their re-election campaigns. With Proposition F they'll just spend twice as much time raising money from twice as many sources, and that makes special interests even more powerful. They can always find ways around campaign limits.

We need campaign spending reform, but Proposition F doesn't provide it. Please join us in voting No on F.

District 8 Democratic Club
Stephen L. Tabor
Ruth Gravanis
Alan Raabick
Miriam Blaustein
Linda Chapman
Dale Carlson
James Firth
Debra Barnes
Levi Sorbin
Debra Stein
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

When campaign contributions are limited, political freedom suffers. Your right to free speech includes not only your right to express your views, but also your right to support as much as you want, any candidate who speaks for you.

Minority viewpoints depend heavily on the contribution of a few dedicated supporters to get your message out. To limit your financial support of your beliefs is to silence your political voice.

Only incumbents, who have many opportunities for free media exposure benefit from this assault on free speech. The dangers of a campaign contribution limit far outweigh any possible benefit from this proposition. Defeat Proposition F!

San Francisco Libertarian Party
Michael R. Fowler, Secretary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

You may think Prop F only applies to big-time lawyers and a few legislators who represent developers. Think again!

Prop F would prohibit many community leaders from public service. If it passes, board members and employees of community and charitable organizations could be banned from serving on City boards and commissions.

We appreciate the public need for a government free of "influencing peddling.” But restrictions on “compensated advocacy” ought to be clearly and carefully crafted to protect the voices of community leaders who argue on behalf of the public interest, not private special interests.

Vote No.

Hon. Juanita Del Carlo
Mission Hiring Hall

Bob Ross
Publisher, Bay Area Reporter

Hon. Jeffrey Ken Mori
Japanese Community Youth Council, Inc.
Bill O’Callahan
American Red Cross
Hon. George Suncin
Horizons Unlimited
Hon. Jean Rita Alviar
Mission Education Project
Hon. Greg Day
Folks Street Town Hall
Hon. Naomi Gray
Hon. James Foster
Carol Wong
Marlena Marseille
Lee Woods
Jo Daly
Dennis Collins
Hon. H. Welton Flynn
(Organizations listed only for purposes of identification.)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will have no effect on developers’ lawyers. None.

It won’t make any difference to state legislators either.

Don’t kid yourself. This is not “reform” and it isn’t “good government.” Proposition F will allow the special interests and influence peddlers to continue exercising influence over our elected officials. It has so many loopholes, lobbying will actively continue, untouched, in the back rooms of City Hall.

And developers will always find ways around campaign contribution limits. As Common Cause has noted, Prop F simply makes tracing their dollars more difficult for the public.

Real reform would directly attack the source of huge contributions—the developers and other special interests that employ the lobbyists to peddle their influence.

VOTE NO.

Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
David Looman
Michael Mason

Rich Waller
Susan Klugerman
Rene Cateshave
Margie O’Driscoll

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
South Africa Boycott

PROPOSITION G

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?

YES 300  NO 301

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has adopted an ordinance prohibiting the City, with certain exceptions, from purchasing goods or services from companies doing business with South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a declaration of policy that says the City must try to avoid doing business with companies that significantly profit from or help maintain the Apartheid system in South Africa. It calls on other public bodies and private groups to adopt similar policies. It directs the Board of Supervisors to identify the companies which have the greatest ties to Apartheid so that the public can also boycott those companies.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to avoid doing business with companies that help maintain Apartheid, and you want a public boycott of those companies.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

"The proposed Declaration of Policy be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

How “G” Got on Ballot

On November 6, 1985 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for the City to boycott businesses with significant ties to South Africa had qualified for the June ballot.

Arlo Hale Smith, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,546 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on October 11.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,941 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:
It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This measure calls for a public boycott of companies that aid apartheid.
Any claim of "conflict" between Proposition G and existing anti-apartheid legislation is imaginary: It is the legislative intent of supporters of this measure that it can be construed as a directive for making existing law tougher.

Personal attacks have no legitimate place in a ballot measure campaign. As proponent of this measure, I repudiate all such tactics.
Vote NO on apartheid. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Arlo Hale Smith

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Boycotts are grassroots politics. They've helped the farmworkers, they've helped win integration, and they can help end the legal racism called "Apartheid".

A Gallup poll found 77% of South Africa's black majority favoring international economic boycotts to force the Apartheid regime to accept reform peacefully.

After the Boycott Initiative made the ballot, the San Francisco Supervisors unanimously passed a similar city purchasing policy. The issue that remains is whether to call on the general public to join in, boycotting companies identified by the Supervisors as the worst offenders in each industry.

The companies that would be targeted consider profits to be the "bottom line". Economic pressure is all they understand.

The AFL-CIO, NAACP, and NOW have called a boycott of Shell Oil because of its profiteering from South Africa's oppressive economic conditions. Proposition G supports that and would put the same pressure on other industries as well.

This proposition is supported by the elected county central committee of the Democratic Party, the Peace-and-Freedom Party and the Humanist Party, and by leading attorneys, such as Terry Francois, Terence Hallinan, Tony Serra, Lewis Hope Lee, Marc Van Der Hout, Abby Ginsberg and Terence Redmond.

If South Africa were a democracy, its majority would long ago have voted to end Apartheid. We need to vote Yes—because they can't.

Atty. Arlo Hale Smith, Democratic Party County Central Committee
Paul Kangas, Peace and Freedom Party
Lois Salisbury, Public Advocates*
Dr. Kevin Danaher, Food First*
Jesse James, Mission Rebels
Terry Collins, Community Activist
Sonny Gebert, Election Action
Robert McColl, Hotel & Restaurant Employees
Executive Board Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Attorneys speak out against Apartheid:
South African police can arrest anyone without charge. They can hold you incommunicado—no contacts with family, lawyers or press.

They regularly censor news, books, music. They have banned Christmas caroling, funerals and other peaceful gatherings. Groups which criticize the government are forbidden to hold meetings.

Blacks are subject to legal segregation; their property and employment rights are greatly restricted; often, they are simply murdered.

As attorneys, we help people who have legal rights that are being violated. But what can we do for those who have no legal rights?

Boycotts and other economic sanctions are the only way to make the Apartheid government accept reform peacefully.

In the Court of World Public Opinion, Apartheid has been convicted of crimes against humanity. By imposing a sentence of economic isolation, we can end Apartheid.

Vote Yes—take a stand for justice.

Terence Hallinan
Arlo Hale Smith
Terry Francois
Karen Anderson Ryer
Robert R. Bryan

Ann Menasche
Rachel Ginsburg
Leo Pauk
Gabriel Gersmer
Ora Prouchovnick
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is a moderate, responsible but effective proposal to bring economic pressure on the South African government to establish constitutional rights for all of its citizens. Vote Yes.

Terence Faulkner, Republican
Mike Garza, Republican

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

All decent Americans abhor apartheid. However, boycotting U.S. investment in South Africa is counterproductive; it only penalizes the actual victims of apartheid.

U.S. international firms have acted as progressive agents for change through the Sullivan principles. Their investments have improved the social and economic condition of the labor force. It is improper to penalize their positive contributions.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

We are individuals and organizations working actively to end the racist system of apartheid in South Africa. And we are voting NO on Proposition G.

Why?

(1) Because Proposition G will weaken San Francisco's present divestment law. This law requires companies doing business with the city to sign affidavits that they will make no new contracts with South Africa.

Proposition G has no such provision.

(2) Proposition G provides no mechanism or funding to carry out its declared purpose of "boycotting" South Africa.

Proposition G will not stop South African products from entering the Port of San Francisco.

Vote against this useless, confusing, and deceptive initiative.

Preserve the stronger divestment law San Francisco already has.

Vote NO on Proposition G!

Yvonne Golden
Geraldine Johnson
Dr. Julienne Malveaux
AFT 2121 Anti-Apartheid Committee
Artists Against Apartheid
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Coalition of Conscience
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club Executive Committee
ILWU 10 and SEIU 250 Southern Africa Liberation Support Committees
National Conference of Black Lawyers
San Francisco Anti-Apartheid Committee
Southern Africa Freedom Committee/All Peoples Congress

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1983 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!

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

PROPOSITION H

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council? YES 303 ➞ NO 304 ➞

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Several city and private agencies conduct various programs related to AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a declaration of policy that says San Francisco should support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council, consisting of a Committee on Education and a Fund-Raising Committee. The Research Committee would make recommendations on the most useful AIDS research projects and try to prevent duplication of efforts. The Education Committee would inform the public about the latest research and about ways to prevent AIDS. The Fund-Raising Committee would seek donations and grants for AIDS research and education projects.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

“The proposed Declaration of Policy for an AIDS research and education council and the formation of advisory committees of civic leaders would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, additional expenditure of public funds for AIDS research may result, the amount of which cannot be determined.”

How “H” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for AIDS research had qualified for the June ballot.

Stony Gebert, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 10,540 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on December 6, 1985.

A check of each signature on the petition showed that 7,564 of the signatures were valid. This is more than 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We need a council to expose and address major AIDS issues without the impasse of present medical/political bias.

As taxpayers, we are subsidizing a treadmill of continual AIDS casualties. There are major oversights where AIDS is concerned. Only recently was it learned that CDC statistics suggest 79% of early AIDS cases appear drug-related. We hear AIDS is 100% fatal. Perhaps that is because death may also be drug-related in the way of immuno-suppressive antibiotic and radiation overloads to already compromised immunity systems. Prevailing medicine is both tunnel-visioned and high-profit motivated. Also well-funded. This solution may be part of the problem. Some physicians are beginning to feel where AIDS is concerned many current practices are ethically, medically bankrupt.

Remissions occur. Largely through immunity-enhancing, holistic medicine. Significantly, only 1% of AIDS cases occur among people at risk in the Asian community. Perhaps this is due to less drug abuse or use of an unfunded, ignored resource: herbology as part of diet. More options: homeopathy, acupuncture, etc.

If, as anticipated, upwards of 40% of those testing positive come down with AIDS, we may become overburdened. To ignore all of the above becomes part of the problem. Vote Yes on Propositon H.

Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Rich McKirkeby, Former Ordery, Marketing Associate, Pacific Bell
Joseph P. Clady, AIDS Hospice, Shanti Counselor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There is great need for research and education about AIDS and related conditions.

We need to attack the disease, not its victims.

Knowledge is the only vaccine available today.

Vote Yes.

John Lorenzini, President, People With AIDS Alliance
Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Jan Beck, Steven Russell, Eugene Ewins, ARC/AIDS Vigil

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There are many possible treatments for AIDS and related conditions which are not being examined by the federal government, especially therapies based on natural substances and processes.

Vote Yes for an AIDS Research Council open to all viewpoints.

Scott Gregory, M.D.
Paul Kangas

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

A tape recording (Talking Book) of the San Francisco Voter Information pamphlet is available from the San Francisco Public Library’s branch for the blind. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

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

Name__________________________________________________________

Address_________________________________ Apt. #________

Telephone No. (required)________________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any)____________________________________

Signature______________________________________________________
PROPOSITION I

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?

YES 307
NO 308

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the Freeway with a surface roadway.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City’s policy to remain as it is, and you want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to change the City’s policy, and you do not want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a policy statement asking whether or not the Embarcadero Freeway should be torn down.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway demolished, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by at least $10.2 million in local funds. Potential private sector financing and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “I” Got on Ballot

On March 3 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy placing the question of demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway before the voters had qualified for the June ballot.

Richard Hongisto, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 11,119 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,720 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
Please refer to mailing label on back cover.

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I
In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land now under the Broadway ramps is put back on the tax rolls, with low-rise buildings limited by restrictive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when united with Proposition J, recognizes these facts:
1) The Embarcadero Freeway is what is left of a never-completed elevated freeway that would have ringed the City through North Beach and Marina neighborhoods to the Golden Gate Bridge.
2) Today this massive freeway, which separates us from our waterfront, would never be built.
3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.
4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf will be preserved.
5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked for this new system.
6) Only that portion of the Embarcadero Freeway east and north of the Main and Beale Street ramps—basically the portion directly on the waterfront—will be removed to make way for the new system. The removal cost, approximately $10 million to be paid for with privately-generated new revenues, is a relatively small part of the overall new system.

As for Proposition I, vote "YES, let’s tear down the Embarcadero Freeway." Then vote for Proposition J and support the plan for a beautiful waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I
Removing the Embarcadero Freeway will allow San Francisco to:
• Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero.
• Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway.
• Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula.
• Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero.
• Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.
• Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won’t benefit San Francisco. Don’t let outsiders determine our future. Vote YES on I.

Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Jack Wohley
Roger Boyer
A. Lee Knight
Robert Bradford
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Donald A. Crosby, AIA
Rui Y. Okamoto
Robert Meyers
Ralph Hartudo
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Douglas G. Wright
Anita Sanchez

Chuck Forester
Fritz Arko
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Hermann, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grunt Dehart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones
Randall Rossi
Karl Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
Jon Twichell
Jane Winstlow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON I
This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY—VOTE YES ON I
Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds—without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city’s fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.

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

Applicant must be received by the registrar of voters no later than 5/27/86.

Election Date: June 3, 1986

MAIL COMPLETED FORM TO:
Registrar of Voters
Room 155 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

PLEASE PRINT REGISTERED NAME:

FIRST NAME ______________________ MIDDLE NAME ___________________ LAST NAME ____________________

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

NUMBER AND STREET—DESIGNATE N, S, E, W ____________________ CITY ________ ZIP ________

X

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT (DO NOT PRINT) ____________________________ DATE ________ (AREA CODE) DAYTIME TELEPHONE ________

I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.

(AREA CODE) RESIDENCE TELEPHONE ________

THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT PROPER SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

STREET OR BOX __________________________

CITY ________________________ STATE ________________________ ZIP ______

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Prec. No. __________________________
A.V. Prec. No. __________________________
Ballot Type/Party __________________________
Affidavit No. __________________________
Signature and Registration Verified as Correct:

__________ Date ________ Deputy Registrar

DATE OF BIRTH

Voters with specified disabilities may qualify as PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS. Contact the Registrar of Voters for further information.

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE.
If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT—VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to 15.7 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown, Fisherman's Wharf and the financial district would be reduced.

Travel within the city would be slowed down at all hours. Vote no to the destruction of the freeway.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
• Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
• Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
• If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
  —By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will in-crease from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
  —Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
  —MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
  —Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Judith Tornese

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Tear it down? The concept is preposterous! There are 70,000 cars a day whizzing by on this high speed downtown elevated waterfront freeway! Where will they all go?
Aside from the outrageous demolition costs involved, (some engineers estimate $40,000,000 of taxpayer money!), eyeball observation, logic, and just plain "common sense" dictates that ground level "total gridlock" will result if this expensive freeway is now destroyed.

Nostalgic individuals must realize that the times have changed! We can't bring the Bay back up to Montgomery Street! On behalf of San Francisco's overburdened taxpayers, we urge a NO vote!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled.
Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a policy statement that says that the City would replace the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt a policy statement which says that the Embarcadero Freeway would be torn down if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt a policy statement to replace the Embarcadero Freeway under these conditions.

Controller's Statement on “J”

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

"The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway replaced with a tree-lined six lane boulevard and other traffic and transit improvements, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by approximately $27.5 million. This includes a one-time freeway demolition cost of $10.2 million plus $17.3 million required to match potential federally-funded transit improvements. Potential financing by the State and private sector and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost."

How “J” Got on Ballot

On March 5 a declaration of policy regarding the future of the Embarcadero Freeway was delivered to the Registrar from the Mayor and several supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows the Mayor or four or more supervisors to submit a declaration of policy to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

In addition to Mayor Feinstein, the March 5 document was signed by Supervisors Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker, Molinaari, Kennedy and Nelder.

POLLs ARE OPEN FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J
San Franciscans now have a chance to remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with an at-grade, six-lane parkway, which will open our waterfront and restore views blocked for years by this large freeway.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for traffic and transit improvements:

- New, shorter freeway ramps connecting directly with The Embarcadero;
- A tree-lined, at-grade, 6-lane Embarcadero Boulevard, with a new waterfront Muni line, a jogging and bicycle path from Fisherman’s Wharf to Mission Bay;
- Extension of Muni Metro south to the Caltrain station at 4th and Townsend;
- New ramps connecting I-280 with The Embarcadero;
- Changes in traffic flow and improvements to existing freeway ramps.

Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman’s Wharf will be preserved and enhanced.

The Board of Supervisors has specified that the Embarcadero Freeway will be torn down only if preliminary engineering during the next two years confirms — as traffic and environmental studies already have — that removal of the freeway will not result in more problems than it solves.

San Francisco became eligible for $88 million in federal highway funds for this new system when the Supervisors approved the plan in 1980. The $10.2 million cost of freeway demolition itself can be paid from revenues from low-rise development of the parcels now under the Broadway ramps and the increased values of nearby properties. Strict waterfront zoning limits the size of any development.

Traffic and environmental studies by the California Department of Transportation since 1980 clearly indicate that the new waterfront transportation system will be vastly superior to the existing situation, and that traffic congestion levels will not be notably different with the elevated structure removed.

Vote Yes on J and let’s remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with a parkway and transit system — once again let us see our waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J gives the voters a chance to be heard on an important and timely issue. This issue is the replacement of a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway as one element of a comprehensive package of transportation improvements in the Waterfront area.

Last fall, the Board of Supervisors adopted for further study a set of traffic and transit improvements for the Waterfront. These improvements include:

- a new landscaped surface-level boulevard
- replacement of the Clay/Washington and Broadway on and off ramps with new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom
- removal of the unused stub of I-280 and construction of new ramps connecting the new waterfront boulevard to Route I-280
- a new light rail transit line linking Fort Mason with the Caltrain Depot
- extension of the Muni Metro to the train depot, improving the Peninsula Commute Service

A YES vote on Proposition J does not allocate funds for these projects. It does allow for further design and engineering studies, including cost analysis, assessment of impacts on traffic, and other matters. The studies will then be presented to the Supervisors so that they can make an informed decision on the plan. If the studies prove positive, San Francisco will be able to transform its Waterfront for the benefit of all.

Proposition J will insure that the City will not proceed with the removal of any of the Freeway until all the studies are completed and all potential consequences are assessed. This is the responsible approach. Vote YES on J.

SPUR
League of Women Voters
Embarcadero Citizens Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SAN FRANCISCO’S NEIGHBORHOODS ASK YOU TO VOTE YES ON J.
REDUCE TRAFFIC CONGESTION — YES ON J!
Traffic backed up by the Embarcadero Roadway slows travel and creates congestion in North Beach and other nearby neighborhoods. J will speed traffic flow.

IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION — YES ON J!

Proposition J will provide regular streetcar service along the Embarcadero and extend Muni Metro service to the south, ultimately extending to Bayview-Hunters Point.

PROMOTE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY — YES ON J!
If Proposition J does not pass, San Francisco could lose $88 million in federal funds for traffic improvements.

(continued)
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

RESTORE THE WATERFRONT—YES ON J!
San Francisco's waterfront could become a focal point for the city, graced by a grand promenade, instead of the dismal, deteriorating eyesore it is now.
San Francisco's neighborhoods join together to ask your support for an improved Embarcadero. We guarantee the freeway will not be removed unless it is replaced by facilities that will assure a smoother, more efficient traffic flow. YES ON J!
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Robert Bradford
Ruth Cravanis
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Anita Sanchez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J
SUPPORT PUBLIC TRANSIT—VOTE YES ON J.
SAVE SAN FRANCISCO FROM GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON J.
The revitalization of the Northeastern Waterfront...as included in San Francisco's Master Plan and transit plans, as overwhelmingly approved by the Board of Supervisors and as urged by Mayor Feinstein...will allow almost $90 million in unused federal highway funds to be used for vital downtown and waterfront transit and street improvements which will be a key to reducing needless auto congestion in San Francisco.
PROPOSITION J SUPPORTS IMPORTANT TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS TO THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT. It will:
— extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific/CatTrain depot
— create a new rail line (possibly using historic streetcars) to connect the entire waterfront from Mission Bay to the Ferry Building to Fisherman's Wharf and Fort Mason
— set the stage for a possible streetcar line along Third Street
Since the city of San Francisco adopted the Transit First policy in the early 1970's, transit investments in the Muni Metro,

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J
A SOUND BUSINESS PROPOSITION—YES ON J!
Common sense and good business demand we make the most of our resources. San Francisco's waterfront is an economic and civic asset unrivaled anywhere—yet much of it is cut off by an ugly, noisy, elevated roadway. The traffic improvements called for by Proposition J will benefit workers, tourists, property owners, neighborhoods, and business.
— Traffic flow and transit will move quickly on a realigned, reorganized Embarcadero Roadway, allowing easier, more pleasant access to waterfront businesses.
— An improved and beautified Embarcadero will create new commercial opportunities and increase the value of existing property and businesses.
— New jobs and an expanded tax base will generate increased revenue for the city as several lots now covered by freeway ramps return to productive private ownership. Though limited to low rise development (40 to 65 feet), tax revenues from development will more than make up the city's share of the project.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J OFFERS RESIDENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO A ONCE IN A LIFETIME OPPORTUNITY TO RECAPTURE THEIR WATERFRONT.

Covering the Embarcadero into a tree-lined boulevard and building a new streetcar line will make the waterfront more pedestrian and transit oriented, that is, more people oriented.

A freeway structure that is a source of objectionable noise and casts a pall over a large part of the waterfront will be removed. The waterfront will be opened up to sunlight and fresh air and made more inviting and cheerful to those who wish to walk on one of the world’s outstanding waterfronts. Air pollution that is now retained by the existing elevated structure will be dissipated.

The transit orientation of the new waterfront will encourage energy conservation. Proposition J will:

— Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero
— Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway
— Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula

— Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero
— Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line
— Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won't benefit San Francisco. Don’t let outsiders determine our future.

VOTE YES ON J FOR A BETTER SAN FRANCISCO.

Sierra Club
Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage
Willinda McCrea*
Bob Cramer*
Rebecca Evans*
Richard Livingston*
Marilyn Clements*
Jennifor Lew*
Jeffrey Henne*
Jane Winslow*
Roger Boyer

A. Lee Knight
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Patrick S. Hobin
Monica Halloran
Walter K. Morris
Lisa Klarman
Jeffrey Heller
Bob Isaacson
George T. Rockrise, FAIA
Jon Twitchell
Marc Kasky

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J GIVES US A CHANCE TO CORRECT A COLOSSAL MISTAKE!

The Embarcadero Freeway should never have been built. The original plan was to build a freeway from bridge to bridge, destroying the Northern Waterfront, Fisherman's Wharf, Fort Mason, and Marina Green in the process. When the people of San Francisco saw what was happening, they stopped it in mid-air—literally.

Walk under it. Hear the noise. Feel the gloom. See how it cuts

out light.

It’s time to remove this mistake. The new waterfront plan will give us a tree-lined boulevard, a new streetcar line, and a Muni Metro extension to the Southern Pacific/Caltrain depot. It will give us a transit and pedestrian oriented waterfront that will give us pride and pleasure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J!

San Francisco Tomorrow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, with a membership of 1700 working architects in San Francisco, urges a “YES” vote on Proposition J. In 1968 the citizens of San Francisco stopped highway planners from ringing our waterfront with freeways. Today voters have another opportunity to return the waterfront to our citizens. Removal of the Embarcadero Freeway is one part of a carefully researched transit plan for San Francisco. This proposition supplies an unique opportunity to carry out a broad range of transportation improvements that will have many positive effects on the City of San Francisco.

Removal of the freeway will:

1. Return the waterfront to the people by removing this barrier to access and view.
2. Facilitate needed MUNI improvements.
3. Encourage development of the Embarcadero as a grand civic boulevard unifying the City of San Francisco.

The members of the American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition I and “YES” on Proposition J.

Donald Kennedy, FAIA
President

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans love Their City, the ambiance, the Bay, waterfront, the views, the healthy neighborhoods.
Freeway builders did their damnest to destroy the City and divide our neighborhoods.
Now we can remove that damned spot, the concrete dinosaur, the hideous barrier that destroys our scenic views, the fence that keeps us from the Bay, the concealer of the Ferry Building.
Correct a mistake.

VOTE YES ON J.

Miriam Blaustein
Charlene Clark
Marie Cleasby
Zach Cowan
Dick Grosboll
Rick Hauptman

Tony Kilroy
Jean Kortum
Ira Kurlander
Jack Morrison
Andy Nash
Norman Relfe

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

NO ON PROPOSITION J.

"J" is for JOKE—a cruel joke on us. What will J really do?
Add traffic to every street east of Gough. Delay the construction of waterfront streetcar service. Cost millions in local dollars needed to improve MUNI. Create a ground-level freeway on the waterfront as big as Van Ness, with more cars.
I'm a private citizen who's concerned about traffic and what it's doing to our City. If you are too, vote NO on Proposition J.

Steve Colman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
• Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
• Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
• If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
—By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
—Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
—MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
—Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Blair C. Pascoe

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

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:
1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by horizontal strikethrough.

7.100 Materials, Supplies and Equipment

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreements for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract. All purchases in excess of one thousand dollars ($1,000) shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchasing of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases and a permanent record of all such quotations shall be kept. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifteen-thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) for materials, supplies or equipment and all contracts and all agreements entered into by the city above $50,000 shall be in writing. Such contracts, agreements and all amendments thereto shall be signed by the chief administrative officer and the deputy chief administrative officer. Such agreements and amendments shall be signed by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the articles requisitioned and may advertise for bids, and any other advertising necessary in the discretion of the chief administrative officer.
bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall direct the rejection of all articles which may be below standards, specifications or samples furnished. He shall not approve any bill or voucher for articles not in conformity with specifications, or which are at variance with any contract.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall also have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment are hereby transferred to the persons responsible therefor, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for and in use in all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.

7.03 Requisition, Contract and Payment

All purchase orders and contracts shall be based on written requisitions or, for materials, supplies or equipment in common use in the various departments, on the purchaser's records of average use by all departments. Purchase orders and contracts in excess of fifteen-thousand-dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) must be approved by the chief administrative officer. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall approve all bids and vouchers for materials, supplies, equipment, and contractual services before the controller shall draw and approve warrants therefor. All contracts for the purchase of materials, supplies and equipment shall be made after inviting sealed bids by publication. All sealed bids received shall be kept on file. When an award of contract is made, notice that the same has been made shall be given by one publication, and any interested person may examine the bids and records at the purchaser's office.

The purchaser of supplies shall by rules and regulations, approved by the chief administrative officer and the controller, designate and authorize appropriate personnel within the purchasing department to exercise the purchaser's signature powers for purchase orders and contracts approved as provided in this charter. 7.200 Public Works and Purchasing Contracts

The construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements, and the purchasing of supplies, materials and equipment, when the expenditure involved in each case shall exceed the sum of fifteen-thousand-dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), shall be done by contract, except as otherwise provided in this charter. It shall constitute official misconduct to split or divide any public work or improvement or purchase into two or more units for the purpose of evading the contract provisions of this section. In an emergency, provided an actual emergency be declared by the board of supervisors to exist, and when authorized by resolution of said board, any public work or improvement may be executed in the most expeditious manner. Notwithstanding any other provision in this section or this charter contained, upon the approval of the chief administrative officer declaring the work to be emergency in character, there may be expended by the department of public works the sum not to exceed five hundred dollars ($500) for new construction of any type in upon improvement of existing structures.

Any public work or improvement estimated to cost less than fifteen-thousand-dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) may be performed under contract or written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county. Any public work or improvement executed by the city, other than that by repair work, shall be authorized by the chief administrative officer when the cost exceeds fifteen-thousand-dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or by the heads of departments not under the chief administrative officer, only after detailed estimates have been prepared and submitted by the head of the department concerned. There shall be separate accounting for each work of the same nature or execution, which accounting shall include all direct, indirect and supervisory elements of cost chargeable to such work or improvement, and each cost accounting shall be reported to the chief administrative officer, or to the mayor when such work shall have been performed by departments not under the chief administrative officer. All such accounts shall be reported to the controller by the public works or improvement costing less than fifteen-thousand-dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) and not performed by the use of city and county labor, materials, and supplies shall, if not performed under contract, be covered by written order or agreement which shall be based on not less than three bids, notice of which shall be given by three days' posting. Records of such bids shall be kept by the department.

When the expenditure for any public work or improvement shall exceed the sum of fifteen-thousand-dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), the same shall be done by contract, except as otherwise provided in this charter. The head of the department in charge of or responsible for the work for which a contract is to be let, or the purchaser of supplies in the case of purchase of materials, supplies and equipment, shall let such contract to the lowest reliable and responsible bidder not less than ten days after advertising by one publication for sealed proposals for the work, improvements or purchase contemplated. Each such advertisement shall contain the reservation of the right to reject any and all bids. The officer responsible for the awarding of any such contract shall require from all bidders information con- cerning their experience and financial qualifications, as provided by general law relative to such investigations authorized by department of public works.

The purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer for bids in excess of fifteen-thousand-dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or the department head concerned, with the approval of the board or commission to which he is responsible, may reject any and all bids and readvertise for bids.

The department head or the purchaser of supplies, as the case may be, shall have power to sign such contract for the estimated expenditures thereunder not in excess of fifteen-thousand-dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000). Any contract involving the expenditure of more than fifteen-thousand-dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), if for the purchase of materials, supplies or equipment, shall require the joint approval of the purchaser of supplies and the chief administrative officer. If such contract is for any public work or improvement, it shall require the joint approval of the department head and the chief administrative officer for amounts in excess of fifteen-thousand-dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), relative to departments under his jurisdiction, or the signature of the department head and the approval by resolution of the board or commission concerned for departments not under the chief administrative officer.

The board of supervisors, by ordinance, shall establish procedure whereby appropriate city and county departments may file sealed bids for the execution of any work to be performed under contract. If such bid is the lowest, the contract shall be awarded to the department. Accurate units costs shall be kept of all direct and indirect charges incurred by the department under any such contract, which unit costs shall be reported to and audited by the controller monthly and on the completion of the work.

In any case where the least gross price or unit cost bid is not accepted, and a contract is entered into with another bidder, written report shall be made to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the controller by the officer authorized to execute the contract, with the reasons for failure to accept such lowest bid.

If any provision of this section is in conflict with any provision of section 7.100 of the charter, the provisions contained in section 7.100 shall govern and control.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.

7.201 Public Works Contract Procedure by Ordinance

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter and, in particular, the provisions of section 7.200, the board of supervisors shall by ordinance determine the monetary limits not to exceed fifteen-thousand-dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), within which the construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements may be done by contract or by written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county, consistent, save as to monetary limits, with the manner provided for in section 7.200 and section 7.100.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
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point two commissioners to terms of one year each, one commissioner to a term of two years, one commissioner to a term of three years and one commissioner to a term of four years. Thereafter, the terms of the commissioners shall be for four years from the commencement thereof. Not less than one-fourth of said commissioners shall be of the same sex, and one member shall have prior experience representing labor and one member shall have prior experience representing management.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, take oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of one hundred dollars ($100).

— Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of considering and adopting examination questions shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission. The regular, weekly office hours shall be 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Persons of commission shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such personnel concerned.

In accordance with section 3.590, the commission shall have the power and it shall be its duty to appoint an executive assistant to be the administrative head of the affairs under its control who shall serve at its pleasure; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of assistant secretary to the civil service commission on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to have civil service status in the position of executive assistant under the civil service provisions of this charter.

3.661 General Powers and Duties

(a) The civil service commission shall be the employment and personnel department of the city and county and shall determine appointments on the basis of merit and fitness, as shown by appropriate tests.

The commission shall classify, and from time to time, may reclassify, in accordance with duties and responsibilities of the employment and training and experience required, all places of employment in the departments and offices of the city and county not specifically exempted by this charter from the civil service provisions thereof, or which are hereby made not specifically exempted from said civil service provisions. The commission shall likewise classify all other positions or other places of employment in the city and county service specifically exempted from the civil service provisions of this charter, but which, by the provisions of section 4.801 thereof, are made subject to examination for classification by the civil service commission for the purpose of determining the basis on which the duties and responsibilities of the employment and training and experience required. The civil service commission shall be the judge of such classification.

(b) The civil service commission may require periodic reports from the personnel director in a manner and form in which it shall prescribe.

(c) The civil service commission may hear appeals from an action of the personnel director with respect to:

1. Allegations of discrimination. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the civil service commission regarding allegations of discrimination shall be final and shall be enforced by every officer and employee.

2. Allegations of fraud; and

3. Allegations of conflict of interest, pursuant to section 8.105.

(d) No action by the personnel director which is the subject of any appeal shall be stayed during the appeal process except by the unanimous vote of the civil service commission.

(e) The commission shall be notified of the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal of personnel regulations and may comment on such proposals. The adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfers, resignations and terminations of employment is subject to ratification by the commission. The commission shall ratify or reject any such regulation within 60 days of receipt. The commission's failure to act shall be deemed approval.

3.662 Department of Personnel Administration

There is hereby established a department of personnel administration which shall consist of a personnel director and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this charter.

3.663 Personnel Director

(a) A personnel director shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the mayor; provided, however, that the personnel director shall be selected from candidates approved by the civil service commission and confirmed by vote of the board of supervisors. The personnel director may be appointed acting personnel director pending confirmation. The person so appointed shall, before assuming office, take oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am appointed to appointment to the personnel director in the spirit of this declaration.

(b) The personnel director shall conduct appropriate examinations for employment, establish eligible lists based on the results and provide for certification of eligibles. The action of the personnel director on examination matters including,
but not limited to, announcements, minimum qualifications, classes of applicants, components, construction, weighting, content, type, list length, duration and certification shall be final.

c. The personnel director shall adopt personnel regulations which, except as otherwise provided in this charter, shall govern both the administrative matters within the jurisdiction of the department of personnel and the exercise of the authority granted in this section, including, but not limited to, recruitment; applications; examinations; eligibilities; duration of eligible lists; certification of eligibles; permanent, temporary and provisional appointments; regular performance evaluations; promotions; transfers; resignations; layoffs or reduction in force due to lack of work; layoff, reinstatement, reemployment or completion of work; and classification. No personnel regulations shall be adopted, amended or repealed without a prior public hearing at least two weeks public notice by the personnel director and after meeting and confer sessions with recognized employee organizations as required by state law. All civil service commission rules relevant to the foregoing as well as the provisions of former sections 8.322, 8.323, 8.326, 8.328, 8.329, 8.330, 8.331, 8.332 and 8.340 of this charter shall become personnel regulations on the effective date of this charter amendment.

d. The personnel director shall conduct the salary surveys for the civil service commission as set forth elsewhere in this charter.

e. The personnel director by personnel regulation shall establish procedures to review and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, except as the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the personnel director shall forthwith be enforced by every employee and officer, unless the decision is appealed to the civil service commission in accordance with personnel regulations.

f. The personnel director shall investigate all employee complaints concerning job related conduct of City employees or their proper support to the source of the complaint.

g. The personnel director by personnel regulation shall promote effective and efficient management through personnel programs that encourage high productivity and exemplary performance.

h. The personnel director by personnel regulation shall provide a procedure for resolution of employee disputes which shall be consistent with other provisions of this charter and shall be utilized by all department heads and appointing officers upon the expiration of the existing term of any otherwise binding agreements.

i. Consistent with the foregoing and other applicable provisions of this charter, the personnel director shall delegate to the various appointing officers the right to make personnel decisions, including but not limited to appropriate disciplinary procedures, and consult with appointing officers with respect to personnel regulations affecting their operations.

j. Personal services contracts shall be reviewed and approved by the personnel director in accordance with the provisions of appropriate personnel regulations. Personal services contracts reasonably expected to involve payment by the city and county of more than twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000) shall be also reviewed and approved by the Commission. Failure of the Commission to act within 30 days of submission of the contract by the personnel director shall be deemed expedited so that final adoption of the eligible list is not delayed beyond sixty (60) days after the date of posting. Eligibles who, as a result of their ranking, would receive a notice of appointment regardless of the outcome of the protest(s) may be offered employment from the adopted eligible lists pending the resolution of any protest(s) and announced as the adopted eligible list.

8.326 Promotions in General—

Except as specifically provided for in section 8.327, the Civil Service Commission shall provide for examinations on an entrance, promotive or combination—entrance and promotive—basis. Consideration shall be given to permanent employees in separate promotive examinations and in promotive examinations which include combination examination in city and county service. When the passing mark has been attained and may include evaluation of work performance and other credits. When an examination announcement is issued for a class on both a promotive and entrance basis, there shall be one resulting list of eligibles which shall include all successful candidates both promotive and entrance in order of relative performance.

Nothingwithstanding anything to the contrary in this or any other provision of the charter, an employee who has been certified from a regularly adopted eligible list to a non-permanent position in a civil service classification shall be permitted to participate in promotional examinations on the same terms and conditions as a person holding a non-permanent position in a civil service classification, subject to a demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the civil service commission.

The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to promotive examinations announced after its effective date.

8.328 Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave—

Employees on permanent or under permanent civil service appointment, who, because of absence on duty authorized military leave after June 27, 1950, did not participate in a promotional examination held after June 27, 1950, and during time of war as defined in section 8.324 of this charter, and in which examination the employee would have been otherwise eligible to compete had he not been absent, and whose examination is hereinafter referred to as the original promotional examination, shall after abridgment of military leave, have the right to participate in a similar promotional examination. Provided, that persons and employees who were on entrance or promotive eligible lists, shall, for the purpose of this amendment, be deemed to be appointees in their classification from the time their names were reached for permanent certification while in the military service.

In order to qualify for participation in a similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section, such employee who desires to participate therein must make application in writing to the civil service commission within thirty days after the abridgment of his military leave, or within thirty days after the effective date of his abridgment, where he is required to file such written request to participate in a similar promotional examination as herein provided shall be deemed a waiver of all rights of the employee to participate in such similar promotional examination.

The civil service commission shall arrange to hold such similar promotional examination within a reasonable time after employees eligible to request participation and the civil service commission shall conduct such examination under the provisions of this section have indicated their desire to so participate, or have waived their right to participate, as herein provided.

The civil service commission shall be the sole judge of the adequacy of such similar promotional examination. If the employee obtains in the similar promotional examination a score rating equal to or
more than the minimum passing mark established by the civil service commission for inclusion on the list of eligibles resulting from the original promotional examination, his name shall thereupon be entered on the eligible list resulting from the original promotional examination in accordance with the relative excellence obtained by all the qualified applicants on the original and similar promotional examinations. Such employees shall be eligible for appointment from such list of eligibles in accordance with the civil service rules to any vacancy thereafter occurring, and subject to satisfactory completion of a probationary period as provided in section 8.340 of this charter for a period of four years after the date on which his name is entered on the eligible list and before eligibles procuring standing through examinations held subsequent to the original promotional examination.

If it is determined by the civil service commission that the name of such person would have been reached for permanent appointment from the list of eligibles established as a result of the original promotional examination during his term of military service, had the name of such person appeared thereon, then such employee, upon appointment to a permanent position as herein provided, shall be granted seniority in such appointment from the date his name would have been reached had his name appeared thereon, but such seniority shall have no effect upon the purpose of the promotion, mine, salary, increments and calculating city and county service credits in other promotional examinations held subsequent to the similar promotional examination herein authorized. For all other purposes, seniority of service shall date from the date of appointment as a result of qualifying in the similar promotional examination as herein authorized.

Such employees who qualify for appointment as a result of a similar promotional examination as herein provided, and who are appointed to permanent positions, as herein provided, shall be permitted to participate in other promotional examinations for which they are otherwise eligible while serving under probationary appointment in the position to which they have been appointed. The purpose of the regular examination procedure for probationary appointments herein provided, that certification from lists of eligibles established from such other examinations shall not be made until the employee has satisfactorily completed the aforesaid probationary appointment.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules to govern the administration of similar promotional examinations for probationary appointments and other matters resulting therefrom.

8.329 Certification of Eligibles; Rule of Three
Whenever a position controlled by the civil service provisions of this charter is to be filled, the appointing officer shall make a requisition to the civil service commission for a person to fill it. Thereupon, the commission shall certify to the appointing officer the names and addresses of the persons standing highest on the list of eligibles for such position. In case the list of eligibles is exhausted on the date on which the commission is required to certify the names of the three persons standing highest on such list, if there are fewer than three names on the list from which certification is to be made, there shall be certified the number thereon. The appointing officer shall fill the position by the appointment of one of the persons certified. The provisions of this section as herein amended at the election of November 2, 1976 shall be applicable only to lists of eligibles finally adopted by the civil service commission pursuant to the provisions of section 8.323 of this charter on or after the effective date of this amendment. In making such certification, sex shall be disregarded except when a statute, a rule of the commission or the appointing officer specifies sex.

From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the commission shall determine whether the position is, in character, temporary, seasonal or permanent, and shall notify the candidate in accordance therewith to the end that the candidate may have knowledge of the probable duration of employment. The commission shall provide for such waiver of temporary or seasonal employment as it may deem just to candidates.

No person shall be disqualified from anything contrary to the terms of any other provision of this charter, or an employee who has been certified from a regularly adopted eligible list to a non-permanent position in a civil service classification shall be entitled to appointment to a permanent position with the same classification before the commission certifies to the appointing officer the names and addresses of the persons standing higher on the list of eligibles when the names of the then current employees subject to a demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the commission. The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to requisitions for permanent positions filled from and after January 1, 1980.

8.330 Duration of Lists of Eligibles
The civil service commission may, after the list of eligibles shall have been exhausted, issue an announcement to all of those eligible from the then current employees subject to a demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the commission. The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to requisitions for permanent positions filled from and after January 1, 1980.

8.330 Temporary and Emergency Appointments
When in time of war declared by the Congress of the United States, temporary and emergency appointments may be made by the mayor, and although for the purpose of filling positions filled pending creation of lists of eligibles through the regular examination procedure as provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof. The civil service commission may certify applicants who are eligible from the eligibles compiled from personal and non-competitive tests to the civil service commission to be appointed pursuant to its rules for temporary or emergency appointments in time of war as herein provided. Such temporary or emergency appointments shall be for a period of not exceeding one hundred and thirty working days. Such temporary or emergency appointments shall cease prior to the expiration of such one hundred and thirty working days at the time of expiration of the civil service eligibility for duty as provided in Section 8.329 of the charter.

If a list of eligibles exists for the position required, but immediate service is deemed necessary by the appointing officer, an eligible from such list is certified and reports for duty as provided in Section 8.329 of the charter, the commission may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment thereto for a period not exceeding thirty working days. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such thirty working days at the time of expiration of the civil service eligibility for duty as provided in Section 8.329 of the charter.

No person shall be compensated under any non-civil service or emergency appointment or appointment as authorized under the provisions of this section for a period exceeding one hundred and thirty working days in any fiscal or calendar year, and no claim or warrant therefore shall be allowed, paid for or any compensation in excess of such one hundred and thirty working days in any fiscal or calendar year.

If no eligibles are available for appointment to a position controlled by the provisions of this charter, the commission shall take such action as it may deem just in the matter of opening the examination and establishing an eligible list for temporary service. If an examination is insufficient to meet the civil service requirements, the examination shall be held and the eligible list established as provided in the civil service rules. If no eligibles are available for appointment to a position controlled by the provisions of this section, no appointment shall be made.
8.340 Dismissal During Probation Period

Any person appointed to a permanent position shall serve a probationary period. The civil service commission personnel director shall by rule establish a probationary period of not less than six months' service and up to a maximum of twelve months' service for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed rank of the police department, fire department, sheriff's department and San Francisco International Airport police force shall be for twelve months except that, with respect to members of the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve months' service from the day following completion of the prescribed department field training officer program, but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment; provided further that probationary members of the uniformed ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in section 8.401 for Twelve-month Probationary Periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four months may be established for executive and management classifications. At any time during the probationary period the appointing officer may terminate the appointment upon giving written notice of such termination to the employee, and to the civil service commission personnel director for such termination. Exceptions in the case of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments the civil service commission shall review the termination. The civil service commission shall by rule establish the procedures for such review. If the appointment resulted from an entrance examination the commission shall within ten days of such dismissal dismiss, or upon the return of the notice to the list of eligibles under such conditions for further appointment as the commission may deem just. If the appointment resulted from a promotional examination the employee shall have the right of appeal and hearing before the civil service commission. The commission shall render a decision within thirty days of receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person dismissed; or (b) order such person reinstated to the position without prejudice; and the commission may in its discretion order that the employee be paid salary from the time of the termination of the appointment; or (c) order the return of such person to a position in the classification from which the person was promoted and may reestablish the employee's eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same promotional classification under such conditions as the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall be final. Immediately prior to the expiration of the probationary period the appointing officer shall report to the civil service commission personnel director the position, and if competent, shall recommend permanent appointment. Nothing in this section shall preclude the civil service commission from reviewing terminations for the purpose of future employability including terminations in the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments.

8.401 Definition of Generally Prevailing Rates of Wages

Notwithstanding any provision of section 8.401 or any provision of any other section of this chapter to the contrary, generally prevailing rates of salaries and wages for those employees covered by section 8.401 of the charter shall be determined by the civil service commission personnel director.

The civil service commission personnel director shall conduct a comprehensive investigation and survey of basic pay rates and wages and salaries in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment for like work and like service, based upon job classifications as provided in section 8.661 and 8.662 of this charter and shall make its findings, based on facts and data collected, as to what are the generally prevailing basic pay rates for each benchmark class of employment solely in the manner hereinafter provided. A benchmark class of employment is defined as any occupational grouping selected as the class for which a representative sample of data will be collected. Basic pay rate data for public and private employment shall be collected solely from the Bay Area counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, San Francisco and Santa Clara; provided, however, that the civil service commission personnel director determines that the data from Recuerd the basic pay rate data from recognized governmental Bay Area salary and wage surveys of private employees in the city and county of San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. The data collected shall be limited to basic rates of pay and salaries actually being paid by public and private employers for like work and like service.

The term “prevailing rates of wages” for employers governed by charter section 8.401 and this section shall be defined as the rate ranges developed from the weighted average of the midpoint of the basic pay rates, excluding fringe benefits, for surveyed public and private employers and the median of the pay rates for private employers as follows:

(1) multiply the medians from the private and the midpoints from public employments data base by the number of employees in the given classification from each data base;

(2) add the products of (1);

(3) divide the sum in (2) by the total number of employees surveyed for that classification; and

(4) extend this figure by 10 percent to establish the maximum of the range and reduce this figure by 10 percent to establish the minimum.

When fixing rates of compensation the board of supervisors shall fix basic pay rates as close as reasonably possible to prevailing rates, provided, however, that the board of supervisors shall not set the maximum rate of pay for any class in excess of the maximum prevailing rate for that class; provided further, however, that no employee shall have his basic pay rate reduced to conform to prevailing rates except as provided for in section 8.406. For those classifications of employment in which the prevailing wage is customary, the board of supervisors shall set the minimum, not less than three intermediate, and maximum salary steps and for a method of advancing the salaries of employees from minimum to intermediate to maximum with due regard for seniority of service.

The term “basic pay rate” as used in this section is hereby defined as applying only to the basic rate of wages, with included range scales, and does not include any other benefits of employment or working condition benefits.

It is the declared intent of the qualified electors of the city and county that neither the board of supervisors nor the mayor have any new power to provide any benefits of employment except those enumerated in the charter. Any addition, deletion or modification of benefits of employment enumerated in the charter shall be submitted, as a charter amendment, to the qualified electors of the city and county. The qualified electors expressly state that they understand that benefits of employment are separated from the "fringe benefits" of employment and the qualified electors expressly reserve the right to either grant or deny such benefits except those conditions of employment commonly referred to as "working conditions". Any reference to "working conditions" shall mean those compensations which must necessarily be provided in order for the employee to perform his job description duties efficiently and safely, and shall include but not be limited to such working conditions and benefits as are typically included in the administrative provisions of the salary standardization ordinance and the salary ordinance.

The board of supervisors may, in its discretion, provide working condition benefits for employees covered under this section and section 8.401 of this charter only in accordance with the following provisions:

(a) The civil service commission personnel director must determine, certify and recommend to the board of supervisors mayor that the working condition benefits are necessary and efficient and safe performance of the employee's duties as enumerated in his job description.

(b) The working condition benefit, as recommended by the civil service commission personnel director, is substantially comparable for like work and like service to that provided for the job classification and is provided to not less than 50 percent of the employees of the class in the jurisdiction covered by the salary survey.

9.108 Initiative, Referendum, and Recall

(a) The registered voters shall have power to propose by petition and to adopt or to reject at the polls, any ordinance, act or other measure which is within the power conferred upon the board of supervisors to enact, or any legislative act which is within the power conferred upon any other office or officer to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinance, act, charter amendment or other measure may be so proposed by filing with the registrar a petition setting forth said measure in full, signed by registered voters of the city and county as many in number as the percentages hereinafter required of the entire voting qualified electors for the office of mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election.

Any declaration of policy may be submitted to the electors in the manner provided for the submission of ordinances; and when approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting on said declaration, it shall thereupon be the duty of the board of supervisors to cause the same to be enacted into law or ordinances and to carry such policies or principles into effect, subject to the referendum provisions of this charter.

Any ordinance which the supervisors are empowered to pass may be submitted to the electors by a majority of the board at a general election or at a special election called for the purpose, said election to be held not less than thirty days from the date of the call. Any such ordinance may be proposed by one-third of the supervisors, or by the mayor, and when so proposed shall be submitted to the electors at the next succeeding general election. No ordinance passed by the supervisors granting any public utility franchise
or privilege, shall go into effect until the expiration of sixty days from the date it becomes final. At the end of such sixty days such ordinance shall be in force and effect, unless within such period there shall be filed with the registrar a petition signed by registered voters equal in number to five percent of the entire vote cast for mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election, requesting that such ordinance be submitted to the electors. In case such petition is filed, such ordinance shall not go into effect until approved by a majority of the voters voting thereon at a general or special election.

If, before the time any other ordinance involving legislative matters becomes effective, there shall be filed with the board of supervisors a petition signed by qualified electors of the city and county equal in number to at least ten percent of the entire vote cast for all candidates for mayor at the last preceding general municipal election at which a mayor was elected, protesting against the passage of such ordinance the same shall be suspended from going into operation, and it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to reconsider such ordinance, and if the same be not entirely repealed, said board shall submit the ordinance to the vote of said electors either at the next general municipal election or at a special election to be called for that purpose, and such ordinance shall not go into effect or become operative unless and until a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon shall vote in favor thereof. The provisions of section 9.109 and 9.110 of the charter shall apply to and govern the verification and certification of such petition.

Annual budget and appropriation ordinances, supplemental appropriation ordinances, the annual salary ordinance, or ordinances amending the same, the ordinances levying taxes, any ordinance appropriating money from the emergency reserve fund, ordinances authorizing the city attorney to compromise litigation, and ordinances necessary to enable the mayor to carry out any of the powers vested in him in the case of public emergency as defined in section 3.08 of the charter, ordinances enacted pursuant to section 8.480 of the charter, as well as ordinances relative to purely administrative matters, shall not be subject to referendum.

Any elective official, the chief administrative officer, the controller or any member of the board of education or public utilities commission may be recalled by the electors. The procedure to effect such recall shall be as follows: A petition demanding the recall from office of the person sought to be recalled shall be filed with the registrar. Said petition shall contain a statement of the grounds on which the recall is sought. Any insufficiency of form or substance in such statement shall in no way affect the validity of the election and proceedings held thereunder. No recall petition shall be filed against any officer until he has held his office for at least six months.

(b) In the event the representative of the board of supervisors, the mayor and the representatives of recognized employee organizations do not reach an agreement through the meet-and-confer process on matters contained in the annual salary standardization ordinance by March 15 of any year, the mayor shall recommend and the board shall adopt approve or reject a schedule of compensation which reflects current prevailing rates for the classifications covered by Section 8.480 of this Charter the last good faith offer presented by the mayor or his or her representative.

In any year when an agreement on matters contained in the salary standardization ordinance has not been achieved, the civil service commission personnel director, upon receipt of a written demand from a recognized employee organization made upon the mayor and the personnel director shall prepare, prior to April 1, a schedule of compensation and administrative provisions which reflect additional rates that would be payable, and working conditions, based upon the last demands made by the recognized employee organization(s) which participated in the meet-and-confer process.

Said schedule shall be transmitted to the registrar of voters for submission to the voters of the city and county at a general election or a special election called for the purpose, and said special election shall be held no less than sixty (60) days from the date of the call. No such schedule shall be withdrawn after it has been received by the registrar of voters. At said election, the ballot shall contain the following two alternatives: (1) Approval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands. (2) Disapproval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

If a majority of the valid votes cast in the election favor paying the additional rates set forth in the schedule of compensation based upon the last demands of the recognized employee organizations which engaged in the meet-and-confer process, it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to amend the salary standardization ordinance to reflect said increased rates.
rates and the same shall be in lieu of said annual compensation, and notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, said rates shall become effective and be payable as if adopted prior to April 1, of any year.

The provisions of sections 3.100 and 3.100-1, relating to the emergency powers of the mayor, shall not be applicable to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

11.105 Effective Date of Amendments
The effective date of the amendments, additions
and deletions to the civil service provisions of the charter shall be ninety (90) days after the acceptance and filing thereof with the Secretary of State.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION G

We the people of San Francisco declare this to be our policy:

1) IT IS IMPROPER TO PROFIT FROM OR PROVIDE SUPPORT TO THE RACIST POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SYSTEM IN SOUTH AFRICA, KNOWN AS APARTHEID.

Therefore it is necessary to sever commercial ties to South Africa, until people of all races obtain equal rights in that country, including equal voting rights.

2) COMPANIES HAVING SUBSTANTIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH APARTHEID MUST BE CONSIDERED IRRESPONSIBLE.

(a) The Board of Supervisors must determine which companies doing or seeking business with the City have the greatest ties to Apartheid. Companies that have a significant involvement in profiting from or maintaining the Apartheid system, may, on that basis, be deemed "irresponsible bidders."

In purchasing goods and services and awarding other contracts, the city must give priority to avoiding such companies; the degree of the preference must be in proportion to the company’s complicity with Apartheid, according to the following criteria:

— how much business the company does in or with South Africa;
— how much the company profits from that business;
— how much support the company provides the Apartheid government in taxes, loans, payments or other funding;
— the nature of the company’s South Africa business;
— the degree of the company’s cooperation with South African political censorship or secrecy agreements;
— the degree to which the company provides the South African government with the technology, materials and other means to maintain and enforce Apartheid.

(b) City funds must not be deposited or invested with any bank or other company which does business in or with, or makes loans to, South Africa.

(c) If any exception to the above policies is found to be necessary or appropriate, the responsible official must promptly and publicly report it to the Board of Supervisors, clearly describing the exception and the reasons for it.

(d) The term “city” includes all agencies, departments, officials, employees, units and subunits of the city and county of San Francisco, and all funds administered by or on behalf of the city or county.

3) WE CALL ON ALL OTHER PUBLIC BODIES AND PRIVATE OR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS TO ADOPT SIMILAR POLICIES.

4) WE CALL A GENERAL PUBLIC BOYCOTT, FOCUSING ON THOSE COMPANIES HAVING THE GREATEST TIES TO APARTHEID.

The Board of Supervisors must determine and announce which company or companies are the worst offenders within each major industry, so that the public can focus its boycott on those companies.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION H

SUMMARY: THIS INITIATIVE STATES THAT THE AIDS EPIDEMIC IS A MAJOR PUBLIC HEALTH PROBLEM OF CONCERN TO EVERYONE, REQUIRING INCREASED SUPPORT FOR RELATED MEDICAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION. IT CALLS FOR A COUNCIL FOR AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION OR SIMILAR UNITED EFFORT TO STOP AIDS.

We the people of San Francisco hereby adopt the following policy:

The AIDS epidemic has rapidly become a major public health problem, costly both in human lives and in general community resources.

The first steps in dealing with such a crisis are:

— the scientific research needed to discover and understand the nature, causes, co-factors, prevention, diagnosis and treatment of the disease, and
— the education of the public about the lessons of that research;

A proper program of research and education pays for itself in the long run;

Prompt action is urgent, because of the rapidly growing number of persons affected, increasing not only the suffering but also the difficulty of eradicating the disease;

The leadership and support of such an effort is everyone's responsibility;

While San Francisco's role in the overall effort against AIDS has been viewed as a positive example to other areas, the continued rapid increase in the spread of the disease means that we cannot afford to rest on our laurels or leave further responsibility to others.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

We call on all appropriate government bodies as well as medical, professional, charitable and community organizations and concerned individuals to join together in an all-out effort to stop AIDS;

We call for support to an organized united effort along the lines of an AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION COUNCIL, including, in some form:

— A COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, to provide informed evaluations as to priorities among research projects and proposals, recommending those which are most cost-effective and most likely to produce early results useful in the prevention or treatment of the disease, to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts or neglect of promising approaches, and to provide the council with complete and up-to-date information regarding comparative results of experimental treatments, prevention programs and other existing research;

— A COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, to inform the public regarding prevention and other research findings, and to inform relevant government officials and the general public, concerning the factual basis for a reordering of current public funding priorities toward an increased war against disease, including research and education against AIDS and related conditions;

— A FUND-RAISING COMMITTEE, to solicit donations, lobby for grants, organize benefits and other fund-raising projects spreading the financial burden by appealing to many sources;

We ask the council and committees to be responsive and accessible to public input, to include representation of all interested groups, to consider all viewpoints, and to be capable of prompt action;

We ask appropriate city officials to determine whether a suitable form of such a council already exists; if it does, we wish the city to support it actively; if not, we wish the city to seek to encourage its formation by such means as may appear proper.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION I

SUMMARY: This initiative asks “Shall we tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?” The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated portion of Route 480 known as the Embarcadero Freeway. This initiative declaration of policy will give the voters the opportunity to establish the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco regarding the proposed teardown of the Embarcadero Freeway.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION J

Shall the City replace a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if such replacement would open the Waterfront to its citizens, improve the tax base, and create a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic?
Candidates

FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER
JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: The Bill of Rights guarantees that every person accused of a crime shall have the effective assistance of counsel. Whether an individual is rich or poor, that person is entitled to a competent and dedicated attorney.

In San Francisco it is the duty of the Public Defender to uphold this sacred right. In every case, we provide the client with the best defense under the law.

In the last 7 years, my outstanding staff has done this work with the highest degree of professionalism. In the next 4 years, that same strong, professional, independent and ethical representation will continue.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John D. Bardis, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative In Congress, 5th District
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Clerk
Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Artist/Community Organizer
Brian Gerz, 55 22nd Ave., Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson, Sheriff of San Francisco
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Matie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere Dr., International Vice President, ILGWU
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for Children & Youth
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 300-26th Ave., Executive Assistant to Sala Burton M.C.
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Community Health Director
Linda Ann Post, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative
Jim Rivaldo, 430 Steiner St., Political Consultant
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Member, SF Community College District Governing Board
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., UC Regent
Samuel W. Walker, 562 Campbell Ave., President — Local 250-A Transport Workers Union of America
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilhurst Ave., Minister
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor
C. R. Zanca, 1966 Pacific Ave., Auto Repair Proprietor

FOR ASSESSOR
SAM DUCA

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I was elected your Assessor in 1978 and re-elected in 1982. My years in the Assessor’s Office were spent in a professional appraisal capacity personnel and administration. I have two university degrees, the coveted MAI designation, and am the recipient of a special Congressional Advisory Board award from the United States Congress. I have served in an advisory capacity, both nationally and internationally, in property tax administration and will continue to serve the taxpayers of the City and County of San Francisco in dealing with Article XIII A of the State Constitution. My community involvement includes participation in cultural, civic business organizations.

Sam Duca

The sponsors for Sam Duca are:
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
Eugene E. Friend, 2590 Lake St. — Investor
Nancy Pelosi, 40 Presidio Ter., Housewife and volunteer in politics
Walter H. Shorein, 740 El Camino del Mar., Chairman, Milton Mayer & Co.
Stanley Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Emma W. Louie, 1257 Jackson St., Housewife
Alfred S. Wilsey, 2590 Jackson St., Ch. of Exec. Comm. of Diversified Holding Co.
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hinckley Walk, Physician
Gerson Bakar, 2310 Hyde St., Investor
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2235 Washington St., Retired
Joseph C. Orrego, Sr., 866 Faxon Ave., Publicity Dept. — S.F. Giants
James A. Seiema, 101 St. Elmo Way, Chairman of the Board, Seiema York Co.
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher
Frances May McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Recreation & Park Commissioner
Frederick F. Campagnoli, 2609 Larkin St., Attorney
Betty Brooks, 1738 26th St., Field Representative
Jesse Teruel Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Businessman
Cyril L. Magnin, 994 California St., Merchant
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John H. Swanson, 145 Lake Merced Hill South, Bowling Alley Owner
Frances G. Goldman, 745 El Camino Del Mar, Child Guidance
Irmia M. Bernardo, 2182 34th Ave., Housewife
Lou J. Murphy, 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Charles M. Cunningham, 475 Connecticut St., Self Employed
Lawrence V. Eppinette, 815 Fell St., Conf. Secretary
Mary M. O’Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Volunteer & Homemaker
Elizabeth R. Duca, 16 Wawona St., Homemaker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Application for Absentee Ballot

is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

Name ____________________________

Residence Address _______________________

Mailing Address ____________________________

Signature ____________________________

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

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

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

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:
The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible. This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter en route to the polls have not been considered.
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CREDITS

The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The active members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Suzanne Guyette, Mary Ann Aronson, Mary Martin and Tom Owen.
Q — Who can vote?
A — You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 5, 1986.

Q — Who can register to vote?
A — You can register to vote if you:
   • are a U.S. Citizen,
   • are at least 18 years of age on election day,
   • are a resident of California, and
   • are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q — How do I register?
A — Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417. You will be sent a form.

Q — Do I have to belong to a political party?
A — Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.”

Q — If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A — At a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, such as this one, you can only choose among the candidates of your party.

Q — Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A — Only if you have moved.

Q — If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A — Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q — What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A — Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Senator, State Assemblymember, County Central Committee, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Your polling place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q — If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q — When do I vote?
A — The election will be Tuesday, June 3, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q — What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A — Call 558-3061.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A — Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes. This is called a “write-in”. If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q — What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A — Ask the workers and they will help you.

Q — Can a worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A — No.

Q — Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A — Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q — Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A — Yes. You can vote early by:
   • Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
   • mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see enclosed card).

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

Q — What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A — You must write:
   • your home address,
   • the address where you want the ballot mailed,
   • then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q — When do I mail by absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A — You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 3, 1986.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS CONCERNING VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

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

A 第一步
如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。

B 第二步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

C 第三步
請切記，將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

D 第四步
請切記，將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 1

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

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

STEP 2

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

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

STEP 3

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

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

STEP 4

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

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

STEP 5

TURN OVER FOR NEXT PAGE
VOTE ALL PAGES

A 第五步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO ÚNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfore la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfore la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfore la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SI" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borradoras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precinct y obtenga otra.

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

请在下页开始投票 PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOM BRADLEY</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Mayor, City of Los Angeles, Alcalde, Ciudad de Los Angeles, 洛杉矶市市长</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUGH G. BAGLEY</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Businessman, Hombre de Negocios, 高人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK L. THOMAS</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EILEEN ANDERSON</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Singer and Dancer, Cantante y Bailarina, 歌剧家及舞者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES “CHUCK” PINEDA, JR.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>State Hearing Officer, Oficial de Audiencias Estatales, 州听证员</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEO T. McCARTHY</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Lieutenant Governor, Vicegobernador, 副州长</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARCH FONG EU</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Secretary of State of California, Secretario de Estado de California, 州务卿</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Vote #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Davis</td>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Garamendi</td>
<td>State Senator, Businessman</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alister McAlister</td>
<td>Assemblyman, 18th District</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jesse M. Unruh</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Van de Kamp</td>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
Member, State Board of Equalization

CONWAY H. COLLIS
Member, State Board of Equalization, Second District
133

BERT DE LOTTO
Appraiser/Broker/Farmer
135

Appraiser/Intermediary/Agricultor

(WRITE-AN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballots, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

United States Senator

ROBERT J. BANUELOS
Communications Technician
142

Técnico de Comunicación

JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT
Political Scientist-Teacher
144

Profesor-Especialista en Ciencias Políticas

CHARLES GREENE
Member, Senior Legislature
146

Miembro, Legislatura Superior

BRIAN LANTZ
Business Consultant
148

Consultor de Negocios

ALAN CRANSTON
United States Senator
150

Senador de Estados Unidos

(WRITE-AN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballots, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

152
### United States Representative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SALA BURTON</td>
<td>Representative in Congress 5th District</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW KLEIN</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL MOBERG</td>
<td>Certified Public Accountant</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*WRITE-IN* To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### State Senator

*There is no contest for State Senator in this district*  
*(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal)*

### Member of the State Assembly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART AGNOS</td>
<td>State Assemblyman Asambleista Estatal</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*WRITE-IN* To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
(MIEMBRO, COMITE CENTRAL DEL CONDADO) 羅中央委員 Member, County Central Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAL ROSELLI</td>
<td></td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARY O'ROURKE</td>
<td>Union Warehouseman/Almacenero Sindicato</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REEVA OLSON</td>
<td>Union Representative/Representante Sindicato</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNIE O'CONNOR</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posición del cargo</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUIDO E. NANNINI</td>
<td>Horticulturist/Horticultor</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBRA A. BARNES</td>
<td>Health Care Director/Director de Cuidados de la Salud</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEVE JONES</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posición del cargo</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMEON WHITE</td>
<td>Program Administrator/Administrador de Programas</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE WONG</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posición del cargo</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALICIA CHAO-WAH WANG</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posición del cargo</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM WACHOB</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posición del cargo</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JORGE A. FORTILLO</td>
<td>Machinist/Maquinista</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINDA POST</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posición del cargo</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVEN M. KREFTING</td>
<td>Environmentalist, Data Consultant/Especialista en el Medio Ambiente, Consultor de Información</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM LANSDOWNE</td>
<td>Communications Marketing/Especialista en Mercadeo de Comunicación</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISE A. MINNICK</td>
<td>Criminal Justice Specialist/Especialista en Justicia Criminal</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARILYN MILLER</td>
<td>Financial Planner/Planificador Financiero</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS MOORE</td>
<td>Deputy Sheriff/Delegado del Alguacil de Policía</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEONEL MONTEREY</td>
<td>City Commissioner/Miembro de la Junta Municipal de la Ciudad</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN MALONE</td>
<td>Community Organizer/Organizador Comunitario</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARY H. SUEN</td>
<td>Furrier/Peletero</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK C. FITZGERALD</td>
<td>Incumbent/En posición del cargo</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSS FIELDS</td>
<td>Computer Programmer/Programador de Computadoras</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 208

DEMOCRATIC PARTY

ELECCION PRIMARIA 3 DE JUNIO DE 1986

COMITES DEL CONDADO

INTERNATIONAL"

PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 3, 1986

COUNTY COMMITTEE

DEMOCRATIC PARTY

INTERNATIONAL"
Bill Honig
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
SUPERINTENDENTE ESTATAL DE INSTRUCCION PUBLICA

Daniel Nusbaum
Teacher
Maestro

Jeanne Baird
Educational Project Advisor
Asesora para Proyectos Educativos

(SUPERINTENDENTE ESTATAL DE INSTRUCCION PUBLICA) 州公共教育總監

Vote for One

Sam Duca
Incumbent
En posesin del Cargo

(ASESOR) 估稅官

Vote for One

Jeff Brown
Incumbent
En posesin del Cargo

(DEFENSOR PUBLICO) 公共辯護律師

Vote for One
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Veterans Bond Act of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $850,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Community Parklands Act of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for acquiring, developing, improving, rehabilitating, or restoring urgently needed local and regional parks, beaches, recreational areas and facilities, and historical resources.</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Water Conservation and Water Quality Bond Law of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $150,000,000 to provide funds for water conservation, groundwater recharge and drainage water management, and clarifies language in the Clean Water Bond Law of 1984.</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Deposit of Public Moneys in Credit Unions. Authorizes Legislature to provide for deposit of public moneys in any credit union. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect. Legislation already approved implementing measure could result in greater interest income to state and local governments.</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Property Taxation. Provides exception to property tax limit when acquisition or improvement of real property approved by two-thirds of voters. Fiscal Impact: By itself, measure has no fiscal effect. No increase can occur in local property tax rate unless bond issue is approved by two-thirds vote. State costs for tax relief programs could increase. State income tax revenues could decline as taxpayers deduct greater amounts for property tax payments.</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Allocation of Vehicle License Fee Taxes to Counties and Cities. Requires allocation of Vehicle License Fee taxes to local governments. Fiscal Impact: Measure would have no direct fiscal effect. Prevents Legislature from changing the law to take vehicle license fees away from counties and cities. Measure would not prevent state reducing other forms of aid to local governments or changing existing formula for dividing vehicle license fee revenues between counties and cities.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Legislators' and Judges' Retirement Systems. Limits retirement allowances for persons entering Legislators' and Judges' Retirement Systems after January 1, 1987. Fiscal Impact: Minor savings to state in future years if rate of inflation exceeds increase in salaries paid to current officeholders.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1986. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $506,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en la compra de granjas y casas para los veteranos de California.

ACTA DE TERRENO DE PARQUES DE LA COMUNIDAD DE 1986. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición, rehabilitación y mejoramiento de parques, playas, áreas e instalaciones de recreación, y los recursos históricos locales y regionales.

LEY DE BONOS PARA LA CONSERVACIÓN DE AGUA Y CONTROL DE LA CALIDAD DEL AGUA DE 1986. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la conservación del agua, rehabilitación de aguas subterráneas, manejo apropiado del agua de drenaje, y clarificación del lenguaje en la Ley de Bonos para Agua Limpia de 1984.

DEPÓSITO DE FONDOS PÚBLICOS EN COOPERATIVAS DE CRÉDITO. Autoriza a la Legislatura para que disponga el depósito de fondos públicos en cooperativas de crédito. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. La legislación ya aprobada que permite el depósito podría resultar en mayor ingreso de intereses para los gobiernos locales y estatales.

FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD: Dispone exenciones a los límites de impuestos a la propiedad en el caso de adquisición o mejoramiento de la propiedad inmueble que se aprueba por decisión impuesta en parter partes de los votantes. Impacto Fiscal: Por sí solo, la medida no tiene ningún impacto fiscal. Sin embargo, la inclusión de nuevos beneficios para la propiedad inmueble puede ocasionar un aumento en los ingresos de impuestos generados por el impuesto a la propiedad.

ASIGNACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS POR PAGOS DE LICENCIA DE VEHÍCULOS A LOS CONDADOS Y CIUDADES. Requiere la asignación a los gobiernos locales de los impuestos recaudados por el pago de licencias de vehículos. Impacto Fiscal: La medida no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo. Implica que la legislatura pueda cambiar la ley para tomar los fondos provenientes de licencias de vehículos de los condados y ciudades. La medida no evitará que el estado pueda reducir otras formas de asistencia a los gobiernos locales o que pueda cambiar la fórmula actual de dividir los réditos provenientes del pago por licencia de vehículos entre los condados y ciudades.

SISTEMAS DE Jubilación DE LOS LEGISLADORES Y JUECES. Limita las pensiones de jubilación para aquellos personajes que se afilian al Sistema de Jubilación de los Legisladores y Jueces después del 1 de enero de 1987. Impacto Fiscal: Ahorros menores para el estado en años futuros si la tasa de inflación excede el aumento en los salarios que se pagan a los que actualmente ocupan cargos.
### Measures Submitted to Vote of Voters

#### State Propositions

**49**
**Nonpartisan Offices.** Prohibits a political party or party central committee from endorsing, supporting, or opposing a candidate for nonpartisan office. Fiscal Impact: No direct state or local government fiscal impact.

- **Yes: 262**
- **No: 263**

**50**
**Property Taxation. Disasters.** Base-year value of property damaged or destroyed by disaster transferable to comparable replacement property in same county. Fiscal Impact: Local property tax revenues would decrease by an unknown amount. County assessor and tax collectors would have nonsignificant higher administrative costs. State would replace revenues lost by school and community college districts. State income tax revenues could increase due to lower property tax deductions on replacement properties. These state costs and revenues cannot be estimated.

- **Yes: 266**
- **No: 267**

**51**
**Multiple Defendants Tort Damage Liability.** Plaintiff's non-economic damage recovery limited to defendant’s liability based on defendant’s percentage of fault. Fiscal Impact: Substantial savings to state and local governments. Savings could be several millions of dollars in a year, varying significantly from year to year.

- **Yes: 270**
- **No: 271**

**52**
**County Correctional Facility Capital Expenditure Bond Act of 1986.** This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county correctional facilities and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of four hundred ninety-five million dollars ($495,000,000).

- **Yes: 273**
- **No: 274**

#### City & County Propositions

**A**
Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgements against the City?

- **Yes: 278**
- **No: 279**

**B**
Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?

- **Yes: 281**
- **No: 282**

**C**
Proposition C has been removed from the ballot by the Board of Supervisors.
### DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

#### CARGOS NO PARTIDARIOS

262 SI 贷成
263 NO 反对

Prohibe a un partido político o a un comité central de un partido político patrocinar, apoyar o oponerse a un candidato a un cargo no partidario. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo a los gobiernos estatales o locales.

#### IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE DEBASTRES.

266 SI 贷成
267 NO 反对

El valor en base de propiedad inmueble dañada o destruida por un desastre puede ser transferible a propiedad inmune de reemplazo comparable en el mismo condado. Impacto Fiscal: Los reembolsos provenientes de impuestos a la propiedad inmobiliaria que se produzcan en un condado destruido por un desastre se pueden transferir a propiedades equivalentes en el mismo condado.

#### RESPONSABILIDAD CIVIL DE MULTIPLES PARTES DEMANDADAS EN JUICIOS DE ARAVOS INDEMNIZABLES.

273 SI 贷成
274 NO 反对

Limita la indemnización que puede recibir el demandante por daños no económicos a la responsabilidad del demandado basándose en el porcentaje de la culpabilidad del demandado. Impacto Fiscal: Ahorro sustancial para los gobiernos estatales y locales. Los ahorros podrían ser algunos millones de dólares al año, que variarían significativamente de año en año.


278 SI 贷成
279 NO 反对

Dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelación, y reemplazo de instalaciones correccionales de los condados y la ejecución del mantenimiento diferido en las mismas en conformidad con una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos noventa y cinco millones de dólares ($$495,000,000$$).

#### PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONTADO

#### “2 Deberá la Ciudad establecer una oficina de administración del riesgo y un despacho de investigación y administración de demandas, para estudiar y reducir el riesgo de pleitos y sentencias contra la Ciudad?”

281 SI 贷成
282 NO 反对

#### “2 Deberá autorizarse al Comprador a firmar contratos por menos de $50,000 sin la aprobación del Jefe Administrativo y a permitir que sus agentes firmen contratos en su lugar?”

#### OFICIALMENTE ELIMINADA

正式撤消
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong> Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong> Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong> Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong> Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong> Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong> Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong> Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR CANDIDATE SELECTION.
VOTER SELECTION CARD

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>County Central Committee*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td>1. ________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>2. ________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>3. ________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>4. ________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>5.* ________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td>6.* ________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>7.* ________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>8.* ________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate</td>
<td>9.* ________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td>10.* ________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. Public Inst.</td>
<td>________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to your sample ballot for the number of County Central Committee members to be elected. The number varies with each district.

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR PROPOSITIONS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Código</th>
<th>Votación</th>
<th>Pregunta en Español</th>
<th>Pregunta en Inglés</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>&quot;¿Debe la Ciudad transferir la administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil a un departamento de administración de personal que tenga poder para cambiar las normas del servicio civil que al presente constan en la Carta Constitucional?&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;The government should transfer the general administration of the civil service system of the commission of civil service to a department of personnel administration that has the power to change the service civil rules that currently exist in the Constitution?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>&quot;¿Debe la Ciudad negar o revocar cualquier permiso de construcción para edificar en la Represa Balboa en las Avenidas Ocean y Phelan en los próximos tres años?&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Should the City deny or revoke any construction permit to build at the Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues within the next three years?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>&quot;¿Debe la Ciudad prohibir la defensa remunerada efectuada por oficiales de la Ciudad y legisladores estatales ante cualquier comisión de la Ciudad, y limitar la cantidad con la que una persona pueda contribuir para un candidato a una oficina municipal en $500?&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Shall the City prohibit the reimbursement of defense by City officials and state legislators before any City commission, and limit the amount that a person can contribute for a municipal office candidate to $500?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>&quot;¿Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el bocajar la empresa que tengan mayor vinculación con la segregación racial sudaficana?&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Should the residents of San Francisco pass a plan of action to boycott the companies with the greatest involvement in racial segregation?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>&quot;¿Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el apoyar a todas las organizaciones apropiadas, públicas y privadas, para establecer y mantener un Consejo para la Investigación y Educación sobre S.I.D.A. (A.I.D.S.)?&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Should the residents of San Francisco pass a plan of action to support all appropriate organizations, public and private, to establish and maintain a Council for the Investigation and Education on SIDA (AIDS)?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>&quot;¿Debe ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el demoler la Autopista Embarcadero?&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Should the residents of San Francisco pass a plan of action to demolish the Embarcadero Freeway?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>&quot;¿Debe ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el reponer parte de la Autopista Embarcadero, si este aumentara el acceso del público a la zona de los muelles y mejorar la tráfico?&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Should the residents of San Francisco pass a plan of action to restore part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the wharf area and improve traffic?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT — An official list of candidates and propositions.

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

VOTE BY MAIL — See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

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

MEASURE — Another name for proposition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

COMPENSATED ADVOCACY — Compensated means being paid for doing something; Advocacy means speaking or writing on behalf of someone else. Proposition F concerns the issue of compensated advocacy.

RISK MANAGEMENT — This field covers two areas: (1) deciding on when it is better to buy insurance and when it is better to be self insured or uninsured, then shopping for the insurance; (2) identifying hazardous conditions on one's property and seeing that they are corrected so that liability and damage claims will be avoided. Proposition A concerns risk management.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

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

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

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

PROPOSITION A

Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgements against the City?

YES 278
NO 279

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Consultants hired by the Chief Administrative Officer are available to City departments that have questions about “risk management”, such as how to keep damage claims to a minimum and how to find the best insurance rates. In some cases, the departments use these consultants. In other cases, the departments make their own decisions. When damage claims are filed, some are handled by the City Attorney’s Office and some are handled by City departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would amend the City Charter to create an Office of Risk Management, under the Chief Administrative Officer. The office would set risk management guidelines for all City departments, boards and commissions. Proposition A would also establish a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration in the City Attorney’s Office. The bureau would be responsible for investigating, evaluating and processing all damage claims made against the City, except those claims made against the Public Utilities Commission and the Police Department. The bureau would also have the power to investigate potential suits against the City and to make settlements within dollar limits to be set by ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer and a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want damage claims and risk management decisions to continue to be handled the way they are now.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

“Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not affect the cost of government. However as a result of its potential future application and the exemption of certain employees from the civil service provisions of the Charter, costs may be affected in an amount presently indeterminate.”

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 10 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON A

Last fiscal year, over 6,400 claims and law suits were filed against the City, costing us more than $10 million in settlements. I believe that it is time to change the way we handle our claims, secure insurance, prevent risks, and settle legitimate claims against the City.

Last summer, we appointed a task force of citizens, under San Francisco Bar President Jerry Falk, to make recommendations on how to streamline our procedures and save money at the same time. The present system is very slow, costly, and inefficient.

Currently, all claims are investigated by the department involved. The City Attorney cannot act on any claim until the department is ready. This results in delay and duplication of effort and increased costs. A centralized and accountable Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney would be more efficient, cost-effective, and professional. It would enable the City to settle many claims quickly, before litigation is begun, saving the City the costs of defending itself in court and lowering the average cost of settling a case.

This can be accomplished without creating new jobs by simply moving into one office the city positions presently scattered throughout the government.

Vote “Yes” on A. Reduce the cost of City government.

Adoption of this measure would also formally establish responsibility for Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer, where it has been unofficially since 1978. With this strengthened authority, the Risk Management Office would be responsible for the gathering of claims data on a City-wide basis, the creation of incentives for both reducing the possibility for injuries and damage and the number of claims for each department, the coordination of insurance purchasing, and specific suggestions to avoid and reduce risk.

This amendment is presented with the recommendation of the Mayor's Task Force on Claims and Judgments, the Chief Administrative Officer, City Attorney, the President of the San Francisco Bar Association, and the President of the Lawyers' Club of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Each year the City spends almost $10 million to settle damage claims. It is estimated that the overall costs to the City for all risk-related activities exceeds $125 million a year. It is time for action to be taken to reduce these huge expenditures. This charter amendment is designed to do just that.

Claims Investigation and Adjustment

Right now, the City claims investigation process is decentralized and largely unorganized. Each department investigates its own claims. Investigators may or may not be specially trained for their duties. There is no uniformity of investigation procedure or claims reporting. In only a few departments do investigators contact injured parties within days of an accident in order to settle the claim quickly and economically.

This amendment will create a claims investigation and adjustment bureau in the Office of the City Attorney. Claims investigation and adjustment activities will be centralized, economized and made much more efficient. The new bureau will be able to respond immediately to accidents and claims, providing quick compensation to deserving persons while at the same time producing a prompt, professional investigation. This reform is greatly needed.

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

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the author and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This charter amendment was proposed by a citizens' task force appointed by Mayor Feinstein. Its mission was to propose ways of reducing the number and financial costs of claims and lawsuits against the City.

The amendment has two principal features. The first is to centralize within the City Attorney's office the investigation of claims filed against city departments. This will allow for improved training and supervision of the investigators, who presently are scattered throughout city government. The result will be more efficient, cost-effective and professional investigation of claims. By improving the quality of claims investigation, the City can identify those claims which have merit and attempt to reach early — and less costly — settlements. Meritless claims will be denied with greater confidence that if suit is filed it can be defended successfully.

The second major feature of the amendment will establish a Risk Management office under the Chief Administrative Officer. Risk management is a concept widely used in private business. Risk managers are professionals skilled in reducing the overall cost of claims. The Risk Manager would be responsible for coordinating the City's insurance program, data collection, and correcting problems within the City which lead to claims. The Risk Manager would review those claims which have been filed against the City. Where it appears that an unsafe condition or practice has led to a claim, the Risk Manager would suggest to the affected department that corrective measures be taken. Reports to the Mayor and to the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors of the recommended corrections and the actions taken would ensure that the various departments will be responsive.

The City cannot eliminate claims and lawsuits against it. But it can limit its exposure by managing the claims process more effectively. This measure will reduce injuries and reduce claims, and that is good for everyone.

Jerome B. Falk, Jr.
Chair, Mayor's Task Force on Claims and Judgments Against the City

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, May 31, 1986

12 Noon  State Senate, Assembly, Congress and State Propositions
1:00      Proposition A—Risk Management & Claims
1:15      Proposition B—Purchaser & Contracts
1:30      Proposition D—Civil Service
2:15      Proposition E—Balboa Reservoir
2:30      Proposition F—Compensated Advocacy
3:00      Proposition G—Apartheid
3:20      Proposition H—AIDS
3:30      Propositions I, J—Embarcadero Freeway
3:50      Statewide Candidates

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

Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchaser must get the approval of the Chief Administrative Officer before signing certain contracts for more than $15,000. Only the voters may change that dollar limit. The Purchaser must personally sign every contract that comes through his office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would raise the limit on contracts requiring the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval to $50,000. It would also allow the Board of Supervisors to change that limit by ordinance. Proposition B would also permit the Purchaser to name certain people in his office to sign contracts on his behalf.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval only on contracts for more than $50,000. You also want the Purchaser to be able to name certain people in his office to be able to sign contracts on his behalf.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to require the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval on contracts for more than $15,000. You also want him to sign all contracts himself.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 3 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON B!

The City's Charter requires that a permanent, non-elected City official, the Chief Administrative Officer, review all purchases and contracts above $15,000. Of course, CAO approval of major contracts is very important. But, due to inflation, the number of contracts that have to go to the CAO for approval is always increasing. Today there are too many documents requiring CAO approval. This slows down the purchasing process, occupies staff time—and ultimately costs the City money. Proposition B will raise the CAO approval level to $50,000, and help the City to improve the efficiency of its purchasing operations.

The City's budget includes more than $250 million for purchases on tens of thousands of contracts. At the current $15,000 review limit, the CAO must approve thousands of documents every year—a costly, time-consuming process. In the long run the City loses money because of the inordinate length of time required to complete all the paperwork.

An adjustment must be made to remove the smaller contracts from this cumbersome process. Review and approval of contracts under $50,000 should be under the responsibility of the City Purchaser, a highly trained and experienced professional, who reports directly to the CAO. By changing the present $15,000 to $50,000, it will be possible for the CAO to give each document that comes to him the attention it requires. And, by placing its orders and paying its bills faster, both the City and businesses will benefit—especially small business and those owned by minorities and women.

Proposition B will allow future adjustments to the limit to be made by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility will ensure the City's ability to adjust to inflation and changes in the market.

This amendment comes to you with the recommendation of auditors, controllers, bankers, and others who exercise top fiduciary responsibility within their own organizations.

VOTE YES ON B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will make essential changes to update the purchasing and payment procedures under the Chief Administrative Officer. These measures are necessary and desirable because they will save the City money by significantly increasing our management efficiency.

Right now, the City loses because it takes too long for contracts to be reviewed and payments okayed, which means that early payment incentives go unutilized. The CAO has to approve every contract greater than $15,000—and with City purchases last year over $250 million, the paperwork logjam is vast and overwhelming.

An increase in the review limit from $15,000 to $50,000 will make an adequate adjustment for inflation—$50,000 now is only about $15,000 in 1967 dollars. Proposition B will also enable the City Purchaser, who reports to the CAO, to maximize potential savings through early payments by designating appropriate personnel to approve contracts up to $50,000. These "Good Business" amendments are consistent with private sector practices and should be incorporated by the CAO in the City's best interests.

Finally, Proposition B will give the City the ability to respond quickly to changes in the market place by allowing changes in the CAO review limit by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility is necessary to ensure that in the future we will not lose money because of institutional rigidity. Control is maintained with the necessity of Board action and Mayoral approval to adjust the review limit, and this same feature will allow for change when desired.

Vote yes on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

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

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the civil service system of the City of San Francisco. The structure of the civil service system and certain rules governing its operation are written into the Charter and can only be changed by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would make major changes. A Department of Personnel Administration would run the Civil Service system and would be able to change rules with Commission approval. Major features of Proposition D are described below. The complete charter amendment is printed in this voters' handbook.

Department of Personnel Administration

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Certain civil service rules governing the general operation of the system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs, are written into the Charter and carried out by the Civil Service Commission. Only the voters can change these rules.

THE PROPOSAL: A department of Personnel Administration would be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. A Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor would run the Department. Certain rules governing examination, selection and appointment would be taken out of the Charter. The Personnel Director would be able to change these rules with the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

Civil Service Commission

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the general operation of the civil service system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs. The Commission also hears and decides appeals on civil service matters.

THE PROPOSAL: The Civil Service Commission would no longer be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. The Commission could investigate the operation of the system, approve rule changes proposed by the Personnel Director, and hear and decide appeals only on claims of job discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest.

Employee Relations

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors appoints an Employee Relations Director to negotiate contracts with City employees; the Board approves all contracts.

THE PROPOSAL: The Mayor or his or her agent would negotiate with City employees; the Board of Supervisors would still approve all contracts.

What your vote means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing civil service system.
Controller’s Statement on “D”

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not directly affect the cost of government, as it removes many civil service policy setting functions from the Charter and an independent Civil Service Commission and transfers responsibility for personnel matters, including labor negotiations, to the Mayor.

"As a product of its inherent flexibility and possible future application, costs could be affected or savings realized in amounts presently indeterminate but probably substantial."

How “D" Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative Charter amendment rewriting the civil service provisions of the Charter had qualified for the June ballot.

Robert Bradford, Jonathan Bulkley, Lee Munsen and Mary Hilton, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 36,049 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 25,027 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 p.m.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy
(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. Consistent with the City's and County's affirmative action goals, no applicant or employee shall be selected, appointed, reduced in rank, removed or in any way favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of age, physical handicap, union activities, political affiliation or sexual orientation.
(b) The purpose of the civil service system is to obtain for the city and county the best qualified persons to fill city and county positions in a timely and economical manner, using professional, fair and equitable personnel selection and personnel management practices with consideration of the following merit principles:

1. Recruiting, selecting and advancing employees based on their ability, knowledge, skills and performance relative to the work to be performed.
2. Establishing equitable and adequate compensation, as provided elsewhere in this charter.
3. Training employees, as needed, to promote productivity and high quality performance and to facilitate career development.
4. Retaining employees during good service and separating employees for good cause.
5. Assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration, with proper regard for their privacy and constitutional rights; and assuring equal employment opportunity, based on the person's ability to do the job.
6. Assuring that employees are protected against coercion for political purposes and are prohibited from using their official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the outcome of an election or a nomination for office.
(c) This charter does not limit the power of departments, agencies, or other subdivisions of the city and county in their exercise of management prerogatives including but not limited to:
1. Directing employees in the performance of their duties;
2. Hiring, promoting, transferring and assigning employees from those qualified;
3. Classifying positions in accordance with Section 3.663 (6);
4. Disciplining employees;
5. Laying off employees because of lack of work, lack of funds or other reasonable cause; and
6. Determining the mission of its departments and divisions, and its budget, organization, the number of its employees, and the numbers, types, classifications and grades of positions or employees assigned to an organization unit, work project, shift or tour of duty, and the methods and technology of performing its work.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy
(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. No person shall in any way be favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, age, religion, national origin or other non-merit factors.
(b) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in subsection (a) or any other provision of this charter, it shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, consistent with a policy of acquiring qualified personnel for the service of the city and county, to encourage the hiring of blind persons. It shall further be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that no otherwise qualified blind person shall be discriminated against in examination, re-examination, appointment, re-appointment, waiver of eligibility for appointment or re-appointment, promotion or demotion in any class, subclass or position in the civil service unless eyesight is indispensable for the performance of the duties and responsibilities of the class, subclass or position. It shall be the duty of the commission to classify, and from time to time it may reclassify, places of employment in the civil service, the duties of which may be efficiently performed by qualified blind persons and to conduct appropriate examinations which will fairly test the capacity of blind persons as well as sighted persons to perform such duties.

2.203-2 Employee Relations Director
- Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3.510 of this charter, the employee relations director shall be appointed by the board of supervisors and shall hold office at the pleasure of said board.
3.102 Employee Relations
- It shall be the duty of the mayor to meet and confer with employee representatives on behalf of the city and county and all its constituent boards, commissions, departments and agencies as required by applicable law. These duties may be performed by a designee of the mayor who shall serve at the pleasure of the mayor. Nothing herein shall limit the mayor from contracting for the performance of these duties.
- Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the mayor shall submit all memoranda of understanding or ordinances to be enacted pursuant to Article VIII of this charter herein to the Board of Supervisors for its approval or rejection.

3.660 Commission; Composition; Meetings
- There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county. The civil service commission shall consist of five members, three of whom shall be appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and this charter section as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the term for which they were appointed, provided that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire June 30, 1981 and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following. The respective terms of the commissioners who shall hold office on the effective date of this section as amended shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date. Thereupon, the mayor shall appoint...
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Vote YES and join 34,000 San Franciscans who signed petitions to get this crucial reform on the ballot. "D" clears the way to modernize Civil Service so that it is fair and efficient. The present system is a 50-year conglomeration of rules that tie the City's hands—

— A protest by one applicant can hold up hiring for an entire job classification for months—even years.
— Often tests cannot be given frequently enough to maintain current tests of qualified employees. This leads to delays and temporary appointments that make hiring top candidates all but impossible.
— Appointments to jobs are restricted to the top three names on a list even though more than three people have the same score!
— Many provisions are out of date. Some deal with hiring during the Korean War. Others limit our ability to carry out affirmative action.

"D" would remove archaic rules from the Charter so they could be changed as the times require—subject to meet and confer and public hearings. Job tests could be expedited; hiring and promotions speeded up; opportunities opened to women and minorities.

Specifically, Proposition D:
1) Creates a Department of Personnel Administration at no additional cost. Like other U.S. cities, day-to-day administration would be the responsibility of a director, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Supervisors.
2) Makes the Civil Service Commission the oversight body to set policy and hear appeals. Rulings would have to be within 60 days, eliminating endless delays.
3) Moves the office of labor relations from the Supervisors to the Mayor, who must make the tough-minded decisions to balance the budget. Never again could the Board give labor $27 million for "comparable worth."

This reform is the product of years of work with SPUR, League of Women Voters, Chamber of Commerce. Members of the Board of Supervisors could have put the reform on the ballot last year but bowed to some labor leaders, and 34,000 San Franciscans had to do the job for them.

Proposition D will enable City government to work better for you. Vote YES.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON 'D'

Proposition D is a complex proposition with a simple goal: remove the archaic restrictions on the hiring, promotion, or firing of city employees and bring San Francisco's personnel system into the modern age.

Archaic is the only way to describe a system that keeps equally qualified people from competing for a job, and that takes months—sometimes years—to fill vacancies.

For example, if 50 people score equally high on a competitive examination, shouldn't they all have a chance for any job for which they are eligible? Not under the current system, which requires complicated tie-breaking rules not at all related to a person's qualifications or abilities.

Or what about being able to hire the best person available for a given job? Currently, eligibility lists are frozen for two years and every person on each list, including the lowest-scoring, must be offered a job before the highest-scoring person on a more recent list. Private businesses couldn't function saddled with such absurdities.

Proposition D cuts through the red tape. It creates a modern personnel department, with a director responsible for carrying out rules to ensure fairness and efficiency. Accountable to the Mayor, the director would be selected from a list provided by the Civil Service Commission, and subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.

The Civil Service Commission remains an independent body, with the right to approve new personnel rules and hold hearings on abuses. Also under 'D', negotiations with employee unions would be under the Mayor, subject to approval by the Supervisors, providing checks and balances in balancing our budget.

With greater accountability and continued checks and balances, Proposition D will open the way to more efficient government in our City.

Bill Maher, Supervisor
Louise Renne, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON 'D'

Proposition D is a necessary reform to the City's Civil System. As the City's Chief Administrative Officer for almost ten years, I have found that quality employee hiring is difficult and the process causes long delays.

The current system is:
• inflexible. The City cannot hire and promote the most qualified persons.
• inefficiently administered by a commission. Other large

(continued)
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cities do not have such a bureaucratic process.

* antiquated. Civil service rules represent practices of the 1950s rather than the 1980s.

The new system:

* allows the Mayor to appoint an effective personnel director, who controls administration and procedures.

- allows efficient procedures to be developed with review of the Civil Service Commission.
- eliminates cumbersome and dated rules and practices.
- expedites City hiring and promotion procedures.

I urge a Yes vote on Proposition D.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

It's 1986 and we're still trying to manage City business as if it were 1932. As heads of City departments, charged with the daily responsibility of putting out fires, fighting crime, maintaining hospitals, parks, libraries and providing other essential services, we know from bitter experience about shortcomings of the existing Civil Service System.

Enacted with the City Charter in 1932, the system is foundering in red tape. Outdated rules are the subject of endless challenges. Tests are put off; vacancies go unfilled; promotions delayed; any appeal, however groundless, stops the process in its tracks.

Proposition D would take old procedures out of the Charter so they could be changed in an orderly process by the Civil Service Commission, which also would hear appeals.

Day-to-day administration of the tests—the content, scoring, all the myriad details of managing a complex system, would be put into a modern, highly professional personnel office. Tests would be speeded up. Hiring would keep pace with need. Promotions would be on the basis of competence. High performance would be the standard. Discipline could be imposed with working rights fully protected, and women and minorities would be assured equal opportunity.

Proposition D will help improve management and the quality of City services. Vote Yes on D.

Frank Jordan, Chief of Police
Emmet Condon, Fire Chief
Don Birrer, Director, Public Works
Mary Burns, General Manager, Recreation & Park
John Frantz, City Librarian
Eugene Garriott, Director, Port
Marvin Geislinger, Purchaser
Wilbur Hamilton, Executive Director, Redevelopment Agency
Claire Isaac, Director, Arts Commission
Ray King, Director, Parking Authority
Dean Macris, Director, City Planning
Grant Mickins, Director, Human Rights Commission
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, PUC
Joyce Ream, Director, Aging
Ed Sarsfield, General Manager, Social Services
Thelma Shelley, Managing Director, War Memorial
Moina So, Executive Director, Community Development
Louis Turpen, Director of Airport
Dr. David Wendler, Director, Health Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The hiring practices outlined in San Francisco City Charter have been virtually unchanged since 1931, a severe handicap in running a modern city. Proposition D is designed to streamline the charter and ensure that the rights of present city employees and candidates for city jobs are protected, while improving the hiring process itself. The initiative also builds management accountability in the city system.

Proposition D Is More Fair, More Efficient, More Economical

The day-to-day personnel functions, including hiring, will be consolidated under a Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. Decisions of the Director of Personnel on examination content and administration are final, unless a decision is stayed during the appeal process by a unanimous vote of the Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D will make it easier to modernize the many archaic Civil Service rules and procedures now included in the Charter, while maintaining a strong and independent Civil Service Commission to safeguard the merit system and protect the rights of city employees. Many detailed rules will come out of the Charter and will become personnel regulations. These regulations can then be modernized, but only through a process which includes public hearings and meet and confer sessions with the union involved. In addition, the Civil Service Commission must approve any changes or new regulations governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfer, resignation and terminations.

Proposition D Will Improve Performance And Public Confidence

The openness and fairness of the proposition will benefit everyone. Well-qualified job candidates will have a better chance of being hired, and well-qualified job holders will have a better chance of being promoted. This means generally better job performance in all departments, resulting in higher employee morale and more public confidence in city government.

Submitted by
Louis Hop Lee, President
Civil Service Commission
Lee Munson, Member Civil Service Commission and Treasurer, San Franciscans for Fair and Efficient Government
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Cities can survive only with strong management. The greatest budgetary restraint must be exercised to assure that full value is received for each tax dollar spent.

With firm limits on what it can spend and faced with a possible loss of Federal funds next year, the City must be managed with the greatest possible efficiency.

Essential to greater efficiency is the need for Civil Service reform. As members of City Commissions, we constantly confront the torturous delays and confused rules that gridlock the present system. The present system simply can’t respond to the City’s personnel needs.

Qualified applicants become frustrated and seek employment elsewhere. Promotions are blocked. Morale suffers. Temporaries fill in; overtime mounts. The ability to plan is crippled; management is weakened.

Proposition D would put the system on a business-like basis. A personnel department would handle day-to-day administration. The Civil Service Commission would be the watchdog to assure the integrity of the merit system.

This streamlined system would replace what is now inflexible and cumbersome. Testing could be accelerated; hiring made more efficient and promotions made on time. The result would be greater efficiency and elimination of costly waste.

Vote Yes on D.

Jerry E. Berg, President, Board of Permit Appeals
Henry Berman, President, Fire Commission
Mo Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Hector Chinchilla, Rent Board
Rev. Harry Chuck, Housing Authority
Dr. Arthur Coleman, President, Port Commission
Owen Davis, Police Commission
J. Edward Fleishell, Airports Commission
H. Welton Flynn, President, Public Utilities Commission
James Foster, Health Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation & Park Commission
James Fussell, President, Housing Authority
Anne Halised, Port Commission
Tommy Harris, Recreation & Park Commission
Tom Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Walter Jebe, Public Library Commission
Jeffrey Lee, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Philip Lee, President, Health Commission
Bruce W. Lilienthal, Small Business Advisory Commission
Jacqueline Nemirovski, President, Arts Commission
Toby Rosenblatt, President, Planning Commission
Dr. David Sanchez, President, Police Commission
Joan San Jule, Housing Authority
John Patrick Short, President, Parking Authority
Marjorie G. Stern, President, Public Library Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D contains civil service reform measures urged by the League of Women Voters since 1969.

Proposition D will:
— Modernize the City’s outdated personnel system by creating a Director of Personnel, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors
— Preserve the principles of merit through policies set by the Civil Service Commission
— Create a more responsive Civil Service system at no additional cost to the taxpayer

EFFICIENCY AND FLEXIBILITY

Proposition D transfers authority for day-to-day management of the City’s personnel system from the Civil Service Commission to the Director of Personnel. This will:
— Prevent hiring delays
— Ensure only the most qualified individuals are hired and promoted
— Provide City managers with more administrative flexibility

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

FAIRNESS FOR EMPLOYEES

Proposition D will:
— Safeguard the rights of City workers
— Protect gains made in hiring women and minorities
— Retain the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit appeals board
— Retain the ability of the City’s unions to negotiate working conditions
— Create a system that can respond quickly and fairly to the needs of City workers

Proposition D will bring the Civil Service system into the 20th century by making the Mayor accountable for the management of a system employing more than 25,000 people. Hiring by merit is still guaranteed by the Charter. Please join us in voting for this Reform!

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
Esther Marks, Past President

Vote Yes on Proposition D the Civil Service Modernization Initiative.

Prevent abuse of a system that was intended to serve the public and protect against favoritism. Prevent situations like this: an employee failed to report to work for a week without explanation; he was telephoned, notified by certified mail and a message left under his door; he was terminated 13 days later; he did not appeal the termination and the civil service commission up-
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Civil Service

Two months later, the employee petitioned the commission for reinstatement. The employee got his job back, not because the process of termination was wrong but because the commission had a long standing objection to using “absent without leave” as a reason for firing.

The quality of public services is dependent upon the effectiveness of the staff who deliver them. The primary role of the civil service commission should be to facilitate recruitment and retention of the best available personnel. It must protect against favoritism and must assure that everyone has an equal and fair chance at employment.

The present system does not do that. We feel this initiative will make the system work better, for the managers, for the employees and for the public.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco government is huge, with a budget of more than $1 billion per year and 25,000 employees. It is expected to solve serious problems. This requires that the City have the ability to hire and promote talented people to do the job.

The present civil service system is so tied up in red tape that jobs remain vacant for six months to a year, and all too often someone who is not capable of doing a good job is hired. Your tax dollars are being wasted, and you are not receiving the quality of services you need and deserve.

Proposition D will modernize San Francisco’s civil service system. It separates the personnel department from the Civil Service Commission, and puts the department under the Mayor where it belongs. The Mayor is responsible for balancing the budget and delivering city services as efficiently as possible. She cannot do this unless she can find capable people to do the job. That is the task of the personnel department in any organization.

Proposition D will also insure that the independent Civil Service Commission has sufficient authority to require the personnel system to be fair in its treatment of City employees. The Commission will be able to issue subpoenas and require testimony of witnesses on investigations it conducts. Should it find that discrimination has occurred, it can issue orders that must be obeyed.

Most major American cities, and virtually all cities and counties in California, have the kind of civil service system that will be established by Proposition D. San Francisco’s present system is still mired in the past. It hobbles the ability of the City to deliver services and spend your tax dollars as efficiently as possible.

SPUR has not placed a statement in the Voter’s Handbook for any other issue over the past 15 years. We feel that Proposition D is so vital for San Francisco’s future that we are making this appeal for your support.

Vote “YES” on Proposition D.

SPUR—The San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Reform Initiative, will give San Francisco citizens the HIGH PERFORMANCE GOVERNMENT necessary to meet the many challenges of the future. Proposition D corrects the outdated and inflexible requirements originally written in San Francisco’s City Charter in 1931. It will eliminate the problems which prevent San Francisco’s personnel system from operating with efficiency the City’s voters and taxpayers deserve:

Proposition D insures City jobs will be filled from current lists of the most qualified employees.

Proposition D prevents ungrounded appeals from delaying for years the appointment or promotion of qualified employees.

Proposition D eliminates the repetitive tasks currently monopolizing the Civil Service Commission meetings and directs the Commission to serve as an appellate body to protect the City’s good employees.

Proposition D centralizes the day-to-day operation of the civil service system and makes the Director of Personnel responsible to the Mayor.

Proposition D simplifies the budgetary process by making the Mayor the City’s chief labor negotiator, responsible for setting working conditions within the City’s financial capacity.

Proposition D is the result of years of painstaking review by the most experienced, able and respected management experts in San Francisco. It is a plan intended to move City government out of the 1930s and equip San Francisco to enter the twenty-first century without being burdened by the red tape of the past.

After ten years of commitment to improving our City, the Mayor’s Fiscal Advisory Committee is convinced adoption of Proposition D is one of the most important issues facing the voters. CHANGE IS LONG OVERDUE. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by,
The Mayor’s Fiscal Advisory Committee

David Anacker
Jerome Anderson
Richard Blum
Charles Chapman
Arthur Cooke, Jr.
Benton Dial
James Edgar
Ruben Garcia
Robert Hayden
Walter Hoodley
John Jacobs
Michael McGill
Ellen Newman
Roy Nordman
Frank Tatsum
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PERSONNEL MANAGERS SAY YES ON PROPOSITION D

As the personnel managers for City Departments, we are charged with the responsibility of managing the City’s personnel system. The activities include examinations, hiring, training, discipline, union-management relations, affirmative action and compensation. No one knows better than we the frustrations experienced in attempting to monitor an unbelievable sequence of overlapping bureaucratic activities in attempting to get the job done.

Proposition D will bring our personnel system into line with most other public personnel systems. The improved system will create the potential for being more responsive to the needs of operating departments. It will improve labor relations by transferring this function to the executive branch of government where it belongs.

Proposition D will streamline certain routine procedures resulting in a reduction of cost and time. Under the current system delays are experienced due to lengthy appeals during which time the departments’ objectives are delayed.

Proposition D will create an atmosphere of increased accountability for department managers in the areas of affirmative action, discipline and job performance.

Proposition D has been endorsed by the San Francisco Council of Human Resource Managers, the association of over one hundred personnel managers in City government.

Proposition D strengthens merit system principles. Civil Service commissioners will have more time to enforce and protect these principles rather than being bogged down in the day-to-day activities of administration.

Proposition D will help bring about improved methods and practices in personnel administration and should result in a more competent and effective workforce which the citizens of San Francisco have a right to expect.

Alvin W. Schaaf
Personnel Director
Recreation and Park Department
Marsha Ramirez
Personnel Officer
San Francisco Port
Edward M. Gazzano
Personnel Director
Department of Public Works
James Horan
Senior Personnel Officer
Department of Social Services
James Ilincic
Personnel Director
San Francisco International Airport

Andrea R. Gourdin
Manager, Bureau of Personnel & Training
Public Utilities Commission
Mori Noguchi
Senior Department Personnel Officer
Mary Smith
Senior Personnel Officer
Laguna Honda Hospital
Thelma Poteet
Senior Personnel Officer
San Francisco General Hospital
John Burke
Personnel Director
Controller’s Office

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will assist the Department of Public Works by streamlining the Civil Service process.

• Under the current system, the duration of eligible lists from 2 to 4 years hampers the Department from hiring graduates of colleges and universities on an annual basis. Consequently, many excellent candidates are not entered into the Civil Service System. Passage of the proposition will improve the quality of the pool of applicants and thereby the quality of public service given by the Department.

• The establishment of a Personnel Director to administer the day-to-day tasks of the system will speed up the decision making process to the advantage of employees and management alike.

The proposition still calls for checks and balances in that the Commission will continue to hear appeals on discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest. The Commission will act as a watchdog while leaving the general administration to the Personnel Director.

The initiative will make for an improved system for employees, management and the citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Donald Birrer
Director of Public Works

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Passage of this amendment will update our civil service system. These changes will make it comparable to other merit system agencies. Some of these changes are

(A) removal of administrative details from the charter which inhibit timely and effective personnel actions.

The following subjects will be placed in personnel regulations:

• Protests of written questions and answers
• Protests of tentative employment lists
• Promotional examinations
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while the Personnel Department administers the day-to-day operation of the merit system.

Equally important the amendment retains important merit system provisions dealing with:
- Employee salary setting procedures
- Positions subject to merit system examinations
- Public hearing and meet and confer requirements
- Penalties for examination fraud
- Seniority, meritorious service and applicable educational credits for promotional examinations in the Police/Fire De-

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Initiative, is a long-overdue reform to streamline antiquated hiring practices in San Francisco's fifty-year-old charter. Proposition D will ensure that the best and brightest job candidates are chosen to serve our city, thus promoting excellence in job performance and helping to eliminate incompetence. This initiative builds management accountability in the city system, while giving the Civil Service Commission the independence to protect the rights of women and minorities.

A Better, More Efficient System at Less Cost

Proposition D consolidates personnel functions, including hiring, under a new Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. The Director has final authority over content of examinations given city job applicants, so more flexibility is possible in finding truly qualified candidates.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service System, as presently constituted, (vintage 1932), is uncivil, and there is nothing "systematic" about it! It's pure, unadulterated municipal lunacy and chaos! Remarkably, BOTH Management and Labor despise it. It certainly is NOT producing the best qualified persons to fill City jobs!

Let's follow Mayor Feinstein's recommendations. If this operation doesn't dramatically improve, there are always FUTURE ELECTIONS where additional, more Draconian changes can be considered by the voters.

As matters now stand, it is far better to light a candle than just sit and curse the darkness! Any changes will be an improve-ment! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

For more than a half-century, San Francisco Mayors have abided by the employee examination, hiring and promotion poli-
cies administered by a strong and independent Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D is a deceptive and dangerous scheme that would give future Mayors and top-level bureaucrats the power to ignore competence and reward political loyalty.

Proposition D would take key Civil Service employment rules out of the City Charter and make them subject to wheeling and dealing by City Hall politicians.

There's an old saying — "if it ain't broke, don't fix it."
Civil Service has worked well for more than 50 years. Proposition D is unnecessary, ineffective and even counter-productive.

It's not just deceptive, it's dangerous.

Joseph L. Alioto
Former Mayor of San Francisco
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Time and time again, different groups have put various propositions on the ballot to weaken our Civil Service System and reintroduce political patronage into City employment practices.

And every time the voters have wisely rejected these schemes, no matter how cleverly they have been disguised.

Proposition D is just another power grab by bureaucrats at the top in City Hall.

We’ve said NO! loud and clear in the past. Let’s say NO one more time.

Submitted by:
TAXPAYERS FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT
Thomas Scanlon
City Treasurer, Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “D”!!!

During the eight years while a member of the Board of Supervisors, I fought hard to reform the Civil Service Commission and to bring working conditions and city workers’ pay equitable to both workers and taxpayers. I fought to insure an independent Civil Service Commission that would remain just that— independent and free from political influence and political patronage of particularly the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

I am truly saddened by the Mayor’s insistence in bringing this disastrous Proposition “D” before the voters. Some of the Supervisors rejected this misguided measure for what it is; an unwise consolidation of authority to hire, fire and promote city workers by the Mayor and newly created personnel officer.

My efforts to bring pay equity to both taxpayers and city workers were continually squashed by then Supervisor Feinstein and Supervisor Molinari. Finally, in 1975, shortly after a disastrous city strike, I was able to place on the ballot, for voter approval, a measure that almost eliminates the power of the Mayor and Supervisors to manipulate the pay of city workers. This measure was overwhelmingly passed by the voters that year and we have not had any labor unrest since that date.

Vote No on “D”!

“D” stands for disaster. It will undo many of these reforms. Also, right now, the City is almost broke, thanks to the manipulation of Mayor Feinstein and her chief ally Supervisor Molinari.

If “D” passes the cost of operating our city government will increase in the next 24 months by not less than $60,000,000.

Contrary to the provisions of Proposition 13, property taxes would be increased, thus forcing up rents.

Vote No on “D”.

Don’t weaken our Civil Service Commission, whereby least deserving city employees could be promoted because of connection or clout.

Vote No on “D”.

We now almost have more problems than we can handle. We don’t want our city turned into another Chicago, wherefor for nearly half a century a corrupt political system flourished under Mayor Richard Daley.

John Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We join San Franciscans for Fair Employment in opposing the Civil Service Initiative, Proposition D.

This measure will severely hamper the well-being of the San Francisco Fire and Police Departments. These departments are two of the finest in the Country and have consistently protected life and property in a professional manner. They must continue that tradition with a civil service system based on MERIT and not political patronage.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Andrew C. Casper
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Keith P. Caiden
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

William F. Murray
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Thomas J. Cahill
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired

Donald M. Scott
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Our present Civil Service system was designed to keep corruption out of government. It has generally served that purpose well. This proposition would dismantle that system and in my opinion open the doors to nepotism, favoritism, patronage and corruption. Better a city government that is bureaucratic than one that is corrupt. Vote NO on D.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is an attack on the merit system and an attempt to return patronage to the Mayor’s office by eliminating the authority of the Civil Service Commission and its built in checks and balances.

The present Civil Service system is not perfect, but corrections can be made within the Charter without destroying a system that has worked for over 50 years and has been free from fraud and corruption.

This proposition will do nothing to improve the caliber of police performance and could have the opposite effect.

I urge you to vote NO on PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by
The San Francisco Police Supervisors and Investigators Association

Don Good, Captain SFPD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D could be a dangerous first step toward weakening the independent, impartial administration of our City government.

Proposition D would transfer power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor. The Director’s decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline and certification would be final. The Commission would have no right to hear examinations or disciplinary appeals.

With the transfer of duties and responsibilities from the Commission to the Mayor’s appointed Personnel Director, the Mayor would have control over personnel functions. Currently, commissioners have independent status and can be dismissed for cause. The Personnel Director could be dismissed at will.

The Merit System could be replaced by a patronage system. Proposition D could open the door to rules permitting the Personnel Director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his or her position on the list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Proposition D is NOT a reform package. The checks and balances for efficient City government would be lopsided, with too much power in the hands of unknown future Mayors.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
John L. Molinari, President
Harry G. Britt
Richard Honigso
Willie B. Kennedy
Wendy Nelder
Nancy Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Beware of PROPOSITION D!

Powerful special interest groups are attempting to remove key City employees from the independent and impartial Civil Service system in the name of “reform”.

They want instead to make these employees answerable directly to future Mayors and politically-appointed Personnel Directors and department heads.

PROPOSITION D got on the ballot because the Chamber of Commerce and such companies as Pacific Bell and PG&E paid a professional southern California campaign firm, $70,000 to collect signatures.

They’re trying to destroy the merit system and replace it with an old-fashioned patronage system.

Department heads will be able to ignore examination scores and reward loyalty rather than competence in promotions and hiring.

Don't let the Chamber of Commerce, big business and their allies in the City bureaucracy dictate who’s hired, fired and promoted among public employees.

PROPOSITION D is not just deceptive, it's dangerous!

Vote NO on PROPOSITION D!

Libby Denebein
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Ron Huberman
Vice-Chairman, Democratic Central Committee
Jim Waceh
Democratic Central Committee
Roberto Esteves
President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Rick Pacurar
President, Harvey Milk Lesbian Gay Democratic Club
Walter L. Johnson
Exec. Sec'y, S. F. Labor Council
Michael Bernick
Linda Post
Sal Roselli
Deborah Stein
John Mehring
Pat Norman
Nancy Walker
Gwen Craig
Harry Britt
Louise Minnick
Carole Migden
Amar Jatesk
Jack Morrison
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D places too much power in the hands of ONE. Proposition D will provide for a personnel director to be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. The Mayor now appoints five members of the Civil Service Commission who also serve at her pleasure.

You work for years to climb the civil service ladder and then somebody comes along with an idea to cut you off at the pockets.

Proposition D will lock in all the employees employed in the Mayor’s office and will control the appointments of any new staff by the next Mayor elect in 1987 and years thereafter.

Like controlling your estate from the grave. Vote NO on D.

Marguerite Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service Merit System has served our City well, giving San Franciscans an equal opportunity. It has helped us obtain employment and earn promotions based on objective examinations.

The Civil Service Merit system replaced the old patronage system that rewarded political loyalty more than competence.

Now the supporters of PROPOSITION D want to create a new Personnel Director, accountable only to the Mayor, and give department heads the absolute power to decide who works for the City and who gets promoted.

If PROPOSITION D passes, equal opportunity would give way to opportunity based on membership in the bureaucratic “establishment”.

Keep our Civil Service Merit System strong and free from the political abuses of the past.

Vote NO on D!

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly
Ben Tan
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Joanne Miller
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
A. Richard Cervantes
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Sodonia Wilson
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, President
S. F. Community College Governing Board
Julie Tang
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Alan S. Wong
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Henry Der
Albert Chung
Rudy Menjiz
Robert “Bob” Morales
Yori Wada

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Can you imagine studying for a civil service examination, being rated at the top of the eligible list and never receiving the promotion? That’s exactly what Proposition “D” will do should the electorate adopt this amendment.

The civil service merit system has defects, but to totally eliminate the system and replace it with a patronage system where promotions are based on who you know, rather than what you know is scandalous.

Civil service was put into place to prevent scandal and the “favor seeking” individual from getting a paid position because he/she happened to support the right elected official.

Proposition “D” will allow one person, chosen by the Mayor, to decide who will be promoted, hired and fired. This is awesome power for one single individual to have at any level of government.

Our current Mayor may choose a fair person for this position, but will future Mayors be as careful? As each new Mayor assumes office, the civil service system will again change. The potential to favor one individual or group over others is great.

Proposition “D” has a great potential to diminish the quality of services we now provide to our citizens, as the future of how people are hired and promoted in the San Francisco Police Department is completely unknown.

It’s true our promotional system is fraught with delays and delays frustrate us all, but Proposition “D” is not the answer. Proposition “D” will only add to our existing problems. Several years ago, our citizens elected a Charter Commission to streamline city government and make civil service work more efficiently. The voters eventually rejected those proposals. The checks and balances that make our government stable were no longer present. It simply went too far.

Proposition “D” goes even further. It brings about a system of patronage and should be defeated lest we want to engage in “free-wheeling and dealing” of civil service jobs and promotions.

We urge a strong No vote against Proposition “D”!

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS’ ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry, President
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The purpose of the Civil Service Commission is to ensure that the merit system would be the only criteria in any examination process.

If Proposition D passes, all authority concerning examinations would be taken from the Civil Service Commission and given to a Personnel Director, who is appointed by the Mayor. This Personnel Director would have the authority to hire and fire at his discretion, with no appeal available. This proposition is contrary to everything the Fire Department and all City employees have strived for over the years.

The Civil Service Commission in its present form was instituted to prevent any possibility of a patronage system, where one person has complete control.

This proposition would do nothing to improve your Fire Department. If you are satisfied with the work and make up of the San Francisco Fire Department in its present form, “Vote No On Proposition D”. You will be doing a service for the San Francisco Fire Department, and the people of San Francisco.

Submitted by the San Francisco Fire Chiefs’ Association

John Flaherty, Battalion Chief SFFD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is bad government and bad politics, changing our independent civil service system into a system dominated by the Mayor:

...By shortening the six year terms of Civil Service Commission to conform to the Mayor’s four year term of office.

...By transferring most of the Commission’s powers to a Personnel Director who serves solely at the Mayor’s pleasure.

Keep politics out of employment services. Vote NO on Proposition D!

Alice B. Toklas, Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Roberto Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D fails to offer enough new and improved procedures to cure the current defects in the civil service system. Charter sections and civil service rules are repealed without specific known replacements.

Proposition D transfers power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created personnel director appointed by, and to serve at the pleasure of, the Mayor. The director’s decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline, and certification would be final. The commission would have no right to hear examination or disciplinary appeals.

There are hidden costs with Proposition D because the new Personnel Administration Department will employ a personnel director, and other employees “as may be necessary to carry out (its) functions and duties.”

The Merit System could be replaced by an old style Patronage System. Proposition D could open the door to rules which permit the personnel director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his/her position on the civil service testing list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Police and Fire Commissions would lose functions as a result of the personnel director’s new power. The director’s unlawful employment discrimination policy would be binding upon department administrators. The director’s procedure for employee dispute resolution must be used by all department heads and appointing officers.

Proposition D is not the answer. The checks and balances for efficient city government would be lopsided.

I urge a no vote on Proposition D.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, 17th Assembly District
Salto Burton
Congresswoman
Art Agnos
16th Assembly District
Milton Marks
State Senator

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

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

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission declared Balboa Reservoir South (located across Phelan Avenue from San Francisco City College) surplus in 1984 and made the site available for low, moderate and market rate housing. In July 1985, a City-community advisory committee chose a developer to build 203 single-family homes on the 13 acre site. Construction has not yet begun.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would prohibit granting new building permits and would revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site (Assessor’s Block 3180, Lot 1) between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit granting any new building permits and you want to revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to allow building permits to be granted for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “E” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for a three-year ban on development of the Balboa Reservoir site had qualified for the June ballot.

Sidney Kass and Jesse David Wall, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 12,430 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 10,012 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 77
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Having been responsible for providing leadership at City College from 1947 to 1977, we cannot stand by and see this site converted to housing. We must speak out. Such a move would preclude forever the logical and much needed campus expansion to what was once our West Campus. We left that site reluctantly to make way for water storage. If it is no longer required for that purpose, let us return it to City College.

Thousands of San Franciscans—high school graduates, dropouts, veterans, re-entering women—representing all of the city’s diverse ethnic groups, have been prepared for transfer to four-year colleges, profitable careers, and have had their lives enriched at the City College of San Francisco. Without City College’s open door and easy access, many would have been deprived of these opportunities.

Its 56 acre campus originally housed 3,000 students. Now it serves over 23,000. This campus, compared to other community colleges, can be best described as cramped, inadequate, and second rate. The condition of the campus is to be contrasted with the excellence of its programs—which are recognized as among the best in the nation.

Lou Batmale
Chancellor 1970-1977
Louis G. Conlan
President 1947-1970

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION ‘E’

We question:
1. Why no EIR was required when the proposed development could have a substantial impact.
2. Whether the future needs of City College for classrooms, housing, and parking have been considered.
3. What the impact on taxpayers is with below market land sale and construction financing by bonds.
   This moratorium will permit adequate study of these issues.
   Vote YES on Proposition ‘E’.

Bruce Bonacker, President
Board of Directors, Glen Park Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don’t let a developer make a mint on land across from the most overcrowded college in the Bay Area! Parking is already an impossibility for residents near City College...adding 200 homes to this land would make the situation much worse.

It’s simple: a college which can’t find room for more students at a time when more people are returning to education doesn’t serve the community.

This land is being sold at much less than its true value. The development wouldn’t do much to ease the City’s housing crunch, but it would undercut the future of City College and the peace of mind of the neighborhood.

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

You’d probably be upset. We certainly are. Please help us protect our neighborhood. Please vote YES on proposition E.

Westwood Park Residents:
Edna Toster
Minnie Dorwin
Eugene Eden
Donna Nicoletti
Robert Armstrong
Pauline Armstrong
Joel Martinez
Richard & Lisa Patterson
David Bean
H. Bozzone
William Burke
Richard Robel
Clyde Theriaut
Danae Manus
Esma Manus

Sunnyside Residents:
Ellen Wall
Melissa Wemmert
David Wall

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let the greedy developers take this potentially picturesque open space.
A yes vote means you want more time to consider its future use. All we ask is time to think and plan.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Suppose there was a publicly owned open space across the street from the main U.C. Berkeley Campus.
Can you imagine for one moment that it would be passed into private ownership?
Vote Yes on E for Equality and Excellence in Education

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

In 1952, the “Experts” said we needed reservoirs. They felt so strongly that they condemned the City College West Campus, destroyed the buildings, and constructed the reservoirs—all at taxpayer’s expense.
Now, in 1986 with more demand for water, the “Experts” say the reservoir is no longer needed. What is the concerned taxpayer to believe?
When in doubt, the city should hold on to the expensive things already paid for.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This is a Planning issue
We have been accused of trying to stop housing for poor people. Not true. In the first place, the price levels are certainly middle income and above, but our main objection is that this badly done plan is damaging to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as to the over-crowded community college across the street.

WHAT WE WANT
Even our critics point out that we originally SUGGESTED housing for that site, but they don’t talk about what else we suggested. We want two levels of parking under a City College Li-

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council, representing 17 neighborhood associations in the area of the surplus reservoir property in question has voted to endorse the three-year stop of private construction on the old West Campus of City College.
Dr. Louis Bateale, Chancellor of City College from 1970-1977, has persuaded us that City College needs the lands.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Stop the reservoir giveaway, Vote YES on E.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College Students:
William Lew, Student
Tim McGuire, Student Council Member
Joseph Goldstein, Student Council Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Taxpayers for Preserving the Reservoir.
Richard Patterson
Darice Murphy
Lucille Carson
Daniel Gutierrez
Franz Witte
Bernhard Scholand
Ruth Hanson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Helen Crizer, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Juanita Raven, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Be a sport.

Give City College a vote of support.

City has 23,000 students and badly needs a library. The only place to put it is in the reservoir site. City College has walked closely with San Francisco for five decades. The reservoir site has always been understood to be reserved for City College.

Until now when someone wants it for housing. Housing is important, but it can be anywhere in town. But a City College library can only be located at the College.

Vote yes to support a book—and a reader.

Reading, studying, writing and research make up our town also.

It is hard to understand criticism of City for wanting to keep this area for a library. Sure, housing sites are at a premium—but even more so a library site for City which is one of the largest schools in the Nation.

Some people blast City for wanting a library because of the need for housing. Housing is needed. But some of those very same people want a big battleship stationed here that will bring in 15,000 new family members.

The Educational and cultural growth of San Francisco mandates living space for the City College library.

If this measure gets a no vote, it means there will be no site for a Library. This is the last chance. Vote YES to help out a book—and a reader.

State financing, when approved, will construct this building.

It is the top building priority at City College.

A YES vote here means there will be time to think about the use of the site. During that three year period, cooler heads may realize this is the only site for a Library. If the housing goes in there will be no library there.

Vote yes for a book, for a good school and a better City.

John Riordan, Board of Governors
San Francisco Community College District.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Sunnyside Neighborhood Association is not against housing, but we are trying to stop a hasty and short-sighted plan. We are asking for this moratorium to get time for a better plan that will answer a variety of needs and benefit the entire city as well as our community.

This is a planning issue.

The release of the reservoir property as surplus by the water department came as a surprise to our neighborhood. The June 1984 "Residence Element" of the city's Master Plan did not even list the land as surplus. By 1985 major decisions were being made for use of the land without adequate neighborhood input.

There were some meetings attended by a few people carefully selected for their zealous pro-housing views or potential financial gain. The resulting plan has gone out of control. Now it benefits only the developer and the lucky few who will get houses on free land.

Proposition E is not an attack on housing.

Please help us save our neighborhood against poor planning by voting YES on Proposition E.

Joe Mahoney, President
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Miraloma Improvement Club urges a YES vote on Proposition E.

Frank Mastro, President
Arnell Rodrigues

Maggie Kroll
Dorothy Evers

B. Sullivan
Dale Jones
Homer Bradford
Kathryn A. Small
Harry Small

Mr. & Mrs. Henry Taylor
Betty Weo Suen
Susan Faschielli
Dale Brown

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION E

All the talk in the world can't change the fact that City College has fewer acres of land relative to its student population than any college in the Bay Area.

Enrollment at City College is INCREASING, as is the enrollment of the San Francisco public schools from which City College draws most of its students. It is obvious that City College needs and deserves the reservoir land. The three year moratorium will give time to produce a better plan which will have in- put by faculty, students and alumni who know the college's needs and want to support it.

Sid Kass
Susie Langdon Kass
Phil Kass
City College Student

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOnETION E

The homeowners of Westwood Park, a neighborhood adjacent to the Balboa Reservoir, support the ballot initiative calling for a 3 year development moratorium. We believe that the City and City College should take additional time to determine their needs and how they might be met by using the Reservoir. In the event that City College does not need this property, we support its development as open space, or as single family detached housing.

Westwood Park Association
Don C. Swander
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Let's not aggregate the traffic problem around City College before we first develop solutions for the existing problems.
A three-year moratorium only buys our neighborhood and elected officials time to find solutions; it doesn't say no to housing. A YES vote is a vote for prudent development. A YES vote helps to preserve the family character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ken Hoegger
Realtor and community Activist

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As representatives of the students of City College, we understand first-hand, the intense need to reserve a site for future school expansion.
Preservation of the Balboa Reservoir, a site directly adjacent to the campus, is particularly crucial. The facilities that CCSF requires, such as a library and an auditorium, are essential to the main structure of the campus. Unlike classrooms, it would be unreasonable to build an auditorium or a library on an off-campus site, since these facilities are integral to the main function of the school.

ASSOCIATED Student Council of City College
Jack Lee, Vice President of Associated Counsel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Local 2121 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, representing City College faculty, urges a yes vote on Proposition E.
While this project provides short-term employment for a few, we are more concerned about the thousands of students who would benefit from planning and development that would better serve the community and the college.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is twice as crowded as any community college in northern California. It needs a much larger library, bookstore and auditorium, and more parking.
The college has always expected to use the empty SOUTH reservoir for educational needs. That land is finally surplus. Neither the college Governing Board nor the Chancellor attended the Mayor's planning sessions for the property and the faculty was not informed. When the 12.3 acre site was offered to a developer for $36,900 for subsidized housing, the Chancellor said, "We are at a crossroad and the correct path is for the Board of Supervisors, with the Mayor’s support, to deed this surplus land to City College so that the college may continue to serve the city effectively for the next 50 years as it has for the past half century." The Mayor refused. Now only Board member John Riordan supports the correct path.
The Water Department says it may need the NORTH reservoir now used for student parking. If that crisis occurs, the Chancellor says, "We'll deal with the situation then." How, if the south reservoir is gone?
(continued)
When land is available other community colleges finance large projects through alliances with civic, athletic and cultural organizations, and through property sales. New methods for public funding are being developed.

The faculty would like three years of careful study to unravel misunderstandings and poor management, and to find the best way to be a good neighbor.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College needs land now for desperately needed facilities, one of which is a library. City College has an enrollment of 23,000 students but our library has seating for 450. There are other possible locations for new housing, but City College can't be moved. Give us an opportunity to plan a development for the community and the college.

Annie M. Young
City College Library Faculty and Staff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty and staff members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Water Department has begun a resource study of water use, due for completion in two or three years. The study may well indicate that one or both reservoirs will be needed. The American Water Works Association states that reservoirs should be used in pairs. This is particularly important because it is the only reservoir at an elevation of 305 feet.

The Mayor twisted the arm of the Water Department to declare one of these reservoirs surplus before the water resource study is completed. Don't let her get away with this kind of political manipulation.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Kurt Common
Ken Crizer
Ed Dierlauf
Herb Naylor
CCSF Engineering Professors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The South Balboa Basin has been unused since college leased buildings, including a large auditorium, were torn down on that site thirty years ago. We hope that three years of thorough planning would explore the possibility of returning a part of that property to the college for the development of a multi-purpose medium-sized auditorium which could be shared with community groups.

Joseph Alessi
Mary Argenti
Neyde Azvedo
John Bischoff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition E. This moratorium is necessary because there are too many worthy uses for this land to make a hasty and potentially very costly decision. Only through careful planning can the limited land available for development be best used.

Nicolas Alexander
Paul Hewitt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, as Physical Education Instructors, have always been committed to a diversified program for our students and community. The reservoir space is a natural land resource for a Multi Educational and Cultural Center.

Your YES vote on E will allow us the freedom to explore ways that this property could most constructively benefit all.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, full-time faculty of the Computer and Information Science Department of City College, urge a YES vote to postpone the decision until additional planning and surveys can be conducted. The current proposal would negatively impact the College's enrollment.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Robert Botzina
Mack Crooks
Bob Davis
Helen Dilibor
Pharr Enciso
Richard Exnerman
Richard Farmer
Lawrence Ferrara
Tod Fleming
Peggy Gorham
William Grothkopf
David Hardiman

Jerome Hosken
Robert Kaar
James Kurck
Dack Lee
Clayton Liu
William Maynez
Annette Rapillyea
Oleg Reusit
David Wall
City College Physics Department

Gail Baran
Curtis Decker
Brendan Duggan
Tomaaki Hagiwara
Johann Hahn
Daniel Hayes

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Lene Johnson
Grover Klemmer
Paula McCullum
Art Octavia
Louise Scourkess

William Beaver
Ronald Cerruti, Chairman
Kirk Gibson
Howard Granger
Frank Holden
Michael Kelly

George Lamy
Norbert Ludkey
Charles Metzler
Charles Miller
Marilyn Schnake
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

A YES vote on Proposition E helps STOP a scheme to GIVE AWAY $12,300,000 worth of City land for $1,800,000 (or less) to a Redwood City real estate developer.

A YES vote will SAVE taxpayers $550,000 per year. The housing project will produce $240,000 in taxes, but supplying City services will cost $790,000 per year.

The Controller's cost estimate does NOT account for the $12,300,000 land value, since land sale below value is NOT technically a cost of government. The Controller also is NOT permitted to assume that the housing project will be constructed, since construction has NOT yet been ordered by the Board of Supervisors.

The plan does NOT restrict housing sales to moderate-income first-time buyers. The plan only restricts use of tax-subsidized funds. Any person favored by the developer or politicians can buy these dwellings and get the benefits of the public land giveaway.

The houses are made "affordable" by giving away the land far below market value, by City-backed low interest, and by cutting construction corners.

The real beneficiaries of the subsidized housing project are the financiers (NOT the project dwellers). Bondholders receive 9.6% average tax-free interest, which is equivalent to 24.6% taxable interest at 61% maximum tax. The developer and bond establishment receive $5,340,000; this is $26,300 (or 22.40%) for each $117,400 unit.

The City loses $51,700 worth of land GIVEN AWAY for each unit.

Vote YES on Proposition E for good fiscal management.

William Marquardt
Financial Analyst, SNAP
Helen Crizer, Treasurer, SNAP

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of College</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Campus (acres)</th>
<th>Area/1000 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City College of SF</td>
<td>22,624</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laney College, Oakland</td>
<td>9,805</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot College, Hayward</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa College</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of San Mateo</td>
<td>13,820</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>11.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Marin</td>
<td>6,663</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given these facts, why does the Governing Board not try to get the old West Campus back? Why don't they support this moratorium to delay the land grab?

The Governing Board is under political pressure from City Hall. They have been threatened with the loss of the north reservoir parking lot and funding for special projects. Forgive them.

Vote Yes on E.

Friends of City College
David Newton
Glen Simpson
Jack Baker
Thomas Velasquez
Tillie McCullough

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The student population at City College is increasing. This semester's enrollment is up 1,265 students over last semester.

The enrollment in the San Francisco public schools has been increasing by 1,218 per year for the last three years. City College draws most of its enrollment from public schools in San Francisco.

Obviously, City College will have a larger enrollment in the future years, and will be in desperate need of space if we do not give it back its old West Campus.

Please reserve this public land for the college.

Please vote YES on E.

Barbara Holman

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON E

In 1981, I launched a six-point program to expand San Francisco's housing supply and the voters had approved a City policy to add 20,000 new housing units within five years. This Proposition would destroy a major portion of the effort to build affordable, single-family housing in our city.

The Balboa Reservoir Site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now a site for development of 203 new single-family homes, most with three bedrooms and two baths. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed as other homes built under the City's program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom could not afford homeownership. It is believed that these new homes will sell rapidly.

The Balboa Reservoir site is one of the few sites large enough to accommodate a substantial number of new homes. Please do not let a few people stop a major opportunity for new housing. Vote no on Prop E.

Not only would Proposition E halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site, but the 9.8% fixed-rate, 30-year mortgage money set aside for the housing would also be lost.

Nothing constructive is accomplished by this measure—it does not provide additional land or facilities for City College. As a matter of fact, City College has neither plans nor money to use the property. Further, the Community College Board of Directors, the governing body for City College, has voted overwhelmingly to oppose the initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No on E.”

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the site of the unused Balboa Reservoir and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost.

These homes are desperately needed for San Franciscans who can't afford to buy in the city where the average house is selling for over $160,000. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a playground for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

The homes would be built on land that belongs to the City. Over two years ago, it was declared surplus and available for housing. It is not part of City College, and City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

We urge you to vote no on Proposition E if you want more affordable housing for San Franciscans.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

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

The 203 affordable owner occupied single family units slated for the southern portion of Balboa Reservoir are part of the 1988 total. Our progress in addressing the City's housing shortage will be curtailed if this ill-advised initiative is approved. SUPPORT OWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Housing production is essential to check rising prices and to maintain our social, economic, and ethnic population diversity. AS A SAN FRANCISCO VOTER, YOU CAN BE PART OF OUR HOUSING PROGRESS BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

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

WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT THE CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY HOUSING BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

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

Doris M. Ward, Member
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

A critical issue facing San Francisco today is the lack of housing middle class San Franciscans can afford.

That is why I have joined these neighborhood associations to support the Balboa Reservoir neighborhood housing proposal. Those participating in the development of the proposal includes:

O.M.I. Community Association
Dorado Terrace Association
Outer Mission-Ingleside
Political Action Committee
Greater Ingelside Community
Mount Davidson Manor
Ocean Avenue Merchants Association
Ingleside Terrace Association
The San Francisco Open Space Committee
City College of San Francisco

From early in 1985 I worked closely with these neighborhood groups in the discussions between city government and community leaders concerning the development plans for this desperately needed new housing at the unused Balboa reservoir site.

THESE ARE THE REASONS YOU SHOULD VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

1. The neighborhood housing proposal that this initiative seeks to stop is the result of months of hard work by the largest coalition of neighborhood associations ever to join together to plan a housing development in San Francisco.

2. The housing at the Balboa Reservoir site was designed with the involvement of the coalition of neighborhood associations to enhance the surrounding community.

3. The governing Board of the Community College District has made clear that they have no plans for the site and no ownership rights to it. City College does not oppose the construction of this development and opposes this initiative.

4. Self-proclaimed “Friends” of City College want to stop the proposal in order to preserve the site for future faculty parking. A clique of City College staffers involved in a neighborhood association pose as community opposition to this development even though a representative from this organization, the Sunny-side Neighborhood Association, had helped plan and support the proposal.

5. By masquerading as concerned neighbors these self-appointed “friends” of City College hope to prevent the construction of 204 critically needed units of housing and pull off one of the biggest land grabs in San Francisco’s history.

DON'T BE.fooLED. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Residence Element of the Comprehensive Plan of the City and County of San Francisco assesses the City’s housing needs and lays out specific steps to meet those needs. This document was adopted by the City Planning Commission in 1984 after extensive public review at neighborhood meetings and public hearings, and consideration of the detailed Environmental Impact Report.

The first objective of the Housing Element is “to provide new Housing for all income groups” in locations appropriate for residential development. To meet this goal, development of housing is to be aggressively pursued and encouraged on surplus, underused and vacant public land.

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

If you want more affordable housing in San Francisco vote no on Proposition E.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Susan J. Biernan, City Planning Commissioner
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on E.
Proposition E deprives San Franciscans of one of their last real chances to become homeowners at an affordable price. At the South Balboa Reservoir we have City-owned land on which 203 units of three-bedroom, two-bath homes can be built at low prices which average San Franciscans can afford to pay. These homes need to be built now, not in three years. In three years the low interest rates on mortgages and the bond financing will be gone. Two hundred families will have lost the opportunity to become homeowners, and the City will have lost the opportunity to ease the tight market in rental housing.

Nor does this ill-conceived initiative help City College in any way. City College does not need this land. Speculation that the College may at some future date find a use for the land is not founded on fact. The College may never be able to build on the reservoir. Their enrollment has dropped by over 4000 students in the last few years.

This initiative is designed to confuse you. It will make our housing shortage worse for three long years. If you support affordable housing in our City, Vote NO on Proposition E.

Bill Maher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Balboa Reservoir site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now planned for development of 203 new single family homes. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed—other homes built under this program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom would not otherwise be able to afford home ownership.

San Francisco has the most expensive housing in the nation where last year the average home sold for over $160,000. Housing is difficult to produce because the obstacles are great—little land on which to build, high construction costs and uncertain interest rates.

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost. The initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional land or facilities for City College. The Community College Board, the governing body of City College, in fact recently voted to oppose this initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No” on Proposition E.

John L. Molinari

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

In 1980, the voters of the City and County of San Francisco approved a measure making it City policy to add 20,000 new units of housing within five years. In 1984 in an effort to satisfy this objective, the Board of Supervisors adopted a policy encouraging the expansion of the City’s housing supply. Making surplus City-owned land, such as the site at Balboa Reservoir, available for affordable housing was an important part of that policy. A proposal to build 203 homes on the unused Balboa Reservoir site was advanced to help implement the pro-housing policy.

Approval of Proposition E would HALT construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.

The Balboa Reservoir homes would be built on land currently belonging to the City and County of San Francisco. The property IS NOT part of the City College, and City College has neither plans or money to buy the property and convert it for City College use.

The only debatable issue is the future of affordable housing on the Balboa Reservoir site.

As we are all aware, San Francisco has the most expensive homes in the United States. The average cost of a home is $152,000. Not many can afford such prices. However, the housing proposed for the Balboa Reservoir will give many more citizens the opportunity to become homeowners. The homes to be built will be sold to first-time buyers at prices ranging from $83,000 to $145,000.

Other homes built in San Francisco under the direction of similar affordable housing programs have been snapped up quickly by San Franciscans. Without the program, most would not have been able to purchase the home and become homeowners.

Again, if you desire to preserve the construction of more affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site, vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Willie B. Kennedy
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Additional single family housing is undeniably San Francisco's most acute social need.
When some vacant surplus City land (12 acres) finally becomes available for 203 additional new private homes there will always be some selfish individuals who are in favor of new housing "just so long as it is not built across the street from me!"
This unused, vacant City reservoir land hasn't generated a dime of taxes for over thirty years! Let's add 203 NEW tax paying owner taxpayers to the City's rolls as quickly as possible.
Stop these self-serving no-growth obstructionists! Please vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Prop E would halt affordable housing construction at the Balboa Reservoir site. Many gay people need affordable housing, too, and we join with other community groups urging you to vote NO on Prop E.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Robert Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E, if approved, would block the construction of 203 badly needed single-family homes on the south portion of the Balboa Reservoir in San Francisco. Sixty percent of these homes would be available for purchase by moderate and middle income families at purchase prices between $80,000 and $120,000. They would be constructed on surplus public land and financed by the sale of mortgage revenue bonds to enable the developer to sell the homes at below market prices.
A neighborhood group headed by two city college faculty members is responsible for placing Proposition E on the ballot. The group contends that the land which is intended to be used for the project should be made available instead to City College for the construction of new teaching facilities even though enrollment at City College is declining and the City College Board has voted 6 to 1 to oppose the initiative.

Like many other areas of the country, San Francisco suffers from a shortage of housing. Purchase prices here are among the highest in the nation. The use of surplus public lands and mortgage revenue bond financing provide a means for making single family homes available to a broad spectrum of families at affordable prices.
The Balboa Reservoir project is supported by the leaders of neighborhood groups in the area surrounding the location of the proposed project and by a majority of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, as well as by Mayor Dianne Feinstein. We urge you to encourage the construction of this much needed housing in San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition E.

San Francisco Board of Realtors
William L. Jansen, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

SAVE OUR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS!
BERNAL HEIGHTS SAYS, "VOTE NO ON PROP E!!!"
We are residents of Bernal Heights in San Francisco. We've worked hard to build affordable family and senior citizen homes in our neighborhood.
We need more affordable housing in our City to survive. The real issue in Prop E is affordable family housing—a "yes" vote prevents the construction of 203 family homes. That's crazy!
Join us in preserving what's best in our City.
Vote "no" on Prop E!

Sylvia M. Yee, Bernal Heights Community Foundation Board of Directors
Frank Hutchins, BHCF Board*
Mary Lou Bertoletti, BHCF Board*
Lela Havener, BHCF Board*
Elizabeth Egger, BHCF Board*
Sister Janet Simons, BHCF Board*
Stephen Antonaras, BHCF Board*
Lorenzo R. Dill, BHCF Board*
Barbara Bagot, BHCF Board*
Margaret C. Randolph, Northwest Bernal Block Club*
Maureen Lamb, NWBBC*
Tim Molinaro, BHCF Planning & Dev't Committee*
Buck Bagot, BHCF P & D Committee*
***Organization for identification purposes only.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco Needs Affordable Housing—
Vote No on Proposition E

Everyone agrees that San Francisco needs affordable housing. The questions are how and where that affordable housing can be built.

The Balboa Reservoir housing development, to be built on the site of a reservoir built thirty years ago and unused since that time, answers those important questions for more than 200 San Francisco first-time homebuying families by providing:

- 203 new affordable three-bedroom, single family homes
- 9.8% fixed-rate financing
- A mix of 30% low-income, 30% moderate-income and 40% market-rate first time buyers
- A convenient site that has been declared “surplus” by the City and “available for development of affordable housing”

The Balboa Reservoir housing development is a small but significant step in the effort to generate affordable housing in our City.

Thousands of San Franciscans from every community, neighborhood group and viewpoint agree that the Balboa Reservoir development is good for San Francisco. Virtually every elected official, including the Governing Board of City College also agree.

All these San Franciscans ask you to say “yes” to affordable housing and “NO” to Proposition E.

San Francisco Coalition for Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar, Executive Director

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The viable plan for affordable single family housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site is being threatened by Proposition E. If Proposition E passes, 203 single family homes will be lost to the citizenry of San Francisco at a time when they are greatly needed.

The facts about the proposed housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site argue strongly against Proposition E. All 203 homes will be for first time home buyers. One-third of the homes will be available to households earning $27,000. Another third of the homes will be available to households earning $36,000. Adequate parking will be provided within the development itself, thus answering any concerns that traffic in the area will be congested.

City College has no need or plan to use South Balboa Reservoir for its facilities. City College’s priority is to develop its existing campus. South Balboa Reservoir should therefore be used for one of the City’s greatest needs: increased and affordable housing which is available to lower and middle income families.

As homeowners who live in the vicinity of South Balboa Reservoir, we welcome its planned use for single family housing and feel it will become an integral and contributing part of the community. We therefore urge you to vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Submitted by:
Stephen Graham, Chairman of the Housing Sub-committee of the Citizen’s Committee for Community Development
Roderick A. McLeod, Vice-Chairman of the Citizen’s Committee on Community Development

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing is a group of neighbors which consists of many of the renters of Westwood Park and Sunnyside neighborhoods as well as owners and renters of Ingleside which are the closest neighbors to the Balboa Reservoir along with some of the students and teachers of City College.

We strongly support the Balboa Reservoir for housing. We believe that the Balboa Reservoir is an ideal spot for housing.

Our neighborhood wants homes in the South Balboa Reservoir.
Vote No On Prop. E.

Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughey
Submitted by Patricia Vaughey

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

As Merchants as well as residents of Ocean Avenue, Greater Ingleside and San Francisco, we support the Development of the Balboa Reservoir as housing.

A Traffic Survey has stated that there will be minimal impact on the existing patterns of traffic by this development.

Additional City College Parking is being considered on another location off I-280 to keep the college congestion away from the neighborhood’s streets.

City College has 44 more acres in which to expand and existing buildings at City College have viable means to expand.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
We believe that housing on the Balboa Reservoir is the most viable solution to develop a vacant piece of property that is directly adjacent to our stores on a Transpreferential Street. Affordable housing is in great need in San Francisco and is as much needed here as anywhere. We want to help provide this need. Vote No on Prop. E.

Ocean Avenue Merchants Assoc.
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughney
Submitted by Patricia Vaughney

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction on much-needed affordable, single-family housing at the long vacant south Balboa Reservoir site. This proposition would also block a major housing development that would bring jobs into an area of the city that has little industry or private business.

Sale prices for these units are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the San Francisco housing market, where the average home is selling for $160,000. Construction of these homes will help all young, first-time home buyers and will require only 5% down, instead of the 20% down payment on houses bought with conventional home mortgages.

This plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by nine nearby neighborhood organizations. If Proposition E is approved and this project is blocked, more young adults will purchase their first home in Vallejo or some other outlying area, further draining San Francisco of the young families that every growing community needs.

San Francisco residents will gain apprenticeships, jobs, contracts and subcontracts from this development.

This plan calls for 2 and 3 bedroom, family-sized houses, with space for another bedroom which can be finished when needed.

Each house will have 2½ parking spaces in front and would not cause parking problems in the area. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

City College of San Francisco has no plans to buy the property, has no money for institutional expansion, nor any mention of this land in any master plan. Some supporters of this proposition are motivated by racist notions and have said they fear that this development will become another "Geneva Towers." This type of thinking is similar to support for apartheid practiced in South Africa and must be defeated by progressive San Francisco voters. Property values will increase, instead of a decrease as a result of this project.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition E.

Larry Uhli Johnson-Redd—President, O.M.I. Pilgrim Community Center Inc.
Maria Campbell-Casey—Program Director, Bay Area Engineering Societies Committee for Manpower Training, Inc.
Clara Mills-Bradford—Program Director, O.M.I. Senior Center
John C. Jackson
Linda Rose-Olsson
Jon Stille—Secretary, Young Adult Committee
Kenneth Butler

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote "No" on Proposition E.

Afordable Housing Alliance—Mitchell Omerberg, Director
Bay Area Urban League—Gregory Best, Field Representative
Bernal Heights Community Foundation—Andre Lennell Day
Community Educational Services—Dorothy Chen, Executive Director
Japanese Community Youth Council St. Francis Square Apartments, Inc.—
Sandra Mayor-Jenkins, Secretary
Minority Contractors Association of Northern California—James Huangbook, Secretary, Board of Directors
National Community Congress—Dr. Eddie C. Welch
Parkmerced Residents Organization, Inc.—Ricardo A. Callejo, Esq.
Potrero Hill Neighborhood House—Enola Maxwell
San Francisco Building Trades Council—Stan Smith
San Francisco Housing & Tenants Council—Joseph Lacey
San Francisco Tenants Union—Jim Faye
Rev. Amos C. Brown—Local Pastor & Community Servant
Greg Day—Chairman, Citizens Committee on Community Development
Polly V. Marshall—Commissioner, San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
Regina A. Sneed
Jim Wachob—San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Michael E. Willis, AIA—Fleming Corporation

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

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Greater Ingleside Political Club — Frank Nono, Treasurer
Housing Conservation and Development Corporation — Lonnie Lawson, Board of Directors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Bayview Baptist Minister Fellowship — Rev. N. B. Mills, President
Bread of Life Missionary Baptist Church — Rev. S. A. Bailey
Cosmopolitan Baptist Church — Rev. A. Ray Genile
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Raymond M. Howard Sr.
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Carole Nelson
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Cornelius O’Reilly
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Paul G. Theiss
Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee — Charles Gates, Chairman
St. Peters Housing Committee — Tessa Rouxerd

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON’T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

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

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: With certain exceptions, City officers, including elected officials and commission members, may represent clients before City boards and commissions other than their own, and be paid for their services. State legislators may represent clients before City boards and commissions, and be paid for their services. Any person may contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would prohibit City officers from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay. This proposition would prohibit State legislators from appearing before City boards, commissions and departments on behalf of clients for pay. City officers would be prohibited from discussing with these officers and legislators matters that the City is deciding. Proposition F would also prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit City officers and State legislators from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to allow City officers and State legislators to represent clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to allow any person to contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

Controller's Statement on "F"

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

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

How "F" Got on Ballot

On February 26 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for limitations on compensated advocacy and campaign contributions had qualified for the June ballot.

Quentin Kopp, Marth Gillham and Cheryl Arenson, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 9,400 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,986 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The purpose of Proposition F is to cut campaign contributions by large contributors (and thus reduce campaign spending) and eliminate undue influence by officeholders retained as paid lobbyists for projects requiring City approval.

Let’s take a minute to analyze the untrue arguments against Proposition F:

- The opponents claim that Proposition F will force half the City’s Commissioners to resign. In fact, Proposition F does not force any Commissioners to resign. It simply says they can’t be a paid lobbyist and a City Commissioner at the same time. Does a commissioner value making money by lobbying more than public service?
- Some have also alleged that Proposition F will prevent duly-elected union leaders from serving as City Commissioners. No it won’t. Proposition F prohibits “compensated advocacy”—that means lobbyists hired by an organization, not members of the organization itself. Proposition F does not apply to salaried employees of labor unions, corporations, or non-profit agencies. Moreover, Section 8.105 of the Charter precludes it specifically from applying to any member serving as a representative of any profession, trade, business, union or association on any board or commission which requires membership of representatives of specific professions, trades, businesses, unions or associations.
- Another untrue argument against Proposition F is that it prohibits City officials only from discussing pending issues with other City officers or State Legislators who are also acting as paid lobbyists in a matter and doesn’t stop those officeholding lobbyists from writing City officials about their clients’ objectives. That’s not so. Proposition F applies to all such lobbying, written or oral. (The dictionary defines “discuss” as “to examine by means of speech or writing.”)

End government decision-making by “insiders” and reduce the influence of money on local campaigns.

VOTE YES ON F.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
San Franciscans for Good Government

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

In all our years of observing San Francisco City government, we have found one maxim to be true time after time: a good idea gets copied, especially among politicians.

For no sooner did Quentin Kopp promise to bring Proposition F to the voters than did Mayor Feinstein come up with an informal, administrative version of her own. Fine, you say (and the Mayor says), then why vote Yes on Proposition F?

(1) The Mayor’s remedy of asking City Commissioners who also act as lobbyists before City agencies to resign is nothing more than a hand slap, and is good only as long as she is mayor. It’s not binding on future mayors and could be changed without any vote of the Board of Supervisors, let alone the people of San Francisco. Proposition F prohibits this kind of conflict-ofinterest, and it will be the law, no matter who is mayor.

(2) The Mayor’s action did nothing to state legislators who can also act as lobbyists before City Boards and Commissions, nor did her action stop the law or business partners of City Commissioners from picking up the slack in big-money lobbying. Proposition F will stop these practices in their tracks.

(3) What about the other half of Proposition F, which reduced the campaign contribution limit to $500 so that all San Franciscans can enjoy equal access to City officials, not just the ones with the big bucks? The Mayor can’t do anything about this, and she hasn’t. Only a Yes vote on Proposition F will reduce the weight of big money and ensure our full voice in City elections and City government.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. If it’s important enough for the Mayor to copy part of it administratively, it’s important enough to do the job right and make it a law.

John J. Barbagelata
Harry Aleo
Jane Calhoun
Dorothy Partridge

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The worst and most persistent problem in American politics is that politicians and political races can be “bought”. Reducing the size of campaign contributions will be a step forward in reducing the role of money in elections. Vote yes for more honest government.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

RESTORE to the people their rightful and equal power as individual voters by reducing the monetary clout and influence of private interests who make the laws and the policies as City officials and Commissioners or State legislators.

TELL the special interests that their money and influence can no longer interfere with representative government.

TELL the special interests that the voters will no longer tolerate the influence-buying which comes with large campaign contributions.

TELL the special interests that this measure will encourage highly talented citizens to serve San Francisco honestly and responsibly.

VOTE YES ON F.

Cheryl Arenson
Anne Renfrew
David Pacheco

Tom Hayes
Dorothy Vaksich

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

"Government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

These noble words from Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, cast in bronze at the entrance to City Hall, seem to have escaped the attention of some City officials who pass by them every day. For in San Francisco City government, Lincoln's simple formula for representative government would read quite differently: "Government of the powerful, by the lobbyists, and for the wealthy."

Government of, by, and for the privileged few is bad government. Government of, by, and for all the people is good government. It's as simple as that—as simple as Lincoln first put it.

Proposition F, the Good Government Initiative, will help San Franciscans maintain control of their government and will prevent undue influence by City officeholders.

To reduce undue influence, Proposition F outlaws the practice of City Commissioners and State Legislators representing special interests for pay before City Commissions and Boards. City Commissions should render their decisions deliberately and impartially, not be swayed by the political clout of the lobbyists appearing before them, or by any political favors those lobbyist/politicians might promise. "I'll scratch your back if you scratch my back" bargains do not belong in government. And until such backroom bargains are made illegal, City government will not belong to the rest of us either.

Proposition F also reduces the maximum amount that anyone can give to a local candidate from $1,000 to $500. If large contributors and other special interests can't give as much money, they can't buy as much influence with elected officials. And the lower the contribution limit, the less campaign spending and the more City government will be responsive to all San Franciscans.

You can "buy back" City government from the privileged and powerful with the most precious of all political commodities: your vote.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Mary Lohneis
Peter Fatooh
Judith Thorson

Babette Dreffe
Daniel Jordan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F, an initiative of the people, is needed to protect the voters and the integrity of the legislative process from being corrupted by the power of money and influence. It prevents City officials and State Legislators from lobbying the City on behalf of high-powered special interests. It also lowers the campaign contribution limit from $1,000 to $500, thus reducing the influence of those same special interests over our elections and elected officials.

The bogus argument that the Mayor won't be able to find qualified people to serve on City commissions if Proposition F is adopted ignores the plain fact that there are 700,000 people in San Francisco, a pool of civic-minded citizens more than large enough to accommodate the 250 commission appointments available in our City government. For example, there are plenty

of architects to fill the one architectural appointment on the Art Commission, just as there are plenty of non-lobbyist business people and lawyers available to serve on other commissions.

Thousands of San Franciscans, not just the "insiders", are ready, willing, and able to serve the public.

Proposition F deserves your vote. Restore integrity to City government. Restore the confidence of the citizens of San Francisco in that government. Let's have no more Wilkes Bashford situations.

VOTE YES ON F.

Oscar Sutro
Martha Gillham
Marguerite Warren

Leonel Monterey
Tony Kilroy

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE "NO" ON F

This proposition disguises itself as "good government" but, in reality, would drive good people out of government. It is so crudely drawn — so sweeping in its implications — that it would bar from government almost anyone with even a remote business or community tie to government.

It would purge from City commissions anyone who "directly or indirectly" receives compensation from any "interests" with an issue before any City agency. Effectively, this could discriminate against employees from community and neighborhood groups, civil rights organizations, non-profit corporations, labor unions, merchant and business groups, as well as architects, lawyers and other professionals.

Actually, there currently are no commissioners who represent any clients before any City agency. All who are appointed in my administration sign a statement saying they will not advocate for any paying client before any official body of the City while they are commissioners. This proposition simply is not necessary.

Proposition F also would lower the limit for any individual campaign contribution from $1,000 to $500. Although this sounds good, it would permit a wealthy person with various businesses and numerous family members to contribute many thousands of dollars through different sources. This would encourage "hidden" contributions. We must strive for disclosure of contributions, not a system which drives contributions underground. Candidates must be able to raise funds enough to put their message before the voters. Reducing the contribution limit can be a tactic to discourage persons from challenging incumbents.

Vote no on Proposition F.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition F purports to achieve a noble objective: The removal of "influence peddling" from City Hall. In fact, Proposition F is so poorly-crafted, it may have exactly the opposite effect on City government. It is not a "good government" initiative. It is bad legislation.

Proposition F provides no definitions and no standards for the public to judge whether City officials comply with its restrictions. Its uncertainties will be chaotic and lead to endless, needless lawsuits.

A measure similar to Proposition F was rejected by the Board of Supervisors because no public hearings were ever held on the legislation. If the public had had a chance to comment on this initiative, it might not have the critical shortcomings, deficiencies and uncertainties that now warrant its rejection by responsible San Franciscans.

In the coming months, the Board will review good government measures that are comprehensible, effective and, most important, certain. Proposition F is a misguided disaster.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

This should properly have been titled the "SINK WILLIE BROWN ORDINANCE"! The "meat of the coconutt" is in Section 4.

Supervisor Kopp's intentions are good, however this sloppily drafted and incomprehensible measure succeeds in "burning down the barn" to eliminate a couple of rats!

Under this proposal, to avoid any potential INDIRECT conflict of interest, (which is undefined!), one would have to be a destitute, unemployed welfare recipient to qualify for service on any City Board or Commission! The Mayor has already solved this "hired advocacy" problem with the "conflict of interest" affidavits she demands IN ADVANCE from any prospective appointee.

Quentin's proposed $500.00 campaign contribution limit is an "inside joke" and he, of all people, knows it! It merely obliges a heavy contributor to have his wife, children, business associates, or friends send in SEPARATE $500.00 checks if he wants to contribute more than $500.00 to a politician's campaign.

These proposals require additional City employees for enforcement and wind up doing far more harm than good. Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

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

Union members and labor officials have legitimate reasons for meeting with City officers. It is unfair and wrong to lump them in the same category as special interest lobbyists, yet that's exactly what Proposition F does. Working people deserve representation on City boards and commissions. VOTE NO!

Walter Johnson
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council
LeRoy King
James Elliot
Keith Eickman
Reva Olson

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

If you want to ban business owners and executives from serving on City boards and commissions, then vote for Proposition F.

If you think board members of non-profit corporations and employees of community agencies have nothing to contribute to City government, then vote for Proposition F.

If you believe union members and labor officials should not have a voice at City Hall, then vote for Proposition F.

But if you share our belief that these individuals have legitimate concerns and expertise that is valuable in running major City departments, then join us in voting NO on Proposition F.

Proposition F is a simplistic, sloppily-drafted, meat axe approach to a problem already resolved by Mayor Feinstein's ban on commissioners lobbying on behalf of private clients.

Proposition F is not good government and it is not reform. Proposition F is bad legislation. VOTE NO.

Hon. Douglas Engmann
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Eugene Friend
Hon. Phyllis Lyon

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

We're sympathetic to the need for political reform. But it's a complicated problem, and Proposition F just isn't the way to go.

Frankly, we can't tell who is and isn't affected by this measure. While a handful of people sometimes might abuse their positions, that's no reason to question the integrity of so many solid citizens who give tirelessly to public service. Proposition F is simply the wrong approach. Please join us in voting NO.

Hon. Amy Meyer
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Walter Jebe
Hon. Bruce Lilienthal
Hon. Doris Kalo
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Jean Karum
Hon. Thomas Horn
Hon. Henry Berman
Hon. Robert McCarthy
Hon. Richard Gageghime
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Hon. Patrick McGrew
Hon. Kirk Miller
Hon. Melvin Lee
Hon. Jerry Berg
Hon. Bonnie Gibson
Hon. Mary Noel Peps
Hon. Mark Baer
Hon. Tim Carrico
Hon. Jo Hanson
Hon. Kevin Malone
John Sanger
Tom Moore

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Concerned about elected officials spending $400,000 to run for supervisor and $1 million on a mayor's race? Then vote NO on Proposition F.

That's right. NO.

Proposition F isn't going to do anything about campaign spending. Prop F simply limits the size of contributions, reducing the current limit from $1,000 to $500. Supervisors can and will continue spending outrageous sums on their re-election campaigns. With Proposition F they'll just spend twice as much time raising money from twice as many sources, and that makes special interests even more powerful. They can always find ways around campaign limits.

We need campaign spending reform, but Proposition F doesn't provide it. Please join us in voting NO on F.

William E. McDonnell
Frances May McAteer
N. A. Sapunar
Caroline and Michael Figoni

Martin D. Murphy
Eugene C. Payne III
Suzanne B. McCarthy

District 8 Democratic Club
Stephen L. Taber
Ruth Gravitis
Alan Ratzick
Miriam Blaustein

Linda Chapman
Dale Carlson
Jones Firth
Debra Barnes
Lew Selbin
Debra Stein
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

When campaign contributions are limited, political freedom suffers. Your right to free speech includes not only your right to express your views, but also your right to support as much as you want, any candidate who speaks for you.

Minority viewpoints depend heavily on the contribution of a few dedicated supporters to get your message out. To limit your financial support of your beliefs is to silence your political voice.

Only incumbents, who have many opportunities for free media exposure benefit from this assault on free speech. The dangers of a campaign contribution limit far outweigh any possible benefit from this proposition. Defeat Proposition F!

San Francisco Libertarian Party
Michael R. Fowler, Secretary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

You may think Prop F only applies to big-time lawyers and a few legislators who represent developers. Think again!

Prop F would prohibit many community leaders from public service. If it passes, board members and employees of community and charitable organizations could be banned from serving on City boards and commissions.

We appreciate the public need for a government free of "influencing peddling." But restrictions on "compensated advocacy" ought to be clearly and carefully crafted to protect the voices of community leaders who argue on behalf of the public interest, not private special interests.

Vote No.

Hon. Juanita Del Carlo  Bob Ross
Mission Hiring Hall Publisher, Bay Area Reporter

Hon. Jeffrey Ken Mori
Japanese Community Youth Council, Inc.
Bill O'Callahan
American Red Cross
Hon. George Sunicin
Horizons Unlimited
Hon. Jean Rita Alviar
Mission Education Project
Hon. Greg Day
Pilc Street Town Hall
Hon. Naomi Gray
Hon. James Foster
Carol Wong
Mariena Marseille
Lee Woods
Jo Daly
Dennis Collins
Hon. H. Welton Flynn
(Organizations listed only for purposes of identification.)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will have no effect on developers' lawyers. None.

It won't make any difference to state legislators either.

Don't kid yourself. This is not "reform" and it isn't "good government." Proposition F will allow the special interests and influence peddlers to continue exercising influence over our elected officials. It has so many loopholes, lobbying will actively continue, untouched, in the back rooms of City Hall.

And developers will always find ways around campaign contribution limits. As Common Cause has noted, Prop F simply makes tracing their dollars more difficult for the public.

Real reform would directly attack the source of huge contributions — the developers and other special interests that employ the lobbyists to peddle their influence.

VOTE NO.

Sue Hestor  Rich Waller
Calvin Welch  Susan Klugerman
David Leeman  Rene Cazenave
Michael Mason  Margie O'Driscol

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION G
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid? YES 300 = NO 301 =

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has adopted an ordinance prohibiting the City, with certain exceptions, from purchasing goods or services from companies doing business with South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a declaration of policy that says the City must try to avoid doing business with companies that significantly profit from or help maintain the Apartheid system in South Africa. It calls on other public bodies and private groups to adopt similar policies. It directs the Board of Supervisors to identify the companies which have the greatest ties to Apartheid so that the public can also boycott those companies.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to avoid doing business with companies that help maintain Apartheid, and you want a public boycott of those companies.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

“The proposed Declaration of Policy be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.

How “G” Got on Ballot

On November 6, 1985 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for the City to boycott businesses with significant ties to South Africa had qualified for the June ballot.

Arlo Hale Smith, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,546 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on October 11.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,941 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:
It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.
(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This measure calls for a public boycott of companies that aid apartheid.

Any claim of “conflict” between Proposition G and existing anti-apartheid legislation is imaginary: It is the legislative intent of supporters of this measure that it can be construed as a directive for making existing law tougher.

Personal attacks have no legitimate place in a ballot measure campaign. As proponent of this measure, I repudiate all such tactics.

Vote NO on apartheid. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Arlo Hale Smith

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Boycotts are grassroots politics. They’ve helped the farm-workers, they’ve helped win integration, and they can help end the legal racism called “Apartheid”.

A Gallup poll found 77% of South Africa’s black majority favoring international economic boycotts to force the Apartheid regime to accept reform peacefully.

After the Boycott Initiative made the ballot, the San Francisco Supervisors unanimously passed a similar city purchasing policy. The issue that remains is whether to call on the general public to join in, boycotting companies identified by the Supervisors as the worst offenders in each industry.

The companies that would be targeted consider profits to be the “bottom line”. Economic pressure is all they understand.

The AFL-CIO, NAACP, and NOW have called a boycott of Shell Oil because of its profiteering from South Africa’s oppressive economic conditions. Proposition G supports that and would put the same pressure on other industries as well.

This proposition is supported by the elected county central committee of the Democratic Party, the Peace-and-Freedom Party and the Humanist Party, and by leading attorneys, such as Terry Francois, Terence Hallinan, Tony Serra, Lewis Hope Lee, Marc Van Der Hout, Abby Ginsberg and Terence Redmond.

If South Africa were a democracy, its majority would long ago have voted to end Apartheid. We need to vote Yes — because they can’t.

Atty. Arlo Hale Smith, Democratic Party County Central Committee
Paul Kangas, Peace and Freedom Party
Lois Salisbury, Public Advocates*
Dr. Kevin Danaher, Food First*
Jesse James, Mission Rebels
Terry Collins, Community Activist
Tony Gebert, Election Action
Robert McCall, Hotel & Restaurant Employees
Executive Board Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Attorneys speak out against Apartheid:

South African police can arrest anyone without charge. They can hold you incommunicado — no contacts with family, lawyers or press.

They regularly censor news, books, music. They have banned Christmas caroling, funerals and other peaceful gatherings. Groups which criticize the government are forbidden to hold meetings.

Blacks are subject to legal segregation; their property and employment rights are greatly restricted; often, they are simply murdered.

As attorneys, we help people who have legal rights that are being violated. But what can we do for those who have no legal rights?

Boycotts and other economic sanctions are the only way to make the Apartheid government accept reform peacefully.

In the Court of World Public Opinion, Apartheid has been convicted of crimes against humanity. By imposing a sentence of economic isolation, we can end Apartheid.

Vote Yes — take a stand for justice.

Terence Hallinan
Arlo Hale Smith
Terry Francois
Karen Anderson Ryer
Robert R. Bryan
Ann Menasche
Rachel Ginsburg
Leo Paoli
Gabriel Gesmer
Orn Prouchovnick
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is a moderate, responsible but effective proposal to bring economic pressure on the South African government to establish constitutional rights for all of its citizens.

Vote Yes.

Terence Faulkner, Republican
Mike Garza, Republican

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

All decent Americans abhor apartheid. However, boycotting U.S. investment in South Africa is counterproductive; it only penalizes the actual victims of apartheid.

U.S. international firms have acted as progressive agents for change through the Sullivan principles. Their investments have improved the social and economic condition of the labor force. It is improper to penalize their positive contributions.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

We are individuals and organizations working actively to end the racist system of apartheid in South Africa. And we are voting NO on Proposition G.

Why?
(1) Because Proposition G will weaken San Francisco's present divestment law. This law requires companies doing business with the city to sign affidavits that they will make no new contracts with South Africa.

Proposition G has no such provision.

(2) Proposition G provides no mechanism or funding to carry out its declared purpose of "boycotting" South Africa.

Proposition G will not stop South African products from entering the Port of San Francisco.

Vote against this useless, confusing, and deceptive initiative.

Preserve the stronger divestment law San Francisco already has.

Vote NO on Proposition G!

Yvonne Golden
Geraldine Johnson
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
AFT 2121 Anti-Apartheid Committee
Artists Against Apartheid
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Coalition of Conscience
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club Executive Committee
ILWU 30 and SEIU 250 Southern Africa Liberation Support Committees
National Conference of Black Lawyers
San Francisco Anti-Apartheid Committee
Southern Africa Freedom Committee/All Peoples Congress

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1983 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!
AIDS Research

PROPOSITION H

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Several city and private agencies conduct various programs related to AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a declaration of policy that says San Francisco should support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council, consisting of a Committee on Education and a Fund-Raising Committee. The Research Committee would make recommendations on the most useful AIDS research projects and try to prevent duplication of efforts. The Education Committee would inform the public about the latest research and about ways to prevent AIDS. The Fund-Raising Committee would seek donations and grants for AIDS research and education projects.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

“The proposed Declaration of Policy for an AIDS research and education council and the formation of advisory committees of civic leaders would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, additional expenditure of public funds for AIDS research may result, the amount of which cannot be determined.”

How “H” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for AIDS research had qualified for the June ballot.

Stony Gebert, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 10,540 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on December 6, 1985.

A check of each signature on the petition showed that 7,564 of the signatures were valid. This is more than 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We need a council to expose and address major AIDS issues without the impasse of present medical/political bias.

As taxpayers, we are subsidizing a treadmill of continual AIDS casualties. There are major oversights where AIDS is concerned. Only recently was it learned that CDC statistics suggest 79% of early AIDS cases appear drug-related. We hear AIDS is 100% fatal. Perhaps that is because death may also be drug-related in the way of immuno-suppressive antibiotic and radiation overloads to already compromised immunity systems. Prevailing medicine is both tunnel-visioned and high-profit motivated. Also well-funded. This solution may be part of the problem. Some physicians are beginning to feel where AIDS is concerned many current practices are ethically, medically bankrupt.

Remissions occur. Largely through immunity-enhancing, holistic medicine. Significantly, only 1% of AIDS cases occur among people at risk in the Asian community. Perhaps this is due to less drug abuse or use of an unfunded, ignored resource: herbology as part of diet. More options: homeopathy, acupuncture, etc.

If, as anticipated, upwards of 40% of those testing positive come down with AIDS, we may become overburdened. To ignore all of the above becomes part of the problem. Vote Yes on Proposition H.

Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Rich McKeirkeby, Former Orderly,
Marketing Associate, Pacific Bell
Joseph P. Clady, AIDS Hospice, Shanti Counselor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There is great need for research and education about AIDS and related conditions.

We need to attack the disease, not its victims.

Knowledge is the only vaccine available today.

Vote Yes.

John Lorenzini, President,
People With AIDS Alliance
Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Jan Beck, Steven Russell, Eugene Ewins, ARC/AIDS Vigil

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There are many possible treatments for AIDS and related conditions which are not being examined by the federal government, especially therapies based on natural substances and processes.

Vote Yes for an AIDS Research Council open to all viewpoints.

Scott Gregory, M.D.
Paul Kangas

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

A tape recording (Talking Book) of the San Francisco Voter Information pamphlet is available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

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

Name______________________________________________________________

Address__________________________________________Apt. #_____________

Telephone No. (required)___________________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any)_______________________________________

Signature__________________________________________________________
PROPOSITION I

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway? YES 307 NO 308

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the Freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a policy statement asking whether or not the Embarcadero Freeway should be torn down.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City's policy to remain as it is, and you want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to change the City's policy, and you do not want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

Controller's Statement on "I"

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

"The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway demolished, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by at least $10.2 million in local funds. Potential private sector financing and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost."

How "I" Got on Ballot

On March 3 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy placing the question of demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway before the voters had qualified for the June ballot.

Richard Hongisto, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 11,119 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,720 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I
In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land now under the Broadway ramps is put back on the tax rolls, with low-rise buildings limited by restrictive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when united with Proposition J, recognizes these facts:
1) The Embarcadero Freeway is what is left of a never-completed elevated freeway that would have ringed the City through North Beach and Marina neighborhoods to the Golden Gate Bridge.
2) Today this massive freeway, which separates us from our waterfront, would never be built.
3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.
4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf will be preserved.
5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked for this new system.
6) Only that portion of the Embarcadero Freeway east and north of the Main and Beale Street ramps—basically the portion directly on the waterfront—will be removed to make way for the new system. The removal cost, approximately $10 million to be paid for with privately-generated new revenues, is a relatively small part of the overall new system.

As for Proposition I, vote "YES, let's tear down the Embarcadero Freeway." Then turn to Proposition J and support the plan for a beautiful waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I
Removing the Embarcadero Freeway will allow San Francisco to:

- Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero.
- Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway.
- Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula.
- Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero.
- Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.
- Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won't benefit San Francisco. Don't let outsiders determine our future. Vote YES on I.

Hon. Toby Rosenblatt          Chuck Forester
Jack Whiteley                  Fritz Arko
Roger Boyer                   James T. Chappell, AICP
A. Lee Knight                 Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Bradford               Robert Berner
Edward A. Green               H. Grant Dehart, AICP
Gail Bloom                    Bonnie B. Jones
Donald A. Crosby, AIA         Randall Rossi
Rai Y. Okamoto                Karl Limbach
Robert Meyers                 Hon. Charlotte Berk
Ralph Hurtado                 Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Susan Bierman            Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima         Hon. James Bronkema
Hon. Douglas G. Wright        Jon Twitchell
Anita Sanchez                 Jane Winslow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON I
This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY—VOTE YES ON I
Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds—without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city's fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.

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

Application must be received by the registrar of voters no later than 5/27/86.

Election Date June 3, 1986

MAIL COMPLETED FORM TO:
Registrar of Voters
Room 155 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

PLEASE PRINT REGISTERED NAME:

FIRST NAME __________________________________________
MIDDLE NAME __________________________________________
LAST NAME __________________________________________

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

NUMBER AND STREET—DESIGNATE N, S, E, W

CITY ________________ ZIP ________________

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT (DO NOT PRINT)

DATE ____________________ (AREA CODE) DAYTIME TELEPHONE

I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.

(AREA CODE) RESIDENCE TELEPHONE

X

THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT PROPER SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

STREET OR BOX __________________________________________

CITY __________________________ STATE ________________ ZIP ________________

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE.
FROM:


DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACIÓN?)

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT — VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to 15.7 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown, Fisherman's Wharf and the financial district would be reduced.

Travel within the city would be slowed down at all hours. Vote no to the destruction of the freeway.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:

- Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
- Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
- If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
  - By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
  - Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
  - MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
  - Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Judith Tornese

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Tear it down? The concept is preposterous! There are 70,000 cars a day whizzing by on this high speed downtown elevated waterfront freeway! Where will they all go?

Aside from the outrageous demolition costs involved, (some engineers estimate $40,000,000 of taxpayer money!), eyeball observation, logic, and just plain "common sense" dictates that ground level "total gridlock" will result if this expensive freeway is now destroyed.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled.
Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

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

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

The Way It Is Now: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the freeway with a surface roadway.

The Proposal: Proposition J is a policy statement that says that the City would replace the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A Yes Vote Means: If you vote yes, you want to adopt a policy statement which says that the Embarcadero Freeway would be torn down if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A No Vote Means: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt a policy statement to replace the Embarcadero Freeway under these conditions.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway replaced with a tree-lined six lane boulevard and other traffic and transit improvements, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by approximately $27.5 million. This includes a one-time freeway demolition cost of $10.2 million plus $17.3 million required to match potential federally-funded transit improvements. Potential financing by the State and private sector and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “J” Got on Ballot

On March 5 a declaration of policy regarding the future of the Embarcadero Freeway was delivered to the Registrar from the Mayor and several supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows the Mayor or four or more supervisors to submit a declaration of policy to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

In addition to Mayor Feinstein, the March 5 document was signed by Supervisors Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker, Molinaro, Kennedy and Nelder.

Polls are Open
from 7:00 A.M. to 8:00 P.M.
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J
San Franciscans now have a chance to remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with an at-grade, six-lane parkway, which will open our waterfront and restore views blocked for years by this large freeway.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for traffic and transit improvements:
- New, shorter freeway ramps connecting directly with The Embarcadero;
- A tree-lined, at-grade, 6-lane Embarcadero Boulevard, with a new waterfront Muni line, a jogging and bicycle path from Fisherman’s Wharf to Mission Bay;
- Extension of Muni Metro south to the Caltrain station at 4th and Townsend;
- New ramps connecting I-280 with The Embarcadero;
- Changes in traffic flow and improvements to existing freeway ramps.

Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman’s Wharf will be preserved and enhanced.

The Board of Supervisors has specified that the Embarcadero Freeway will be torn down only if preliminary engineering during the next two years confirms — as traffic and environmental studies already have — that removal of the freeway will not result in more problems than it solves.

San Francisco became eligible for $88 million in federal highway funds for this new system when the Supervisors approved the plan in 1980. The $10.2 million cost of freeway demolition itself can be paid from revenues from low-rise development of the parcels now under the Broadway ramps and the increased values of nearby properties. Strict waterfront zoning limits the size of any development.

Traffic and environmental studies by the California Department of Transportation since 1980 clearly indicate that the new waterfront transportation system will be vastly superior to the existing situation, and that traffic congestion levels will not be notably different with the elevated structure removed.

Vote Yes on J and let’s remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with a parkway and transit system — once again let us see our waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J gives the voters a chance to be heard on an important and timely issue. This issue is the replacement of a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway as one element of a comprehensive package of transportation improvements in the Waterfront area.

Last fall, the Board of Supervisors adopted for further study a set of traffic and transit improvements for the Waterfront. These improvements include:
- a new landscaped surface-level boulevard
- replacement of the Clay/Washington and Broadway on and off ramps with new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom
- removal of the unused stub of I-280 and construction of new ramps connecting the new waterfront boulevard to Route I-280
- a new light rail transit line linking Fort Mason with the Caltrain Depot
- extension of the Muni Metro to the train depot, improving

the Peninsula Commute Service

A YES vote on Proposition J does not allocate funds for these projects. It does allow for further design and engineering studies, including cost analysis, assessment of impacts on traffic, and other matters. The studies will then be presented to the Supervisors so that they can make an informed decision on the plan. If the studies prove positive, San Francisco will be able to transform its Waterfront for the benefit of all.

Proposition J will insure that the City will not proceed with the removal of any of the Freeway until all the studies are completed and all potential consequences are assessed. This is the responsible approach. Vote YES on J.

SPUR
League of Women Voters
Embarcadero Citizens Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SAN FRANCISCO’S NEIGHBORHOODS ASK YOU TO VOTE YES ON J.
REduce TRAFFIC CONgestION—YES ON J!
Traffic backed up by the Embarcadero Roadway slows travel and creates congestion in North Beach and other nearby neighborhoods. J will speed traffic flow.

IMPROve PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION—YES ON J!

SPUR
League of Women Voters
Embarcadero Citizens Committee

Proposition J will provide regular streetcar service along the Embarcadero and extend Muni Metro service to the south, ultimately extending to Bayview-Hunters Point.

PROMOTE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY—YES ON J!
If Proposition J does not pass, San Francisco could lose $88 million in federal funds for traffic improvements.

(continued)
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

RESTORE THE WATERFRONT — YES ON J!
San Francisco's waterfront could become a focal point for the city, graced by a grand promenade, instead of the dismal, deteriorating eyesore it is now.
San Francisco's neighborhoods join together to ask your support for an improved Embarcadero. We guarantee the freeway will not be removed unless it is replaced by facilities that will assure a smoother, more efficient traffic flow. YES ON J!
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Robert Bradford
Ruth Gravantis
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Anita Sanchez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SUPPORT PUBLIC TRANSIT — VOTE YES ON J.
SAVE SAN FRANCISCO FROM GRIDLOCK — VOTE YES ON J.

The revitalization of the Northeastern Waterfront... as included in San Francisco's Master Plan and transit plans, as overwhelmingly approved by the Board of Supervisors and as urged by Mayor Feinstein... will allow almost $90 million in unused federal highway funds to be used for vital downtown and waterfront transit and street improvements which will be a key to reducing needless auto congestion in San Francisco.

PROPOSITION J SUPPORTS IMPORTANT TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS TO THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT. It will:
— extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific/CalTrain depot
— create a new rail line (possibly using historic streetcars) to connect the entire waterfront from Mission Bay to the Ferry Building to Fishermans Wharf and Fort Mason
— set the stage for a possible streetcar line along Third Street
Since the city of San Francisco adopted the Transit First policy in the early 1970's, transit investments in the Muni Metro,

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A SOUND BUSINESS PROPOSITION — YES ON J!
Common sense and good business demand we make the most of our resources. San Francisco's waterfront is an economic and civic asset unrivaled anywhere — yet much of it is cut off by an ugly, noisy, elevated roadway. The traffic improvements called for by Proposition J will benefit workers, tourists, property owners, neighborhoods, ... and business.

— Traffic flow and transit will move quickly on a realigned, reorganized Embarcadero Roadway, allowing easier, more pleasant access to waterfront businesses.

— An improved and beautified Embarcadero will create new commercial opportunities and increase the value of existing property and businesses.

— New jobs and an expanded tax base will generate increased revenue for the city as several lots now covered by freeway ramps return to productive private ownership. Though limited to low rise development (40 to 65 feet), tax revenues from development will more than make up the city's share of the project.

— Other projects in the area, such as upgrading piers 1½, 3, and 5 as well as the Ferry Building and existing facilities like the YMCA will benefit from the proposed improvements.

— Traffic studies show overall access to the downtown will be improved by Proposition J. Federal money has been set aside for this proposal and cannot be used for other projects in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON THIS CAREFULLY PLANNED PROJECT TO REVITALIZE OUR WATERFRONT!

Robert Meyers
Dennis J. Potts
Kenneth R. Lerch
M. Arthur Gensler, Jr., FAIA
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones

Chuck Forester
David M. Hartley
Donald P. Black
Mrs. Bland Platt
Richard Reinhardt
James W. Haas
James Reson
Peter J. Locke
Marjorie G. Stern
John B. Lowry
Lawrence Ferlinghetti
Nancy Peters
Steven Taber

Norman Rolfe
San Francisco Muni Coalition
California Transit League
Jack Wholey
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Regina Sneed
Tony Kilroy
Hon. Jack Morrison
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Bay Area Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Hon. Amy Meyer, Recreation and Park Commissioner
Alan Lubliner

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J OFFERS RESIDENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO A ONCE IN A LIFETIME OPPORTUNITY TO RECAPTURE THEIR WATERFRONT.

Converting the Embarcadero into a tree-lined boulevard and building a new streetcar line will make the waterfront more pedestrian and transit oriented, that is, more people oriented.

A freeway structure that is a source of objectionable noise and casts a pall over a large part of the waterfront will be removed. The waterfront will be opened up to sunlight and fresh air and made more inviting and cheerful to those who wish to walk on one of the world’s outstanding waterfronts. Air pollution that is now retained by the existing elevated structure will be dissipated.

The transit orientation of the new waterfront will encourage energy conservation. Proposition J will:
—Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero
—Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway
—Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula

Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero
Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line
Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute
Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won’t benefit San Francisco. Don’t let outsiders determine our future.

VOTE YES ON J FOR A BETTER SAN FRANCISCO.

Sierra Club
Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage
Willinda McCrea*
Bob Cramer*
Rebecca Evans*
Richard Livingston*
Marlyn Clemens*
Jennie Lew*
Jeffrey Henne*
Jane Winslow*
Roger Boyer

A. Lee Knight
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Patrick S. Hohl
Monica Halloran
Walter K. Morris
Lisa Klariment
Jeffrey Heller
Bob Isaacson
George T. Rockrise, FAIA
Jon Twichell
Marc Kasy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J GIVES US A CHANCE TO CORRECT A COLOSSAL MISTAKE!

The Embarcadero Freeway should never have been built. The original plan was to build a freeway from bridge to bridge, destroying the Northern Waterfront, Fisherman’s Wharf, Fort Mason, and Marina Green in the process. When the people of San Francisco saw what was happening, they stopped it in mid-air—literally.

Walk under it. Hear the noise. Feel the gloom. See how it cuts out light.

It’s time to remove this mistake.

The new waterfront plan will give us a tree-lined boulevard, a new streetcar line, and a Muni Metro extension to the Southern Pacific/Caltrain depot. It will give us a transit and pedestrian oriented waterfront that will give us pride and pleasure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J!

San Francisco Tomorrow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, with a membership of 1,700 working architects in San Francisco, urges a “YES” vote on Proposition J. In 1968 the citizens of San Francisco stopped highway planners from ringing our waterfront with freeways. Today voters have another opportunity to return the waterfront to our citizens. Removal of the Embarcadero Freeway is one part of a carefully researched transit plan for San Francisco. This proposition supplies an unique opportunity to carry out a broad range of transportation improvements that will have many positive effects on the City of San Francisco.

Removal of the freeway will:

1. Return the waterfront to the people by removing this barrier to access and view.
2. Facilitate needed MUNI improvements.
3. Encourage development of the Embarcadero as a grand civic boulevard unifying the City of San Francisco.

The members of the American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition I and “YES” on Proposition J.

Donald Kennedy, FAIA
President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J**

San Franciscans love Their City, the ambiance, the Bay, waterfront, the views, the healthy neighborhoods.

Freeway builders did their damnest to destroy the City and divide our neighborhoods.

Now we can remove that damned spot, the concrete dinosaur, the hideous barrier that destroys our scenic views, the fence that keeps us from the Bay, the concealer of the Ferry Building.

Correct a mistake.

**VOTE YES ON J.**

Miriam Blausin
Charlene Clark
Marie Cleasby
Zach Cowan
Dick Grebbohl
Rick Hauptman

Tony Kilroy
Jean Kortum
Ira Kruilander
Jack Morrison
Andy Nash
Norman Rolfe

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J**

NO ON PROPOSITION J.

"J" is for JOKE—a cruel joke on us. What will J really do? Add traffic to every street east of Gough. Delay the construction of waterfront streetcar service. Cost millions in local dollars needed to improve MUNI. Create a ground-level freeway on the waterfront as big as Van Ness, with more cars.

I'm a private citizen who's concerned about traffic and what it's doing to our City. If you are too, vote NO on Proposition J.

Steve Colman

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J**

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:

- Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
- Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
- If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that by the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
- Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
- MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
- Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Blair C. Pascoe

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

**Special Notice to Absentee Voters**

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

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION A

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out.

3.202 Office of Risk Management
There is established under the chief administrative officer an office of risk management which shall review, analyze and report to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the finance committee of the board of supervisors the practices of the several departments, boards and commissions of the city and county regarding loss prevention and risk management, including the insurance requirements of the city and county. The office shall also establish and assist in the implementation of planning and operational guidelines regarding risk management and loss prevention for each department, board or commission. The chief administrative officer may appoint, at his or her pleasure, or contract with, a qualified individual or organization for the operation of the office. The qualifications of the individual or organization operating the office shall include relevant education, training and experience in insurance and risk management.

3.401 City Attorney
(a) The city attorney shall be an elective officer. He shall furnish an official bond in the sum of ten thousand dollars ($10,000). He shall appoint, and at his pleasure may remove, all assistants and employees of his office. He shall devote his entire time and attention to the duties of his office. He must, at the time of his election, be an elector of the city and county, qualified to practice in all the courts of the state, and he must have been so qualified for at least 10 years next preceding his election.

(b) The city attorney must represent the city and county in all actions and proceedings in which it may be legally interested, and, for or on behalf of the city and county, or, any officer of the city and county in any action or proceeding, when directed so to do by the supervisors, except where a cause of action exists in favor of the city and county against said officer. Whenever any cause of action exists in favor of the city and county, the city attorney shall commence the same when within his knowledge or when directed so to do by the supervisors. He shall give his advice or opinion in writing to any officer, board or commission of the city and county when requested. Except as otherwise provided in this charter, he shall not settle or dismiss any litigation for or against the city and county, unless, upon his written recommendation, he is ordered so to do by ordinance.

(c) The city attorney shall perform, or approve as to form, all ordinances before they are enacted by the supervisors. He shall approve, by endorsement in writing, the form of all official or other bonds required by this charter or by ordinance before the same are submitted to the proper commission, board or office for final approval, and no such bonds shall be finally approved without such approval as to form by the city attorney. Except as otherwise provided in this charter, he shall prepare in writing the draft or form of all contracts before the same are executed on behalf of the city and county. He shall examine and approve the title of all real property to be acquired by the city and county.

He shall keep on file in his office copies of all written communications and opinions, also all papers, briefs and transcripts used in matters wherein he appears; and books of record and registers of all actions or proceedings in his charge in which the city and county or any officer or board thereof, is a party to or interested.

(b) The duties of the city attorney in connection with the city’s delinquent revenue collection shall be transferred to and performed by the attorney for said bureau which shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

(c) There is established in the office of the city attorney a bureau of claims investigation and administration which shall have the responsibility of investigating, evaluating and processing for the several boards, commissions and departments all claims for money or damages made upon the city and county pursuant to section 7.703 of this charter or the general law of the State of California. Claim investigation functions of the police department in existence on June 4, 1986, shall continue as an adjunct to the bureau established under this section. Claims functions of the public utilities commission shall remain under that commission unless transferred to the bureau of claims investigation and administration by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the bureau shall have the power to investigate events and occurrences giving rise to potential civil liability against the city and county and adjust and settle demands, within dollar limits to be established by ordinance, prior to their presentation as claims. There shall be established by ordinance a revolving fund to satisfy such demands adjusted prior to their presentation as claims. The bureau shall be responsible for the investigation of all claims and the analysis of city policies and practices upon which the bureau shall report and advise the several departments.

The city attorney shall appoint a chief of the bureau who shall serve at his or her pleasure. The chief of the bureau may appoint, subject to confirmation by the city attorney, investigators who shall serve at the pleasure of the chief; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of civil claims investigator or any equivalent classification on the date of approval of this amendment by the electorate shall continue to have civil service status to said position under the civil service provisions of this charter.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out.

7.100 Materials, Supplies and Equipment
The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreements for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract. All purchases in excess of one thousand dollars ($1,000) shall be by written contract, provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency arising while a contract is not already existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases and a permanent record of all such quotations shall be kept. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) for materials, supplies and equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of materials, supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two or more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned and may advertise for
bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of or dealers in other articles made to such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefore, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance or rejection of such recommendation stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall direct the rejection of all articles which may be below standards, specifications or samples furnished. He shall not approve any bill or voucher for articles not in conformity with specifications, or which are at variance with any contract.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall also have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for and in use in all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.

7.103 Requisition, Contract and Payment
All purchase orders and contracts shall be based on written requisitions, or, for materials, or supplies in common use in the various departments, on the purchaser's records of average use by all departments. Purchase orders and contracts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) must be approved by the chief administrative officer. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall approve all bids and vouchers for materials, supplies, equipment, and contractual services before the controller shall draw and approve warrants therefor. All contracts for the purchase of materials, supplies and equipment shall be made after inviting sealed bids by public auction. All sealed bids received shall be kept on file. When an award of a contract is made, notice that the same has been made shall be given by one publication, and any interested person may examine the bids and records at the purchaser's office.

The purchaser of supplies shall by rules and regulations, approved by the chief administrative officer and the controller, designate and authorize appropriate persons within the purchasing department to exercise the purchaser's signature powers for purchase orders and contracts ap-

proved as provided in this chapter.

7.201 Public Works and Purchasing Contracts
The purpose of the department is the repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements, and the purchasing of supplies, materials and equipment, when the expenditure involved in each case shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or when the purchase is on order; and contracts shall be awarded by the department head, as provided by this charter. He shall constitute official misconduct to split or divide any public work or improvement or purchase into two or more units for the purpose of evading the contract provisions of this section. In all cases, there shall be an actual emergency, be declared by the board of supervisors to exist, and when authorized by resolution of said board, any public work or improvement may be executed in the most expeditious manner. Notwithstanding any other provision in this section or this charter contained, upon the approval of the chief administrative officer declaring the work to be emergency in character, there may be expended by the department of public works the sum not to exceed five hundred dollars ($500) for new construction of any type in or upon unimproved or unaccepted streets.

Any public work or improvement estimated to cost less than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) may be performed under contract or written order by the city and county. The necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county. Any public work or improvement executed by the city and county, other than routine repair work, shall be authorized by the chief administrative officer when the cost exceeds fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or by the heads of departments not under the chief administrative officer, only after detailed estimates have been prepared and submitted by the head of the department concerned.

There shall be separate accounting for each work or improvement so executed, which accounting shall include all direct, indirect and supervisory elements of cost chargeable to such work or improvement, and each cost accounting shall be reported to the chief administrative officer, or to the mayor when such work shall have been performed by departments not under the chief administrative officer. All such accounts shall be reported to the controller. Any public work or improvement costing less than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) and not performed by the use of city and county labor, materials, and supplies, shall, if not performed under contract, be covered by written order or agreement which shall be based on not less than three bids, notice of which shall be given by three days' posting. Records of such bids shall be kept by the department.

When the expenditure for any public work or improvement shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), the same shall be done by contract, except as otherwise provided in this charter. The department in charge of or responsible for the work for which a contract is to be let, or the purchaser of supplies in the case of purchases of materials, supplies and equipment, shall let such contract to the lowest reliable and responsible bidder not less than ten days after advertising by one publication for sealed proposals for the work, improvements or purchase contemplated. Each such advertisement shall contain the type of the right to reject any and all bids. The officer responsible for the awarding of any such contract shall require from all bidders information con-

POLL'S CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.
point two commissioners in terms of one year each, one commissioner in term of two years, one commissioner to a term of three years, and one commissioner to a term of four years. Thereafter, the terms of the commissioners shall be for four years from the commencement thereof. Not less than five commissioners of said commission shall be of the same sex, and one member shall have prior experience representing labor and one member shall have prior experience representing management.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of one hundred dollars ($100).

Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of considering and adopting examination questions shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission, after the regular daily working hours of 8 am to 5 pm. Such person or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commissioner before final action is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

In accordance with section 3,500, the commission shall have the power and it shall be its duty to appoint an executive assistant to be the administrative head of the affairs under its control who shall serve at its pleasure; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of assistant secretary to the civil service commission on the effective date of this section as amended shall continue to have civil service status in the position of executive assistant under the civil service provisions of this charter.

3661-General Powers and Duties

(a) The civil service commission shall be the employment and personnel department of the city and county and shall determine appointments on the basis of merit and fitness, as shown by appropriate tests. The commission shall classify, and from time to time, may reclassify, in accordance with duties and responsibilities of the employment, and training and experience required, all places of employment in the departments and offices of the city and county not specifically exempted by this charter from the civil service provisions thereof; or which may be created hereafter by general law and not specifically exempted from the civil service provisions thereof. The commission shall likewise classify all other places of employment in the city and county specifically exempted from the civil service provisions of this charter, but which, by the provisions of section 8,401 thereof, are made subject to classification for purposes of salary standardization purposes on the basis of duties and responsibilities of the employment and training and experience required. The civil service commission shall be the judge of such classification.

(b) The civil service commission may require periodic reports from the personnel director in a manner and form which it shall prescribe.

(c) The civil service commission may hear appeals from an action of the personnel director with respect to:

1. Allegations of discrimination. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the civil service commission regarding allegations of discrimination shall forthwith be enforced by every officer and employee;
2. Allegations of fraud;
3. Allegations of conflict of interest, pursuant to section 8,105.

(d) No action by the personnel director which is the subject of any appeal shall be stayed during the appeal process except by the unanimous vote of the civil service commission.

(e) The commission shall be notified of the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal of personnel classification laws and may comment on such proposals. The adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing fraud shall be subject to ratification by the commission. In addition, the adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfers, resignations and terminations shall be subject to ratification by the commission.

The commission shall ratify or reject any such regulation within 60 days of receipt. The commission's failure to act shall be deemed approval.

3662 Department of Personnel Administration

There is hereby established a department of personnel administration which shall consist of a personnel director and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. Any employee who was a permanent civil service employee shall be placed under the jurisdiction of the department until he is placed under the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration.

The department of personnel administration shall be the personnel department for the city and county and shall provide a means to recruit, select, certify, appoint, train, evaluate, promote career development, classify positions, administer salaries, administer employee discipline, discharge and other related personnel activities in order to maintain an effective and responsive work force.

3663 Personnel Director

(a) A personnel director shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the mayor; provided, however, that the personnel director shall be selected from candidates nominated by any civil service commissioner and confirmed by vote of the board of supervisors. The nominee of the mayor may be appointed acting personnel director pending confirmation. The person so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the civil service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of personnel director in the spirit of this declaration."

(b) The personnel director shall conduct appropriate examinations for employment, establish eligible lists based on their results and provide for certification of eligible. The action of the personnel director on examination matters including,
but not limited to, announcements, minimum qualifications, classes of applicants, components, construction, weighting, content, type, list length, duration and certification shall be final.

(c) The personnel director shall adopt personnel regulations which, except as otherwise provided in this chapter, shall be the only regulations within the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration and the exercise of the authority granted in this section, including, but not limited to, recruitment; applications; examinations; eligibility; duration of eligible lists; certification of eligibles; permanent, temporary and provisional regular performance evaluations; promotions; transfers; resignations; layoffs or reduction in force due to lack of work or lack of funds, reorganization, retrenchment or completion of work; and classification. No personnel regulations shall be adopted, amended or repealed without a prior public hearing upon notice by the personnel director and after meeting and conference sessions with recognized employee organizations as required by state law. All civil service commission rules relevant to the foregoing as well as the provisions of former sections 8.322, 8.323, 8.326, 8.328, 8.329, 8.330, 8.331, 8.332 and 8.340 of this charter shall become personnel regulations on the effective date of this charter amendment.

(d) The personnel director shall conduct the salary surveys for the civil service commission as set forth elsewhere in this charter.

(e) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall establish procedures to review and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the personnel director shall be final for any public notice by the personnel director or officer, unless the decision is appealed to the civil service commission in accordance with personnel regulations.

(f) The personnel director shall investigate all employee complaints concerning job related conduct of City and County employees and shall promptly report to the Board of Supervisors.

(g) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall promote effective and efficient management through personnel programs that encourage high productivity and exemplary performance. The personnel director by personnel regulation shall provide a procedure for resolution of employee disputes which shall be consistent with any provisions of this charter and shall be utilized by all department heads and appointing officers upon the expiration of the existing term of any otherwise binding agreements.

(h) Consistent with the foregoing and all applicable provisions of this charter, the personnel director shall delegate responsibilities to appointing officers to discharge personnel responsibilities, including but not limited to appropriate disciplinary procedures, and consult with appointing officers with respect to personnel regulations affecting their operations.

(i) Personal services contracts shall be reviewed and approved by the personnel director in accordance with the provisions of appropriate personnel regulations. Personal services contracts reasonably expected to involve payment by the city and county of more than twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000) shall also be reviewed and approved by the Commission. Failure of the Commission to act within 30 days of submission of the contract by the personnel director shall be deemed to constitute approval by the commission.

(k) The personnel director shall establish a system of job classification. The provisions of section 8.200 shall govern whenever new classifications are created or existing positions are reclassified. The personnel director shall make the judge of such classification determinations.

(l) From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the decision of personnel administration shall determine whether a position within a classification consists, "in character," temporary or permanent. Appointments may be made on a permanent, temporary or on these conditions, if confirmation is required, a provisional basis.

(m) Excepting sections 3.500, 3.660, 3.661, 8.105, 8.107, all but the second to the last paragraph of section 8.341, section 8.346, the last sentence of section 8.400, all but the three last words in the first sentence of the third paragraph of section 8.404, sections 8.405, 8.406, 8.407 and this section, wherever the words "civil service commission" or "commission" appear in the personnel provisions of this charter, they shall be replaced by the words "department of personnel administration," "department," "personnel director" or "director," as the case may be; the word "personnel" or "personnel record" shall be replaced by the words "personnel regulation" or "registrations," the words "general manager, personnel" and "secretary of the civil service commission" shall be replaced by the words "personnel director" and the words "section 3.661" shall be replaced by the words "section 3.662" or "section 3.663," as appropriate.

The clerk of the board of supervisors, after consultation with the city attorney, is hereby directed to conform the language of the charter as herein amended when next the charter is submitted for republication.

8.322 Protest of Written Questions and Answers

- After the conclusion of a civil service examination a tentatively-listed eligible shall be posted for the inspection of the public and of participants. The posting period shall be for a minimum of three (3) working days for the entrance examinations or five (5) working days for promotional or combined entrance and promotional examinations. During this period a fee shall be charged by the personnel director. The amount of such fee shall be established by ordinance of the board of supervisors. The fee shall be waived for eligibles who wish to inspect their own papers. Inspection of papers shall include all documents supporting the eligibles' rank and score except neither the identity of the examiner giving any marking or grade in an oral examination nor the examination questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written test shall be provided. Only participants in the examination may review the questions used in the examination. If no protests are received during the posting period the eligible list is automatically adopted and protests are received during the posting period the investigation and action of the general manager, personnel, shall be expedited so that final adoption of the eligible list is not delayed beyond sixty (60) days after the date of posting. Eligibles who, as a result of their ranking would receive a notice of appointment regardless of the decision of the personnel director, may appeal from adopt lists pending the resolution of any protest and amendment to the adopted eligible list.

8.326 Promotions in General

- Except as specifically provided for in this section, 8.327, the Civil Service Commission shall provide for examinations on an entrance, promotional or combination-entrance and promotional basis. Consideration shall be given to permanent employees in separate promotional examinations and in combination examinations which are combined with entrance examinations for city and county service when the passing mark has been attained and may include evaluation of work performance and other credits. When examinations from these lists are certified on both a promotional and entrance basis, there shall be a resulting list of eligibles which shall include all successful candidates on both a promotional and entrance in order of relative performance.

- Nothing is to the contrary in this or any other provision of the charter which would prevent the regularly-adopted eligible list on a non-permanent position in a civil service classification shall be permitted to participate in promotional examinations on the same terms and conditions as a person holding a permanent appointment to a position in that same classification, subject to a demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position on a periodic and in the manner provided by rule of the civil service commission.

- The provisions of this section as herein amended shall be applicable to promotional examinations announced after its effective date.

8.328 Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave

- Employees employed by permanent civil service appointing officers because of absence on duly authorized military leave after June 27, 1950, did not participate in a promotional examination held after June 27, 1950, and during time of war as defined in section 8.324 of this charter, and in which examination the employee would have been eligible to compete had the war not intervened, and which examination was not then or subsequently suspended or modified and the employee was in grade of employment from which he was called to active military service, shall have the right to participate in a similar promotional examination. Provided, that persons and employees who were on entrance or promotional eligible lists, shall, for the purpose of this amendment, be deemed to be appointments in the classification in which they were previously placed and were granted permanent certification while in the military service.

- In order to qualify for participation in a similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section, such employee who desires to participate in such examination shall make application in writing to the Civil Service Commission within thirty days after the close of this examination. Failure to file such written request to participate in a similar promotional examination as herein provided shall be deemed a waiver of all rights of the employee to participate in such similar promotional examination.

- The civil service commission shall arrange to hold a board to hold the examination and to judge the adequacy of such similar promotional examination, if the employee obtains in the similar promotional examination a score rating equal or
more than the minimum passing mark established by the civil service commission for inclusion on the list of eligibles resulting from the original promotional examination, his or her name shall be placed on the eligible list resulting from the original promotional examination in accordance with the relative excellence obtained by all the qualified participants in the original and similar promotional examinations. Such employees shall be eligible for appointment from any list of eligibles in accordance with civil service rules to any vacancy thereafter occurring, and subject to satisfactory completion of a probationary period as provided in section 8.340 of this charter for a period of four years after the date on which their name is entered on the eligible list and before eligibles procuring standing through examinations held subsequent to the original promotional examination.

If it is determined by the civil service commission that the name of such person would have been reached for permanent appointment from the list of eligibles established as a result of the original promotional examination during his term of military service, had the name of such person appeared thereon, then such employee, upon successful completion of a permanent probationary period as herein provided, shall be granted seniority in such appointment from the date his name would have been reached had his name appeared thereon, but such seniority shall be used only for the purpose of determining salary increments and calculating city and county service for retirement and shall not affect promotions held subsequent to the similar promotional examination herein authorized. For all other purposes, seniority of service shall date from the date of appointment as a result of qualifying in the similar promotional examination as herein authorized.

Such employees who qualify for appointment as a result of promoting in the similar promotional examination as herein provided, and who are appointed to permanent positions, as herein provided, shall be permitted to participate in other promotional examinations for which they are otherwise eligible, while serving under probationary appointment in the position to which appointed as a result of the similar promotional examination, provided that certification from lists of eligibles established from such other examinations shall not be made until the employee has satisfactorily completed the permanent probationary appointment.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules to govern the administration of similar promotional examinations herein authorized, and appointments and other matters arising thereunder as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section as herein amended.

8.329 Certification of Eligibles; Rule of Three

Whenever a position controlled by the civil service commission is to be filled, the appointing officer shall make a requisition to the civil service commission for a person to fill it. Thereupon, the commission shall certify to the appointing officer the names and addresses of the three persons standing highest on the list of eligibles for such position as in case the position is promotive, the commission shall certify the names of the three persons standing highest on such list. If there are fewer than three names on the list from which certification is to be made, there shall be certified the number thereon. The appointing officer shall fill the position by the appointment of one of the persons so certified. The provisions of this section as herein amended at the election of November 2, 1976, shall be applicable only to lists of eligibles finally adopted by the civil service commission pursuant to the provisions of section 8.323 of this charter or on or after the effective date of this amendment. In making such appointment, the appointing officer shall be governed by the rules of the commission as when a statute, a rule of the commission or the appointing officer specifies sex.

From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the commission shall determine whether the position is, in character, temporary, seasonal or permanent, and shall notify the candidate in accordance therewith to the end that the candidate may have knowledge of the probable duration of employment. The commission shall provide for the issuance of temporary or seasonal employment as it may deem just to candidates.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this or any other provision of this charter, an employee who has been certified from a regularly adopted eligible list to a non-permanent position in a civil service commission, shall be eligible for appointment to a permanent position within that same classification before the commission certifies to the appointing officer the names and addresses of persons standing higher on the list of eligibles who are not then current employees, subject to a demonstration of satisfactory performance by the United States government, or the state government, or any political subdivision thereof, while any act authorizing compulsory military service or training is in effect, the provisions of this section may also be made operates upon recommendation of the civil service commission and approval of the board of supervisors by ordinance enacted by two-thirds vote of the board. Authority for temporary employment appointments pursuant to the authority of this paragraph shall cease six months after the board by the board of supervisors of the ordinance which authorized such appointments.

8.332 Temporary and Emergency Appointments

When no list of eligibles exists or no eligible is available on an existing list for a position in the class requisitioned by the appointing officer, and immediate service in the position is required, the appointing officer and another list exists which is deemed by the civil service commission to be suitable for temporary service, the service desired, the commission shall certify for civil service temporary appointment an eligible from such list; if no such other list deemed suitable, the position to be filled is classified as non-promotive, the commission pursuant to its rules may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment thereto for a period not exceeding one hundred and thirty working days. Non-civil service or emergency appointments extended beyond ninety days must be approved by the civil service commission. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such one hundred and thirty working days at the time a civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in section 8.329 of the charter.

If a list of eligibles exists for the position requisitioned, but immediate service is necessary, the appointing officer pending the time an eligible from such list is certified and reports for duty as provided in section 8.329 of the charter, the commission may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment thereto for a period not exceeding thirty working days. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such thirty working days at the time a civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in section 8.329 of this charter.

No person shall be compensated under any non-civil service or emergency appointment or appointment as authorized under the provisions of the foregoing paragraphs of this section for a period exceeding one hundred and thirty working days in any fiscal or calendar year, and no claim or warrant therefor shall be approved, allowed or paid for any compensation in excess of such one hundred and thirty working days in any fiscal year.

If no eligibles are available for appointment to a permanent position in the class requested by the appointing officer, the commission shall immediately hold an examination and establish an eligible list for such position. If its annual appropriation is insufficient to meet the cost of said examination, it shall report to the mayor the estimated cost thereof; and the
8.340 Dismissal During Probation Period

Any person appointed to a permanent position shall serve a probationary period of at least twelve months service and up to a maximum of twelve months for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the unified rank of the peace officer, fire department, sheriff's department and San Francisco International Airport police force shall be for twelve months except that, with respect to members of the unified ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve months' service from the first day following completion of the prescribed department field training officer program, but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment; provided further that probationary members of the unified ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in section 8.305. The probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four months may be established for executive and management classifications. At any time during the probationary period the appointing officer may terminate the appointment upon written notice and without respect to the civil service commission's determination of the reasons for such termination. Except in the case of members of the unified ranks of the police and fire departments the civil service commission shall review the termination. The civil service commission shall by rule establish the procedures for such review. If the appointment results in termination the commission may declare such person dismissed or may return the name to the list of eligibles under such conditions for further appointment as the commission may deem just; if the appointment resulted from a promotional examination the employee shall have the right of appeal and hearing before the civil service commission. The commission shall render a decision within thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person dismissed; or (b) order such person reinstated to the position without prejudice; and the commission may in its discretion order that the employee be paid salary at the rate of straight time for a period of up to six months for such appointment; or (c) order the return of such person to a position in the classification from which that person was promoted and may reestablish the employee's eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same or similar position under such conditions as the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall be final immediately prior to the expiration of the probationary period and the appointing officer shall report to the civil service commission as to the competence of the probationer for the position; and if competent, shall recommend permanent appointment. Nothing in this section shall preclude the civil service commission from reexamination of the employee's qualifications for any purpose of future employability including terminations in the unified ranks of the police and fire departments.

8.407 Definition of Generally Prevailing Rates of Wages

Notwithstanding any provision of section 8.401 or any provision of any other section of this chapter or the contrary, generally prevailing rates of salaries and wages for those employees covered by section 8.401 of the charter shall be determined by the civil service commission as set forth below.

The civil service commission personnel director shall conduct a comprehensive investigation and survey of basic pay rates and wages and salaries in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment for like work and like service, based upon job classifications as provided in section 3661.3662 of this charter and shall make its findings, based on facts and data collected, as to what are the generally prevailing basic pay rates for each benchmark class of employment solely in the manner hereinafter provided. A benchmark classification shall be a group of employees within occupation grouped selecting the class for which a representative sample of data will be collected.

Basic pay rate data for public and private employment shall be collected solely from the Bay Area counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, San Francisco and Santa Clara; provided, however, that for any benchmark class of employment for which the civil service commission personnel director determines there is insufficient data from Bay Area public jurisdictions the commission personnel director shall survey major public agencies in the state employing such class, major public agencies to be defined as those employing more than 3,000 persons.

The commission personnel director shall collect basic pay rate data for like work and like service from Bay Area public jurisdictions as follows:

(a) The counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Santa Clara, and San Mateo.

(b) The ten most populous cities in these five Bay Area counties based on the latest federal decennial census.

(c) Agencies of the state and federal governments and from school districts and other special districts in the six Bay Area counties as determined by the civil service commission personnel director.

The commission personnel director shall collect private basic pay rate data from recognized governmental Bay Area salary and wage surveys of private employers in the city and county of San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. The data collected shall be limited to basic rates of pay and salaries actually being paid by public and private employers for like work and like service.

The term "prevailing rates of wages" for employers governed by charter section 8.401 and this section shall be defined as the rate ranges developed from the weighted midpoints of the basic pay rates, excluding fringe benefits, for surveyed public and private employers and the median of the pay rates for private employment to be determined as follows:

(1) multiply the medians from the private and the midpoints from public employment data base by the number of employees in the given classification from each data base;

(2) add the products of (1);

(3) divide the sums in (2) by the total number of employees surveyed for that classification; and

(4) extend this figure by 10 percent to establish the maximum of the range and reduce this figure by 10 percent to establish the minimum.

When fixing rates of compensation the board of supervisors shall fix basic pay rates as close as reasonably possible to prevailing rates, provided, however, that the board of supervisors shall not set the maximum rate of pay for any class in excess of the maximum prevailing rate for that class; provided further, however, that no employee shall have his basic pay rate reduced to conform to prevailing rates except as provided for in section 8.406. For those classifications of employment in which the practice is customary, the schedules of compensation shall provide for maximum, not less than three intermediate, and maximum salary steps and for a method of advancing the salaries of employees from minimum to intermediate to maximum with due regard for seniority of service.

The term "basic pay rate" as used in this section is hereby defined as applying only to the basic rate of wages, with included range scales, and does not include any other benefits of employment or working condition benefits.

It is the declared intent of the qualified employees of the city and county that neither the board of supervisors nor the mayor have the authority to provide any benefits of employment except those enumerated already provided for in this charter and any addition, deletion or modification of benefits of employment enumerated in this charter shall be submitted, as a charter amendment, to the qualified employees of the city and county. The qualified employees expressly state that they understand that benefits of employment are sometimes referred to as "fringe benefits" of employment and the qualified employees expressly reserve the right to either grant or deny such benefits except those conditions of employment commonly referred to as "working conditions". Any reference to "working conditions" shall mean those compensations which must necessarily be provided in order for the employee to perform his job description duties efficiently and safely, and shall include but be limited to such working conditions and benefits as are typically included in the administrative provisions of the salary standardization ordinance and the salary ordinance.

The board of supervisors may, in its discretion, provide working condition benefits for employees covered under this section and section 8.401 of this charter only in accordance with the following provisions:

(a) The civil service commission personnel director shall determine, certify and recommend to the board of supervisors that the working condition benefit is equitable or necessary for the efficient and safe performance of the employee's duties as enumerated in his job description.

(b) The working condition benefit, as recommended by the civil service commission personnel director, is substantially comparable for like work and like service to that provided for the job classification and is provided to not less than 50 percent of the employees of the class in the jurisdiction covered by the salary survey.

9.08 Initiative, Referendum, and Recall

(a) The registered voters shall have power to propose, adopt or reject at the polls, any ordinance, act or other measure which is within the power conferred upon the board of supervisors to enact, or any legislative act which is within the power conferred upon any other board, commission or officer to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinances, acts, charters, or measures may be so proposed by filing with the registrar a petition setting forth said measure in full, signed by registered voters of the city and county as many in number as the percentages hereinafter required of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor cast at the last preceding regular municipal election.

Any declaration of policy may be submitted to the voters in the manner provided for the submission of ordinances; and when approved by a majority of the qualified voters voting on said declaration, it shall thereafter be the duty of the board of supervisors to enact an ordinance or ordinances to carry such policies or principles into effect; subject to the referendum provisions of this charter.

Any ordinance which the supervisors are empowered to pass may be submitted to the voters by a majority of the board at a general election or at a special election called for the purpose, said election to be held not less than thirty days from the date of the call. Any such ordinance, or proposed act or other measure provided for by the supervisors, or by the mayor, and when so proposed shall be submitted to the voters at the next succeeding general election. No ordinance passed by the supervisors granting any public utility franchise
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or privilege, shall go into effect until the expiration of sixty days from the date it becomes final. At the end of such sixty days such ordinance shall be in force and effect, unless within such period there shall be filed with the register a petition signed by registered voters equal in number to five percent of the entire vote cast for mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election, requesting that such ordinance be submitted to the electors. In case such petition is filed, such ordinance shall not go into effect until approved by a majority of the voters voting thereon at a general or special election.

If, before the time any other ordinance involving legislative matters becomes effective, there shall be filed with the board of supervisors a petition signed by qualified electors of the city and county equal in number to at least ten per centum of the entire vote cast for all candidates for mayor at the last preceding general municipal election at which a mayor was elected, protesting against the passage of such ordinance the same shall be suspended from going into operation, and it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to reconsider such ordinance, and if the same be not entirely repealed, said board shall submit the ordinance to the vote of said electors either at the next general municipal election or at a special election to be called for that purpose, and such ordinance shall not go into effect or become operative unless and until a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon shall vote in favor thereof. The provisions of sections 9.100 and 9.101 of the charter shall apply to and govern the verification and certification of such petition.

Annual budget and appropriation ordinances, supplemental appropriation ordinances, the annual salary ordinance, or ordinances amending the same, the ordinances levying taxes, any ordinance appropriating money from the emergency reserve fund, ordinances authorizing the city attorney to compromise litigation, and ordinances necessary to enable the mayor to carry out any of the powers vested in him in the case of public emergency as defined in section 3.100 of the charter, ordinances enacted pursuant to section 8.410 of the charter, as well as ordinances relative to purely administrative matters, shall not be subject to referendum.

Any elective officer, the chief administrative officer, the controller or any member of the board of education or public utilities commission may be recalled by the electors. The procedure to effect such recall shall be as follows: A petition demanding the recall from office of the person sought to be recalled shall be filed with the registrar. Said petition shall contain a statement of the grounds on which the recall is sought. Any insufficiency of form or substance in such statement shall in no way affect the validity of the election and proceedings held thereunder. No recall petition shall be filed against any officer until he has held his office for at least six months.

(b) In the event the representative of the board of supervisors, mayor and the representatives of recognized employee organizations do not reach an agreement through the meet-and-confer process on matters contained in the annual salary standardization ordinance by March 15 of any year, the mayor shall recommend and the board shall approve or reject a schedule of compensation which reflects current prevailing rates for the classifications covered by Section 8.410 of this Charter the last good faith offer presented by the mayor or his or her representative.

In any year when an agreement on matters contained in the salary standardization ordinance has not been achieved, the civil service commission personnel director shall prepare, prior to April 1, a schedule of compensation and administrative provisions which reflect additional rates that would be payable, and working conditions, based upon the last demands made by the recognized employee organization(s) which participated in the meet-and-confer process.

 Said schedule shall be transmitted to the registrar of voters for submission to the electors of the city and county at a general election or a special election called for the purpose, and said special election shall be held no less than sixty (60) days from the date of the call. No such schedule shall be withdrawn after it has been received by the registrar of voters. At said election, the ballot shall contain the following two alternatives:

(1) Approval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

(2) Disapproval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

If a majority of the valid votes cast in the election favor paying the additional rates set forth in the schedule of compensation based upon the last demands of the recognized employee organizations which engaged in the meet-and-confer process, it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to amend the salary standardization ordinance to reflect said increased rates.

Note: All sections are new.

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

Section 1. This ordinance may be called the "City College Public Lands Preservation Ordinance."

Section 2. The City Planning Commission and the Director of Public Works of the City of San Francisco, shall disapprove or deny, WITH NO EXEMPTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS, any building permit application for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, located across Phelan Avenue from the presently occupied campus of City College and consisting of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

Section 3. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall revoke or rescind, WITH NO EXEMPTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS, any building permit application previously granted for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, which consist of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

Section 4. The term "building permits" includes building permits, site permits and any other permits for the performance of construction work.

Section 5. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of the ordinance shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. No provision of this ordinance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent implementation of the policy stated above.

Note: All sections are new.

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

Section 1. The People of the City and County of San Francisco desire and are entitled to a local government whose officers do not engage in, assist or promote compensated advocacy on behalf of private interests before City and County commissions and boards while also serving as City and County officers.

Section 2. No officer of the City and County may, during the term of office, engage in compensated advocacy before any City and County board or commission, or any member of the board or commission or its staff, in order to represent any private interest, for which representation the officer receives, directly or indirectly, any compensation, reward or gift.

Section 3. Officers of the City and County shall not discuss matters pending before their commission or department with other City and County officers or state legislators when those other officers or state legislators are acting as compensated advocates for a private interest.

Section 4. No member of the California State Legislature shall appear before any City and County board, department or commission as a compensated advocate representing a private interest.

Section 5. In the financing of city and county campaigns: (a) No person other than a candidate shall make, and no campaign treasurer shall solicit or accept, any contribution which will cause the total amount contributed by such person with respect to a single election in support of or opposition to such candidate, including contributions to political committees supporting or opposing such candidate, to exceed $500.00. (b) If any person is found guilty of violating the terms of this section, such campaign treasurer who received part or all of the contribution or contributions which constitute the violation shall pay promptly, from available campaign funds, if any, the amount received from such person in excess of the amount permitted by this section to the City and County Treasurer for deposit in the General Fund of the City and County.

Section 6. Any person violating the terms of this ordinance, upon receipt of a written demand from a recognized employee organization made upon the mayor and the personnel director shall prepare, prior to April 1, a schedule of compensation and administrative provisions which reflect additional rates that would be payable, and working conditions, based upon the last demands made by the recognized employee organization(s) which participated in the meet-and-confer process.

Said schedule shall be transmitted to the registrar of voters for submission to the electors of the city and county at a general election or a special election called for the purpose, and said special election shall be held no less than sixty (60) days from the date of the call. No such schedule shall be withdrawn after it has been received by the registrar of voters. At said election, the ballot shall contain the following two alternatives:

(1) Approval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

(2) Disapproval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

If a majority of the valid votes cast in the election favor paying the additional rates set forth in the schedule of compensation based upon the last demands of the recognized employee organizations which engaged in the meet-and-confer process, it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to amend the salary standardization ordinance to reflect said increased rates.

Note: All sections are new.

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

Section 1. The People of the City and County of San Francisco desire and are entitled to a local government whose officers do not engage in, assist or promote compensated advocacy on behalf of private interests before City and County commissions and boards while also serving as City and County officers.

Section 2. No officer of the City and County may, during the term of office, engage in compensated advocacy before any City and County board or commission, or any member of the board or commission or its staff, in order to represent any private interest, for which representation the officer receives, directly or indirectly, any compensation, reward or gift.

Section 3. Officers of the City and County shall not discuss matters pending before their commission or department with other City and County officers or state legislators when those other officers or state legislators are acting as compensated advocates for a private interest.

Section 4. No member of the California State Legislature shall appear before any City and County board, department or commission as a compensated advocate representing a private interest.

Section 5. In the financing of city and county campaigns: (a) No person other than a candidate shall make, and no campaign treasurer shall solicit or accept, any contribution which will cause the total amount contributed by such person with respect to a single election in support of or opposition to such candidate, including contributions to political committees supporting or opposing such candidate, to exceed $500.00. (b) If any person is found guilty of violating the terms of this section, such campaign treasurer who received part or all of the contribution or contributions which constitute the violation shall pay promptly, from available campaign funds, if any, the amount received from such person in excess of the amount permitted by this section to the City and County Treasurer for deposit in the General Fund of the City and County.

Section 6. Any person violating the terms of this ordinance, upon receipt of a written demand from a recognized employee organization made upon the mayor and the personnel director shall prepare, prior to April 1, a schedule of compensation and administrative provisions which reflect additional rates that would be payable, and working conditions, based upon the last demands made by the recognized employee organization(s) which participated in the meet-and-confer process.

Said schedule shall be transmitted to the registrar of voters for submission to the electors of the city and county at a general election or a special election called for the purpose, and said special election shall be held no less than sixty (60) days from the date of the call. No such schedule shall be withdrawn after it has been received by the registrar of voters. At said election, the ballot shall contain the following two alternatives:

(1) Approval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

(2) Disapproval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

If a majority of the valid votes cast in the election favor paying the additional rates set forth in the schedule of compensation based upon the last demands of the recognized employee organizations which engaged in the meet-and-confer process, it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to amend the salary standardization ordinance to reflect said increased rates.
rates and the same shall be in lieu of said annual compensation, and notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, said rates shall become effective and be payable as if adopted prior to April 1, of any year.

The provisions of sections 3.100 and 3.100-1, relating to the emergency powers of the mayor, shall not be applicable to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

11.105 Effective Date of Amendments
The effective date of the amendments, additions and deletions to the civil service provisions of the charter shall be ninety (90) days after the acceptance and filing thereof with the Secretary of State.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION G

We the people of San Francisco declare this to be our policy:
1) IT IS IMPROPER TO PROFIT FROM OR PROVIDE SUPPORT TO THE RACIST POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SYSTEM IN SOUTH AFRICA, KNOWN AS APARTHEID.
Therefore it is necessary to sever commercial ties with South Africa, until people of all races obtain equal rights in that country, including equal voting rights.
2) COMPANIES HAVING SUBSTANTIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH APARTHEID MUST BE CONSIDERED IRRESPONSIBLE.
(a) The Board of Supervisors must determine which companies doing or seeking business with the City have the greatest ties to Apartheid. Companies that have a significant involvement in profiting from or maintaining the Apartheid system, may, on that basis, be deemed "irresponsible bidders."
(b) In purchasing goods and services and awarding other contracts, the city must give priority to avoiding such companies; the degree of the preference must be in proportion to the company's complicity with Apartheid, according to the following criteria:
   — how much business the company does in or with South Africa;
   — how much the company profits from that business;
   — how much support the company provides the Apartheid government in taxes, loans, payments or other funding;
   — the nature of the company's South Africa business;
   — the degree of the company's cooperation with South African political censorship or secrecy agreements;
   — the degree to which the company provides the South African government with the technology, materials and other means to maintain and enforce Apartheid.
(b) City funds must not be deposited or invested with any bank or other company which does business in or with, or makes loans to, South Africa.
(c) If any exception to the above policies is found to be necessary or appropriate, the responsible official must promptly and publicly report it to the Board of Supervisors, clearly describing the exception and the reasons for it.
(d) The term "city" includes all agencies, departments, officials, employees, unions and subunits of the city and county of San Francisco, and all funds administered by or on behalf of the city or county.
(3) WE CALL ON ALL OTHER PUBLIC BODIES AND PRIVATE OR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS TO ADOPT SIMILAR POLICIES.
(4) WE CALL A GENERAL PUBLIC BOYCOTT, FOCUSING ON THOSE COMPANIES HAVING THE GREATEST TIES TO APARTHEID.
The Board of Supervisors must determine and announce which company or companies are the worst offenders within each major industry, so that the public can focus its boycott on those companies.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION H

SUMMARY: THIS INITIATIVE STATES THAT THE AID S EPIDEMIC IS A MAJOR PUBLIC HEALTH PROBLEM OF CONCERN TO EVERYONE, REQUIRING INCREASED SUPPORT FOR RELATED MEDICAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION. IT CALLS FOR A COUNCIL FOR AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION OR SIMILAR UNITED EFFORT TO STOP AIDS.

We the people of San Francisco hereby adopt the following policy:

The AIDS epidemic has rapidly become a major public health problem, costly both in human lives and in general community resources;
The first steps in dealing with such a crisis are:
— the scientific research needed to discover and understand the nature, causes, co-factors, prevention, diagnosis and treatment of the disease, and
— the education of the public about the lessons of that research;
A proper program of research and education pays for itself in the long run;
Prompt action is urgent, because of the rapidly growing number of persons affected, increasing not only the suffering but also the difficulty of eradicating the disease;

The leadership and support of such an effort is everyone's responsibility;
While San Francisco's role in the overall effort against AIDS has been viewed as a positive example to other areas, the continued rapid increase in the spread of the disease means that we cannot afford to rest on our laurels or leave further responsibility to others.
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:
We call on all appropriate government bodies as well as medical, professional, charitable and community organizations and concerned individuals to join together in an all-out effort to stop AIDS;
We call for support to an organized united effort along the lines of an AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION COUNCIL, including, in some form:
— A COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, to provide informed evaluations as to priorities among research programs and proposals, recommending those which are most cost-effective and most likely to produce early results useful in the prevention or treatment of the disease, to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts or neglect of promising approaches, and to provide the council with complete and up-to-date information regarding comparative results of experimental treatments, prevention programs and other existing research;
— A COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, to inform the public regarding prevention and other research findings, and to inform relevant government officials and the general public, concerning the factual basis for a re-ordering of current public funding priorities toward increased war against disease, including research and education against AIDS and related conditions;
— A FUND-RAISING COMMITTEE, to solicit donations, lobby for grants, organize benefits and other fund-raising projects, spreading the financial burden by appealing to many sources;
We ask the council and committees to be responsive and accessible to public input, to include representation of all interested groups, to consider all viewpoints, and to be capable of prompt action;
We ask appropriate city officials to determine whether a suitable form of such a council already exists; if it does, we wish the city to support it actively; if not, we wish the city to seek to encourage its formation by such means as may appear proper.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION I

SUMMARY: This initiative asks "Shall we tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?" The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated portion of Route 480 known as the Embarcadero Freeway. This initiative declaration of policy will give the voters the opportunity to establish the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco regarding the proposed teardown of the Embarcadero Freeway.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION J

Shall the City replace a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if such replacement would open up the Waterfront to its citizens, improve the tax base, and create a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic?
Candidates

FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER
JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco
My age is 42

My qualifications for office are: The Bill of Rights guarantees that every person accused of a crime shall have the effective assistance of counsel. Whether an individual is rich or poor, that person is entitled to a competent and dedicated attorney.

In San Francisco it is the duty of the Public Defender to uphold this sacred right. In every case, we provide the client with the best defense under the law.

In the last 7 years, my outstanding staff has done this work with the highest degree of professionalism. In the next 4 years, that same strong, professional, independent and ethical representation will continue.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:

Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John D. Bardis, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Yang Brown, 850-40th Ave., Housewife
Sala Burton, 8 Shatt Blvd., Representative In Congress, 5th District
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Clerk
Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Artist/Community Organizer
Brian Getty, 55 22nd Ave., Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson, Sheriff of San Francisco
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., International Vice President, ILGWU
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for Children & Youth
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070 26th Ave., Executive Assistant to Sala Burton M.C.
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Community Health Director
Linda Ann Post, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative
Jim Rivaldo, 430 Steiner St., Political Consultant
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Member, SF Community College District
Governor Board
Yori Wood, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel W. Walker, 562 Campbell Ave., President — Local 250-A Transport
Workers Union of America
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilitas Ave., Minister
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor
C. R. Zancan, 1966 Pacific Ave., Auto Repair Proprietor

FOR ASSESSOR
SAM DUSA

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor

My qualifications for office are: I was elected your Assessor in 1978 and re-elected in 1982. My years in the Assessor’s Office were spent in a professional appraisal capacity personnel and administration. I have two university degrees, the coveted MAI designation, and am the recipient of a special Congressional Advisory Board award from the United States Congress. I have served in an advisory capacity, both nationally and internationally, in property tax administration and will continue to serve the taxpayers of the City and County of San Francisco in dealing with Article XII-A of the State Constitution. My community involvement includes participation in cultural, civic business organizations.

Sam Duca

The sponsors for Sam Duca are:

Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 740 Broadway St., Investor
Eugene E. Friend, 2980 Lake St., Investor
Nancy Pelosi, 40 Presidio Ter., Housewife and volunteer in politics
Walter H. Shorenstein, 740 El Camino del Mar, Chairman, Milton Meyer & Co.
Stanley Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Emma W. Louie, 1257 Jackson St., Housewife
Alfred S. Wilsey, 2390 Jackson St., Ch. of Exec. Comm. of Diversified
Holding Co.
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hindley Wells, Physician
Gerson Bakar, 2310 Hyde St., Investor
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management
Jane McLuggage Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired
Joseph C. Ongco, Sr., 866 Fuxon Ave., Publicity Dept. — S.F. Giants
James A. Scaterina, 101 St. Elmo Way, Chairman of the Board, Scaterina York Co.
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher
Frances May McNeer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Recreation & Park Commissioner
Frederick F. Campagnoli, 2601 Larkin St., Attorney
Betty Brooks, 1538 26th St., Field Representative
Jess Teruel Esteva, 5258 Diamond Heights Blvd., Businessman
Cyril I. Magnin, 994 California St., Merchant
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John H. Swanson, 145 Lake Merced Hill South, Bowling Alley Owner
Frances G. Goldman, 745 El Camino Del Mar, Child Guidance
Irma M. Bernardo, 2182 34th Ave., Housewife
Leo J. Murphy, 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Charles M. Cunningham, 475 Connecticut St., Self Employed
Lawrence V. Eppinette, 815 Fell St., Conf. Secretary
Mary M. Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Volunteer & Homemaker
Elizabeth R. Duca, 16 Wawona St., Homemaker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Application for Absentee Ballot
is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

Name
Residence Address
Mailing Address
Signature

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

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

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:
The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.
This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter en route to the polls have not been considered.
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CREDITS
The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The active members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Suzanne Guyette, Mary Ann Aronson, Mary Martin and Tom Owen.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 5, 1986.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
• are a U.S. Citizen,
• are at least 18 years of age on election day,
• are a resident of California, and
• are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don't want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, such as this one, you can only choose among the candidates of your party.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Senator, State Assemblymember, County Central Committee, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your polling place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don't know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can't help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 3, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I've written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in”. If you want to and don't know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

Q—Can a worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
• Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
• mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see enclosed card).

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

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
• your home address,
• the address where you want the ballot mailed,
• then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail by absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 3, 1986.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS CONCERNING VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

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

A 第一步
请特别注意
如有错误，请向助理员换取新选票。

STEP 1

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

B 第一步
请双手持票向自动機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2

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

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

C 第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

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

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

D 第三步
請把帶鉤之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

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

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y págalala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate’s name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person’s name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the “YES” or after the word “NO”.

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO ÚNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido. Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escribe el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SI" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borradas están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvalo al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

選民須知：

投票時選票的任何其他候選人，請在選票上箭頭所指之候選人名打孔。如果有兩個或以上
候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上箭頭所指之所有候選人中，選擇你要投票的候選人打孔，但不
要超過要選舉的候選人數。

投票合格的非候選人候選人，請在非候選候選人選票信封所提供的預定空位上寫下數候選人
所競選的職位和候選人的姓名。

投票任何選項，請在選票上箭頭所指之"YES"或"NO"字標打孔。

選票上若有顯著污點或損壞者，選票作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔了，撕裂或弄壞了，或損壞了非候選候選人的選票信封，則
把該選票遞交給選舉的監票員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

請在下頁開始投票

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(GOBERNADOR)</th>
<th>Governor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HUGH G. BAGLEY</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hombre de Negocios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK L. THOMAS</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EILEEN ANDERSON</td>
<td>Singer and Dancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cantante y Bailarina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES &quot;CHUCK&quot; PINEDA, JR.</td>
<td>State Hearing Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oficial de Audiencias Estatales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM BRADLEY</td>
<td>Mayor, City of Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alcalde, Ciudad de Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>投票1人</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(VICEGOBERNADOR)</th>
<th>Lieutenant Governor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEO T. McCARTHY</td>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicegobernador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(SECRETARIO DE ESTADO)</th>
<th>Secretary of State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARCH FONG EU</td>
<td>Secretary of State of California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretario de Estado de California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>投票1人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
(CONTRALOR) 主計官
Controller

JOHN GARAMENDI
State Senator, Businessman
Senador Estatal, Hombre de Negocios 州參議員，商人
107 ➔

ALISTER McALISTER
Assemblyman, 18th District, California Legislature
Asambleista, Distrito 18, Legislatura de California 加州議員
109 ➔

GRAY DAVIS
Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature
Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Legislatura de California 加州議員
111 ➔

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

113 ➔

(TESORERO) 司庫
Treasurer

JESSE M. UNRUH
California State Treasurer
Tesorero del Estado de California 加州財務長官
118 ➔

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

120 ➔

(PROCURADOR GENERAL) 司法廳長
Attorney General

JOHN VAN DE KAMP
Attorney General, California
Procurador General, California 加州檢察總長
125 ➔

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

127 ➔
### Member, State Board of Equalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BERT DE LOTTO</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraiser/Broker/Farmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasador/Intermediario/Agricultor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLIS</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization, Second District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### United States Senator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Scientist-Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profesor-Especialista en Ciencias Politicas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES GREENE</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Senior Legislature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro, Legislatura Superior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRIAN LANTZ</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultor de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALAN CRANSTON</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senador de Estados Unidos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT J. BANUELOS</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Technician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Técnico de Comunicación</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### Democratic Party

### PRIMARY ELECTION

### UNITED STATES SENATOR

JUNE 3, 1986
## United States Representative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BARBARA BOXER</td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of Congress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro del Congreso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JAMES LEGARE</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Truck Operator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conductor de Camión</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Write-in) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 162

## State Senator

(There is no contest for State Senator in this District)

(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal)

本區沒有州參議員選舉。

## Member of the State Assembly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WILLIE L. BROWN, JR.</td>
<td></td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislator/Lawyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislador/Abogado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Write-in) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 180
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CATHERINE DODD</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNE BELISLE DALEY</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RON HUBERMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERENCE HALLINAN</td>
<td>Attorney-at-Law</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESSE J. IVY</td>
<td>Senior Deputy Sherriff</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSAN J. BIERMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAR JACIKE</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNETH JOHN AZBILL</td>
<td>American Indian Lawyer</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td>Community Service — Attorney</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WADE “SPEEDY” WOODS</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONY KILROY</td>
<td>Neighborhood Environmentalist</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES LEGARE</td>
<td>Motor Truck Operator</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLE MIGDEN</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLEN CHATIN</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LULU M. CARTER</td>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN): To vote for candidates not on the ballot, write the name and office title on the long side of your ballot.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>DANIEL NUSBAUM</td>
<td>211 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEANNE BAIRD</td>
<td>213 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>215 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>217 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asessor</td>
<td>SAM DUCA</td>
<td>222 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>224 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>229 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>231 →</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Measures Submitted to Vote of Voters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td>VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $850,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 236, NO 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td>COMMUNITY PARKLANDS ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for acquiring, developing, improving, rehabilitating, or restoring urgently needed local and regional parks, beaches, recreational areas and facilities, and historical resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 239, NO 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td>WATER CONSERVATION AND WATER QUALITY BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $150,000,000 to provide funds for water conservation, groundwater recharge and drainage water management, and clarifies language in the Clean Water Bond Law of 1984.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 242, NO 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td>DEPOSIT OF PUBLIC MONEYS IN CREDIT UNIONS. Authorizes Legislature to provide for deposit of public moneys in any credit union. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect. Legislation already approved implementing measure could result in greater interest income to state and local governments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 246, NO 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. Provides exception to property tax limit when acquisition or improvement of real property approved by two-thirds of voters. Fiscal Impact: By itself, measure has no fiscal effect. No increase can occur in local property tax rate unless bond issue is approved by two-thirds vote. State costs for tax relief programs could increase. State income tax revenues could decline as taxpayers deduct greater amounts for property tax payments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 249, NO 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td>ALLOCATION OF VEHICLE LICENSE FEE TAXES TO COUNTIES AND CITIES. Requires allocation of Vehicle License Fee taxes to local governments. Fiscal Impact: Measure would have no direct fiscal effect. Prevents Legislature from changing the law to take vehicle license fees away from counties and cities. Measure would not prevent state reducing other forms of aid to local governments or changing existing formula for dividing vehicle license fee revenues between counties and cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 254, NO 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td>LEGISLATORS’ AND JUDGES’ RETIREMENT SYSTEMS. Limits retirement allowances for persons entering Legislators’ and Judges’ Retirement Systems after January 1, 1987. Fiscal Impact: Minor savings to state in future years if rate of inflation exceeds increase in salaries paid to current officeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 258, NO 259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1986. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $800,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en la compra de granjas y casas para los veteranos de California.

ACTA DE TERRENOS DE PARQUES DE LA COMUNIDAD DE 1986. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición, desarrollo, mejora, rehabilitación o restauración urgentemente necesitada por parques, playas, áreas e instalaciones de recreación, y los recursos históricos locales y regionales.

LEY DE BONOS PARA LA CONSERVACIÓN DE AGUA Y CONTROL DE LA CALIDAD DEL AGUA DE 1986. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $800,000,000 para la conservación del agua, resbasteconcimientos de aguas subterráneas, manejo apropiado del agua de drenaje, y clarificación del lenguaje en la Ley de Bonos para Agua Limpia de 1984.

DEPÓSITO DE FONDOS PÚBLICOS EN COOPERATIVAS DE CRÉDITO. Autoriza a la Legislatura para que disponga el depósito de fondos públicos en cualquier cooperativa de crédito.

FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD: Dispone exenciones a los límites de impuestos a la propiedad en el caso de adquisición o mejoramiento de la propiedad inmueble al ser vendida por dos terceras partes de los vendedores. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. La legislación ya aprobada que pone en efecto la medida podría resolver en mayor ingreso de intereses para los gobiernos locales y estatal.

ASIGNACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS POR PAGOS DE LICENCIA DE VEHÍCULOS A LOS CONDUCE Y CIUDADES. Requiere la asignación a los gobiernos locales de los impuestos recaudados en pagos por Licencia de Vehículo. Impacto Fiscal: La medida no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo. Impide que la Legislatura pueda cambiar la ley para tomar los fondos provenientes de licencias de vehículos de las ciudades y condados. La medida no evitará que el estado pueda reducir otras formas de asistencia a los gobiernos locales o que pueda cambiar la fórmula actual de dividir los recaudos provenientes del pago por licencia de vehículos entre los condados y ciudades.

SISTEMAS DE JUBILACIÓN DE LOS LEGISLADORES Y JUECES. Limita las pensiones de jubilación para aquellas personas que se afilien al Sistema de Jubilación de los Legislativos y Jueces después del 1er. de enero de 1987. Impacto Fiscal: Ahorros menores para el estado en años futuros si la base de inflación excede el aumento en los salarios que se pagan a los que actualmente ocupan cargos.

PUBLICIDAD DE INVESTIGACIÓN DE LUCES. No se introducirán cambios significativos en la legislación actual.

PUBLICIDAD DE INVESTIGACIÓN DE LUCES. Publicidad de investigaciones y publicidad de investigaciones de luz.
## MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

### STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Nonpartisan Offices. Prohibits a political party or party central committee from endorsing, supporting, or opposing a candidate for nonpartisan office. Fiscal Impact: No direct state or local government fiscal impact.</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Property Taxation. Disasters. Base-year value of property damaged or destroyed by disaster transferable to comparable replacement property in same county. Fiscal Impact: Local property tax revenues would decrease by an unknown amount. County assessor and tax collectors would have nonsignificant higher administrative costs. State would replace revenues lost by school and community college districts. State income tax revenues could increase due to lower property tax deductions on replacement properties. These state costs and revenues cannot be estimated.</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Multiple Defendants Tort Damage Liability. Plaintiff's non-economic damage recovery limited to defendant's liability based on defendant's percentage of fault. Fiscal Impact: Substantial savings to state and local governments. Savings could be several millions of dollars a year, varying significantly from year to year.</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>County Correctional Facility Capital Expenditure Bond Act of 1986. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county correctional facilities and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of four hundred ninety-five million dollars ($495,000,000).</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgements against the City?</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Proposition C has been removed from the ballot by the Board of Supervisors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

**CARGOS NO PARTIDARIOS.** Prohibe a un partido político o un comité central de un partido político patrocinar, apoyar o oponerse a un candidato a un cargo no partidario. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo a los gobiernos estatal e locales.

**IMPUTOS A LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE DESATENDIDA.** El valor en año base de propiedad inmueble dañada o destruida por un desastre puede ser transferible a propiedad inmueble de reemplazo comparable en el mismo condado. Impacto Fiscal: Los rellenos provenientes de impuestos locales a la propiedad disminuirían en una cantidad despreciable. Los tesoreros y recolectores de impuestos del condado tendrán insignificantes costos administrativos más altos. El estado reemplazará los rebotes de los distritos escolares y de colegios de educación superior de departamentos de cobro. Los reclamos del impuesto estatal a la renta podrían aumentar debido a menores deducciones en el impuesto a la propiedad en las propiedades de reemplazo. Estos costos y rellenos estatales no pueden ser calculados.

**RESPONSABILIDAD CIVIL DE MULTIPLES PARTES DEMANDADAS EN JUICIOS DE AGRARIOS INDEMNIZABLES.** Limita la indemnización que puede recibir el demandante por daños en económicos a la responsabilidad del demandado basándose en el concepto de la culpabilidad del demandado. Impacto Fiscal: Ahorrará sustanciales para los gobiernos estatal y local. Los ahorros podrían ser algunos millones de dólares al año, que variarían significativamente de año en año.

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA INSTALACIONES CORREccionales DE CONDADOS DE 2006.** Esta acta sigue las recomendaciones de los profesionales y también resuelve impuestos corregionales de los condados y la elección del mantenimiento diferido en las mismas en conformidad con una emisión de bonos por conceptos noventa y cinco millones de dólares ($455,000,000).

**PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONTADO**

**278 SI 贷成**

"¿Deberá la Ciudad establecer una oficina de administración del riesgo y un despacho de investigación y administración de demandas, para estudiar y reducir el riesgo de plazos y sentencias contra la Ciudad?"

**279 NO 反對**

"Si la ciudad estableció una oficina de administración del riesgo y un despacho de investigación y administración de demandas, no se mejorarían los plazos y sentencias contra la ciudad.

**281 SI 贷成**

"¿Debería autorizar el Comprador a firmar contratos por menos de $50,000 sin la aprobación del Jefe Administrativo y a permitir que sus agentes firmen contratos en su lugar?"

**282 NO 反對**

"No se debe autorizar al comprador a firmar contratos por menos de $50,000 sin la aprobación del jefe de administración y a permitir que sus agentes firmen contratos en su lugar.

**C**

正式撤消

**OFICIALMENTE ELIMINADA**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**VOTER SELECTION CARD**

**PRIMARY ELECTION**
**JUNE 3, 1986**

**POLLS ARE OPEN**
**FROM**
**7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.**

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42 236 237</td>
<td>A 278 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 239 240</td>
<td>B 281 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 242 243</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 246 247</td>
<td>D 288 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 249 250</td>
<td>E 292 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 254 255</td>
<td>F 296 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 258 259</td>
<td>G 300 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 262 263</td>
<td>H 303 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 266 267</td>
<td>I 307 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 270 271</td>
<td>J 310 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 273 274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See reverse side for candidate selection.
VOTER SELECTION CARD

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>County Central Committee*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>5.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td>6.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>7.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(If any)</td>
<td>8.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>9.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate</td>
<td>10.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. Public Inst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to your sample ballot for the number of County Central Committee members to be elected. The number varies with each district.

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR PROPOSITIONS.
PROPOSITIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

288 SI 贷成
289 NO 反对

"¿Debería la Ciudad transferir la administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil a un departamento de administración de personal que tenga poder para cambiar las normas del servicio civil que al presente constan en la Carta Constitucional?"

292 SI 贷成
293 NO 反对

"¿Debería la Ciudad negar o revocar cualquier permiso de construcción para edificar en la Represa Balboa en las Avenidas Océano y Pórtico en los próximos tres años?"

296 SI 贷成
297 NO 反对

"¿Debería la Ciudad prohibir la defensa remunerada efectuada por oficiales de la Ciudad y legisladores estatales ante cualquier comisión de la Ciudad, y limitar la cantidad con la que una persona puede contribuir para un candidato a una oficina municipal en $500?"

300 SI 贷成
301 NO 反对

"¿Debería ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el boicotear las empresas que tengan mayor vinculación con la segregación racial sudafricana?"

303 SI 贷成
304 NO 反对

"¿Debería ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el apoyar a todas las organizaciones apropiadas, públicas y privadas, para establecer y mantener un Consejo para la Investigación y Educación sobre S.I.D.A. (A.I.D.S.)?"

307 SI 贷成
308 NO 反对

"¿Debería ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el demostrar al Autopista Embarcadero?"

310 SI 贷成
311 NO 反对

"¿Debería ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el repasar parte de la Autopista Embarcadero, si esto aumentará el acceso del público a la zona de los muelles y mejorará el tráfico?"
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT — An official list of candidates and propositions.

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

VOTE BY MAIL — See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

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

MEASURE — Another name for proposition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

COMPENSATED ADVOCACY — Compensated means being paid for doing something; Advocacy means speaking or writing on behalf of someone else. Proposition F concerns the issue of compensated advocacy.

RISK MANAGEMENT — This field covers two areas: (1) deciding on when it is better to buy insurance and when it is better to be self insured or uninsured, then shopping for the insurance; (2) identifying hazardous conditions on one's property and seeing that they are corrected so that liability and damage claims will be avoided. Proposition A concerns risk management.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.
2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).
3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.
PROPOSITION A

Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgments against the City?

YES 278

NO 279

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Consultants hired by the Chief Administrative Officer are available to City departments that have questions about "risk management", such as how to keep damage claims to a minimum and how to find the best insurance rates. In some cases, the departments use these consultants. In other cases, the departments make their own decisions. When damage claims are filed, some are handled by the City Attorney's Office and some are handled by City departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would amend the City Charter to create an Office of Risk Management, under the Chief Administrative Officer. The office would set risk management guidelines for all City departments, boards and commissions. Proposition A would also establish a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration in the City Attorney's Office. The bureau would be responsible for investigating, evaluating and processing all damage claims made against the City, except those claims made against the Public Utilities Commission and the Police Department. The bureau would also have the power to investigate potential suits against the City and to make settlements within dollar limits to be set by ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer and a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want damage claims and risk management decisions to continue to be handled the way they are now.

Controller's Statement on "A"

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not affect the cost of government. However as a result of its potential future application and the exemption of certain employees from the civil service provisions of the Charter, costs may be affected in an amount presently indeterminate."

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On March 10 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted "No."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 71
VOTE YES ON A

Last fiscal year, over 6,400 claims and law suits were filed against the City, costing us more than $10 million in settlements. I believe that it is time to change the way we handle our claims, secure insurance, prevent risks and settle legitimate claims against the City.

Last summer, we appointed a task force of citizens, under San Francisco Bar President Jerry Falk, to make recommendations on how to streamline our procedures and save money at the same time. The present system is very slow, costly, and inefficient.

Currently, all claims are investigated by the department involved. The City Attorney cannot act on any claim until the department is ready. This results in delay and duplication of effort and increased costs. A centralized and accountable Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney would be more efficient, cost-effective, and professional.

It would enable the City to settle many claims quickly, before litigation is begun, saving the City the costs of defending itself in court and lowering the average cost of settling a case.

This can be accomplished without creating new jobs by simply moving into one office the city positions presently scattered throughout the government.

Vote "Yes" on A. Reduce the cost of City government.

Adoption of this measure would also formally establish responsibility for Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer, where it has been unofficially since 1978. With this strengthened authority, the Risk Management Office would be responsible for the gathering of claims data on a City-wide basis, the creation of incentives for both reducing the possibility for injuries and damage and the number of claims for each department, the coordination of insurance purchasing and specific suggestions to avoid and reduce risk.

This amendment is presented with the recommendation of the Mayor's Task Force on Claims and Judgments, the Chief Administrative Officer, City Attorney, the President of the San Francisco Bar Association, and the President of the Lawyers' Club of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Each year the City spends almost $10 million to settle damage claims. It is estimated that the overall costs to the City for all risk-related activities exceeds $125 million a year. It is time for action to be taken to reduce these huge expenditures. This charter amendment is designed to do just that.

Claims Investigation and Adjustment

Right now, the City claims investigation process is decentralized and largely unorganized. Each department investigates its own claims. Investigators may or may not be specially trained for their duties. There is no uniformity of investigation procedure or claims reporting. In only a few departments do investigators contact injured parties within days of an accident in order to settle the claim quickly and economically.

This amendment will create a claims investigation and adjustment bureau in the Office of the City Attorney. Claims investigation and adjustment activities will be centralized, economized and made much more efficient. The new bureau will be able to respond immediately to accidents and claims, providing quick compensation to deserving persons while at the same time producing a prompt, professional investigation. This reform is greatly needed.

Risk Management

Presently, there is no overall plan for the management of the City's risk exposure: insurance purchasing, avoidance of industrial accidents, gathering data on accident patterns, etc. Again, risk management as a function is fragmented among the various City departments. As a consequence, departments cannot develop the necessary expertise to manage themselves to reduce risk-related costs.

This measure will establish a risk manager under the Chief Administrative Officer. For the first time, overall City planning will be possible in order to control risk. Departments will be told what activities are producing injuries or damage and advised on corrective measures. Private industry has been utilizing risk managers of this type for years. It is time that the City did the same.

This amendment will reduce the cost of government and insure a more efficient delivery of City services to all San Franciscans. We urge you to give it your unqualified support.

Board of Supervisors

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

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This charter amendment was proposed by a citizens' task force appointed by Mayor Feinstein. Its mission was to propose ways of reducing the number and financial costs of claims and lawsuits against the City.

The amendment has two principal features. The first is to centralize within the City Attorney's office the investigation of claims filed against city departments. This will allow for improved training and supervision of the investigators, who presently are scattered throughout city government. The result will be more efficient, cost-effective and professional investigation of claims. By improving the quality of claims investigation, the City can identify those claims which have merit and attempt to reach early—and less costly—settlements. Meritless claims will be denied with greater confidence that if suit is filed it can be defended successfully.

The second major feature of the amendment will establish a Risk Management office under the Chief Administrative Officer. Risk management is a concept widely used in private business. Risk managers are professionals skilled in reducing the overall cost of claims. The Risk Manager would be responsible for coordinating the City's insurance program, data collection, and correcting problems within the City which lead to claims. The Risk Manager would review those claims which have been filed against the City. Where it appears that an unsafe condition or practice has led to a claim, the Risk Manager would suggest to the affected department that corrective measures be taken. Reports to the Mayor and to the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors of the recommended corrections and the actions taken would ensure that the various departments will be responsive.

The City cannot eliminate claims and lawsuits against it. But it can limit its exposure by managing the claims process more effectively. This measure will reduce injuries and reduce claims, and that is good for everyone.

Jerome B. Falk, Jr.
Chair, Mayor's Task Force on Claims and Judgments Against the City

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, May 31, 1986

12 Noon State Senate, Assembly, Congress and State Propositions
1:00 Proposition A—Risk Management & Claims
1:15 Proposition B—Purchaser & Contracts
1:30 Proposition D—Civil Service
2:15 Proposition E—Balboa Reservoir
2:30 Proposition F—Compensated Advocacy
3:00 Proposition G—Apartheid
3:20 Proposition H—AIDS
3:30 Propositions I, J—Embarcadero Freeway
3:50 Statewide Candidates

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

Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchaser must get the approval of the Chief Administrative Officer before signing certain contracts for more than $15,000. Only the voters may change that dollar limit. The Purchaser must personally sign every contract that comes through his office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would raise the limit on contracts requiring the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval to $50,000. It would also allow the Board of Supervisors to change that limit by ordinance. Proposition B would also permit the Purchaser to name certain people in his office to sign contracts on his behalf.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval only on contracts for more than $50,000. You also want the Purchaser to be able to name certain people in his office to be able to sign contracts on his behalf.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to require the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval on contracts for more than $15,000. You also want him to sign all contracts himself.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 3 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON B!

The City's Charter requires that a permanent, non-elected City official, the Chief Administrative Officer, review all purchases and contracts above $15,000. Of course, CAO approval of major contracts is very important. But, due to inflation, the number of contracts that have to go to the CAO for approval is always increasing. Today there are too many documents requiring CAO approval. This slows down the purchasing process, occupies staff time—and ultimately costs the City money. Proposition B will raise the CAO approval level to $50,000, and help the City to improve the efficiency of its purchasing operations.

The City's budget includes more than $250 million for purchases on tens of thousands of contracts. At the current $15,000 review limit, the CAO must approve thousands of documents every year—a costly, time-consuming process. In the long run the City loses money because of the inordinate length of time required to complete all the paperwork.

An adjustment must be made to remove the smaller contracts from this cumbersome process. Review and approval of contracts under $50,000 should be under the responsibility of the City Purchaser, a highly trained and experienced professional, who reports directly to the CAO. By changing the present $15,000 to $50,000, it will be possible for the CAO to give each document that comes to him the attention it requires. And, by placing its orders and paying its bills faster, both the City and businesses will benefit—especially small business and those owned by minorities and women.

Proposition B will allow future adjustments to the limit to be made by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility will ensure the City's ability to adjust to inflation and changes in the market.

This amendment comes to you with the recommendation of auditors, controllers, bankers, and others who exercise top fiduciary responsibility within their own organizations.

VOTE YES ON B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will make essential changes to update the purchasing and payment procedures under the Chief Administrative Officer. These measures are necessary and desirable because they will save the City money by significantly increasing our management efficiency.

Right now, the City loses because it takes too long for contracts to be reviewed and payments okayed, which means that early payment incentives go unutilized. The CAO has to approve every contract greater than $15,000—and with City purchases last year over $250 million, the paperwork logjam is vast and overwhelming.

An increase in the review limit from $15,000 to $50,000 will make an adequate adjustment for inflation—$50,000 now is only about $15,000 in 1967 dollars. Proposition B will also enable the City Purchaser, who reports to the CAO, to maximize potential savings through early payments by designating appropriate personnel to approve contracts up to $50,000. These “Good Business” amendments are consistent with private sector practices and should be incorporated by the CAO in the City's best interests.

Finally, Proposition B will give the City the ability to respond quickly to changes in the market place by allowing changes in the CAO review limit by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility is necessary to ensure that in the future we will not lose money because of institutional rigidity. Control is maintained with the necessity of Board action and Mayoral approval to adjust the review limit, and this same feature will allow for change when desired.

Vote yes on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE... DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
PROPOSITION D

Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the civil service system of the City of San Francisco. The structure of the civil service system and certain rules governing its operation are written into the Charter and can only be changed by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would make major changes. A Department of Personnel Administration would run the Civil Service system and would be able to change rules with Commission approval. Major features of Proposition D are described below. The complete charter amendment is printed in this voters’ handbook.

Department of Personnel Administration

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Certain civil service rules governing the general operation of the system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs, are written into the Charter and carried out by the Civil Service Commission. Only the voters can change these rules.

THE PROPOSAL: A department of Personnel Administration would be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. A Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor would run the Department. Certain rules governing examination, selection and appointment would be taken out of the Charter. The Personnel Director would be able to change these rules with the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

Civil Service Commission

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the general operation of the civil service system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs. The Commission also hears and decides appeals on civil service matters.

THE PROPOSAL: The Civil Service Commission would no longer be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. The Commission could investigate the operation of the system, approve rule changes proposed by the Personnel Director, and hear and decide appeals only on claims of job discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest.

Employee Relations

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors appoints an Employee Relations Director to negotiate contracts with City employees; the Board approves all contracts.

THE PROPOSAL: The Mayor or his or her agent would negotiate with City employees; the Board of Supervisors would still approve all contracts.

What your vote means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing civil service system.
Controller's Statement on "D"

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not directly affect the cost of government, as it removes many civil service policy setting functions from the Charter and an independent Civil Service Commission and transfers responsibility for personnel matters, including labor negotiations, to the Mayor.

"As a product of its inherent flexibility and possible future application, costs could be affected or savings realized in amounts presently indeterminate but probably substantial."

How "D" Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative Charter amendment rewriting the civil service provisions of the Charter had qualified for the June ballot.

Robert Bradford, Jonathan Bulkeley, Lee Munsen and Mary Hilton, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 36,049 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 25,027 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. Consistent with the City's and County's affirmative action goals, no applicant or employee shall be selected, appointed, reduced in rank, removed or in any way favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, union activities, political affiliation or sexual orientation.

(b) The purpose of the civil service system is to obtain for the city and county the best qualified persons to fill city and county positions in a timely and economical manner, using professional, fair and equitable personnel selection and personnel management practices with consideration of the following merit principles:

1. Recruiting, selecting and advancing employees on the basis of their ability, knowledge, skills and performance relevant to the work to be performed.

2. Establishing equitable and adequate compensation, as provided elsewhere in this charter.

3. Training employees, as needed, to promote productivity and high quality performance and to facilitate career development.

4. Retaining employees during good service and separating employees for good cause.

5. Assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration, with protections for their privacy and constitutional rights; and assuring equal employment opportunity, based on the person's ability to do the job.

6. Assuring that employees are protected against coercion for political purposes and are prohibited from using their official authority for their personal benefit, or for affecting the outcome of an election or a nomination for office.

(c) This charter does not limit the power of departments, agencies, or other subdivisions of the city and county in their exercise of management prerogatives including but not limited to:

1. Directing employees in the performance of their duties;

2. Hiring, promoting, transferring and assigning employees from those qualified;

3. Classifying positions in accordance with Section 3.660;

4. Disciplining employees;

5. Laying off employees because of lack of work, lack of funds or other reasonable cause; and

6. Determining the mission of its departments and divisions, and its budget, organization, the number of its employees, and the numbers, types, classifications and grades of positions or employees assigned to an organization unit, work project, shift or tour of duty, and the methods and technology of performing its work.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. No person shall in any way be favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, age, religion, national origin or other non-merit factors. Nothing in this section shall in any way be construed to the contrary in subsection (a) or any other provisions of the charter. It shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, consistent with a policy of acquiring qualified personnel for the service of the City and County, to encourage the hiring of blind persons. It shall further be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that no otherwise qualified blind person shall be discriminated against in examination, re-examination, appointment, re-appointment, waiver of eligibility for appointment or re-appointment, promotion or demotion in any class, subclass or position in the civil service unless it is determined by the civil service commission to classify, and from time to time it may reclassify places of employment in the civil service the duties of which may be efficiently performed by qualified blind persons and to conduct appropriate examinations which will fairly test the capacity of blind persons as well as sighted persons to perform such duties.

2.203-2 Employee Relations Director

(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3.510 of this charter, the employee relations director shall be appointed by the board of supervisors and shall hold office at the pleasure of said board.

3.102 Employee Relations

(a) It shall be the duty of the mayor to meet and confer with employee representatives on behalf of the city and county and all its constituent boards, commissions, departments and agencies as required by applicable law. These duties may be performed by a designee of the mayor who shall serve at the pleasure of the mayor. Nothing herein shall limit the mayor from contracting for the performance of these duties.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the mayor shall submit all memoranda of understanding or ordinances to be enacted pursuant to Article VIII of this charter to the board of supervisors for its approval or rejection.

3.660 Commission; Composition; Meetings

There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to service of the city and county shall have the general powers and duties set forth in section 3.661.

The civil service commission shall consist of five members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and this charter section as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years, beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981 and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years, beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms of the commissioners who shall hold office on the effective date of this section as amended shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date. Thereupon, the mayor shall appoint.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Vote YES and join 34,000 San Franciscans who signed petitions to get this crucial reform on the ballot. "D" clears the way to modernize Civil Service so that it is fair and efficient. The present system is a 50-year conglomeration of rules that tie the City's hands—

— A protest by one applicant can hold up hiring for an entire job classification for months—even years.

— Often tests cannot be given frequently enough to maintain current tests of qualified employees. This leads to delays and temporary appointments that make hiring top candidates all but impossible.

— Appointments to jobs are restricted to the top three names on a list even though more than three people have the same score!

— Many provisions are out of date. Some deal with hiring during the Korean War. Others limit our ability to carry out affirmative action.

“D” would remove archaic rules from the Charter so they could be changed as the times require—subject to meet and confer and public hearings. Job tests could be expedited; hiring and promotions speeded up; opportunities opened to women and minorities.

Specifically, Proposition D:
1) Creates a Department of Personnel Administration at no additional cost. Like other U.S. cities, day-to-day administration would be the responsibility of a director, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Supervisors.

2) Makes the Civil Service Commission the oversight body to set policy and hear appeals. Rulings would have to be within 60 days, eliminating endless delays.

3) Moves the office of labor relations from the Supervisors to the Mayor, who must make the tough-minded decisions to balance the budget. Never again could the Board give labor $27 million for “comparable worth.”

This reform is the product of years of work with SPUR, League of Women Voters, Chamber of Commerce. Members of the Board of Supervisors could have put the reform on the ballot last year but bowed to some labor leaders, and 34,000 San Franciscans had to do the job for them.

Proposition D will enable City government to work better for you. Vote YES.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON 'D'

Proposition D is a complex proposition with a simple goal: remove the archaic restrictions on the hiring, promotion, or firing of city employees and bring San Francisco’s personnel system into the modern age.

Archaic is the only way to describe a system that keeps equally qualified people from competing for a job, and that takes months—sometimes years—to fill vacancies.

For example, if 50 people score equally high on a competitive examination, shouldn't they all have a chance for any job for which they are eligible? Not under the current system, which requires complicated tie-breaking rules not at all related to a person's qualifications or abilities.

Or what about being able to hire the best person available for a given job? Currently, eligibility lists are frozen for two years and every person on each list, including the lowest-scoring, must be offered a job before the highest-scoring person on a more recent list. Private businesses couldn't function saddled with such absurdities.

Proposition D cuts through the red tape. It creates a modern personnel department, with a director responsible for carrying out rules to ensure fairness and efficiency. Accountable to the Mayor, the director would be selected from a list provided by the Civil Service Commission, and subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.

The Civil Service Commission remains an independent body, with the right to approve new personnel rules and hold hearings on abuses. Also under 'D', negotiations with employee unions would be under the Mayor, subject to approval by the Supervisors, providing checks and balances in balancing our budget.

With greater accountability and continued checks and balances, Proposition D will open the way to more efficient government in our City.

Bill Maher, Supervisor
Louise Renne, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON 'D'

Proposition D is a necessary reform to the City's Civil System. As the City's Chief Administrative Officer for almost ten years, I have found that quality employee hiring is difficult and the process causes long delays.

The current system is:
• inflexible. The City cannot hire and promote the most qualified persons.
• inefficiently administered by a commission. Other large (continued)
cities do not have such a bureaucratic process.

* antiquated. Civil service rules represent practices of the 1950s rather than the 1980s.

The new system:

* allows the Mayor to appoint an effective personnel director, who controls administration and procedures.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

It's 1986 and we're still trying to manage City business as if it were 1932. As heads of City departments, charged with the daily responsibility of putting out fires, fighting crime, maintaining hospitals, parks, libraries and providing other essential services, we know from bitter experience about shortcomings of the existing Civil Service System.

Enacted with the City Charter in 1932, the system is foundering in red tape. Outdated rules are the subject of endless challenges. Tests are put off; vacancies go unfilled; promotions delayed; any appeal, however groundless, stops the process in its tracks.

Proposition D would take old procedures out of the Charter so they could be changed in an orderly process by the Civil Service Commission, which also would hear appeals.

Day-to-day administration of the tests—the content, scoring, all the myriad details of managing a complex system, would be put into a modern, highly professional personnel office. Tests would be speeded up. Hiring would keep pace with need. Promotions would be on the basis of competence. High performance would be the standard. Discipline could be imposed with working rights fully protected, and women and minorities would be assured equal opportunity.

Proposition D will help improve management and the quality of City services. Vote Yes on D.

Frank Jordan, Chief of Police
Emmet Condon, Fire Chief
Don Birr, Director, Public Works
Mary Burns, General Manager, Recreation & Park
John Frantz, City Librarian
Eugene Gartland, Director, Port
Marvin Getzinger, Purchaser
Wilbur Hamilton, Executive Director, Redevelopment Agency
Claire Inaacs, Director, Arts Commission
Ray King, Director, Parking Authority
Dean Macris, Director, City Planning
Grant Dickins, Director, Human Rights Commission
Rudy Norden, General Manager, PUC
Joyce Ream, Director, Aging
Ed Sarofield, General Manager, Social Services
Thelma Shelley, Managing Director, War Memorial
Moin So, Executive Director, Community Development
Louis Turpin, Director of Airport
Dr. David Werdegard, Director, Health Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The hiring practices outlined in San Francisco City Charter have been virtually unchanged since 1931, a severe handicap in running a modern city. Proposition D is designed to streamline the charter and ensure that the rights of present city employees and candidates for city jobs are protected, while improving the hiring process itself. The initiative also builds management accountability in the city system.

Proposition D Is More Fair, More Efficient, More Economical

The day-to-day personnel functions, including hiring, will be consolidated under a Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. Decisions of the Director of Personnel on examination content and administration are final, unless a decision is stayed during the appeal process by a unanimous vote of the Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D will make it easier to modernize the many archaic Civil Service rules and procedures now included in the Charter, while maintaining a strong and independent Civil Service Commission to safeguard the merit system and protect the rights of city employees. Many detailed rules will come out of the Charter and will become personnel regulations. These regulations can then be modernized, but only through a process which includes public hearings and meet and confer sessions with the union involved. In addition, the Civil Service Commission must approve any changes or new regulations governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfer, resignation and terminations.

Proposition D Will Improve Performance And Public Confidence

The openness and fairness of the proposition will benefit everyone. Well-qualified job candidates will have a better chance of being hired, and well-qualified job holders will have a better chance of being promoted. This means generally better job performance in all departments, resulting in higher employee morale and more public confidence in city government.

Submitted by
Louis Hop Lee, President
Civil Service Commission
Lee Munson, Member Civil Service Commission and Treasurer, San Franciscans for Fair and Efficient Government
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Cities can survive only with strong management. The greatest budgetary restraint must be exercised to assure that full value is received for each tax dollar spent.

With firm limits on what it can spend and faced with a possible loss of Federal funds next year, the City must be managed with the greatest possible efficiency.

Essential to greater efficiency is the need for Civil Service reform. As members of City Commissions, we constantly confront the torturous delays and confused rules that gridlock the present system. The present system simply can’t respond to the City’s personnel needs.

Qualified applicants become frustrated and seek employment elsewhere. Promotions are blocked. Morale suffers. Temporaries fill in; overtime mounts. The ability to plan is crippled; management is weakened.

Proposition D would put the system on a business-like basis. A personnel department would handle day-to-day administration. The Civil Service Commission would be the watchdog to assure the integrity of the merit system.

This streamlined system would replace what is now inflexible and cumbersome. Testing could be accelerated; hiring made more efficient and promotions made on time. The result would be greater efficiency and elimination of costly waste.

Vote Yes on D.

Jerry E. Berg, President, Board of Permit Appeals
Henry Berman, President, Fire Commission
Mo Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Hector Chinchilla, Rent Board
Rev. Harry Chuck, Housing Authority
Dr. Arthur Coleman, President, Port Commission
Owen Davis, Police Commission
J. Edward Fleishell, Airports Commission
H. Welton Floyd, President, Public Utilities Commission
James Foster, Health Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation & Park Commission
James Fussell, President, Housing Authority
Anne Hafstead, Port Commission
Tommie Harris, Recreation & Park Commission
Tom Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Walter Jebe, Public Library Commission
Jeffrey Lee, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Philip Lee, President, Health Commission
Bruce W. Lilienthal, Small Business Advisory Commission
Jacqueline Nemenovski, President, Arts Commission
Toby Rosenblatt, President, Planning Commission
Dr. David Sanchez, President, Police Commission
Joan San Jule, Housing Authority
John Patrick Shaw, President, Parking Authority
Marjorie G. Stern, President, Public Library Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D contains civil service reform measures urged by the League of Women Voters since 1969.

Proposition D will:
—Modernize the City’s outdated personnel system by creating a Director of Personnel, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors
—Preserve the principles of merit through policies set by the Civil Service Commission
—Create a more responsive Civil Service system at no additional cost to the taxpayer

EFFICIENCY AND FLEXIBILITY

Proposition D transfers authority for day-to-day management of the City’s personnel system from the Civil Service Commission to the Director of Personnel. This will:
—Prevent hiring delays
—Ensure only the most qualified individuals are hired and promoted
—Provide City managers with more administrative flexibility

FAIRNESS FOR EMPLOYEES

Proposition D will:
—Safeguard the rights of City workers
—Protect gains made in hiring women and minorities
—Retain the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit appeals board
—Retain the ability of the City’s unions to negotiate working conditions
—Create a system that can respond quickly and fairly to the needs of City workers

Proposition D will bring the Civil Service system into the 20th century by making the Mayor accountable for the management of a system employing more than 25,000 people. Hiring by merit is still guaranteed by the Charter. Please join us in voting for this Reform!

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
Esther Marks, Past President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote Yes on Proposition D the Civil Service Modernization Initiative.

Prevent abuse of a system that was intended to serve the public and protect against favoritism. Prevent situations like this: an employee failed to report to work for a week without explanation; he was telephoned, notified by certified mail and a message left under his door; he was terminated 13 days later; he did not appeal the termination and the civil service commission up-
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held the termination. **Two months** later, the employee petitioned the commission for reinstatement. The employee got his job back, not because the process of termination was wrong but because the commission had a long standing objection to using “absent without leave” as a reason for firing.

The quality of public services is dependent upon the effectiveness of the staff who deliver them. The primary role of the civil service commission should be to facilitate recruitment and retention of the best available personnel. It must protect against favoritism and must assure that everyone has an equal and fair chance at employment.

The present system does not do that. We feel this initiative will make the system work better, for the managers, for the employees and for the public.

Vote **Yes** on Proposition D.

**John H. Jacobs**, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco government is huge, with a budget of more than $1 billion per year and 25,000 employees. It is expected to solve serious problems. This requires that the City have the ability to hire and promote talented people to do the job.

The present civil service system is so tied up in red tape that jobs remain vacant for six months to a year, and all too often someone who is not capable of doing a good job is hired. Your tax dollars are being wasted, and you are not receiving the quality of services you need and deserve.

Proposition D will modernize San Francisco’s civil service system. It separates the personnel department from the Civil Service Commission, and puts the department under the Mayor where it belongs. The Mayor is responsible for balancing the budget and delivering city services as efficiently as possible. She cannot do this unless she can find capable people to do the job. That is the task of the personnel department in any organization.

Proposition D will also insure that the independent Civil Service Commission has sufficient authority to require the personnel system to be fair in its treatment of City employees. The Commission will be able to issue subpoenas and require testimony of witnesses on investigations it conducts. Should it find that discrimination has occurred, it can issue orders that must be obeyed.

Most major American cities, and virtually all cities and counties in California, have the kind of civil service system that will be established by Proposition D. San Francisco’s present system is still mired in the past. It hobbles the ability of the City to deliver services and spend your tax dollars as efficiently as possible.

SPUR has not placed a statement in the Voter’s Handbook for any other issue over the past 15 years. We feel that Proposition D is so vital for San Francisco’s future that we are making this appeal for your support.

Vote “**YES**” on Proposition D.

SPUR—The San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Reform Initiative, will give San Francisco citizens the HIGH PERFORMANCE GOVERNMENT necessary to meet the many challenges of the future. Proposition D corrects the outdated and inflexible requirements originally written in San Francisco’s City Charter in 1931. It will eliminate the problems which prevent San Francisco’s personnel system from operating with efficiency the City’s voters and taxpayers deserve:

Proposition D insures City jobs will be filled from current lists of the most qualified employees.

Proposition D prevents ungrounded appeals from delaying for years the appointment or promotion of qualified employees.

Proposition D eliminates the repetitive tasks currently monopolizing the Civil Service Commission meetings and directs the Commission to serve as an appellate body to protect the City’s good employees.

Proposition D centralizes the day-to-day operation of the civil service system and makes the Director of Personnel responsible to the Mayor.

Proposition D simplifies the budgetary process by making the Mayor the City’s chief labor negotiator, responsible for setting working conditions within the City’s financial capacity.

Proposition D is the result of years of painstaking review by the most experienced, able and respected management experts in San Francisco. It is a plan intended to move City government out of the 1930s and equip San Francisco to enter the twenty-first century without being burdened by the red tape of the past.

After ten years of commitment to improving our City, the Mayor’s Fiscal Advisory Committee is convinced adoption of Proposition D is one of the most important issues facing the voters. **CHANGE IS LONG OVERDUE. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.**

Submitted by,
The Mayor’s Fiscal Advisory Committee

David Anacher
Jerome Anderson
Richard Blum
Charles Chapman
Arthur Cooke, Jr.
Benton Dial
James Edgar
Ruben Garcia

Robert Hayden
Walter Hoodley
John Jacobs
Michael McGill
Ellen Newman
Roy Nordman
Frank Tatum
Civil Service

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PERSONNEL MANAGERS SAY YES ON PROPOSITION D

As the personnel managers for City Departments, we are charged with the responsibility of managing the City's personnel system. The activities include examinations, hiring, training, discipline, union-management relations, affirmative action and compensation. No one knows better than we the frustrations experienced in attempting to monitor an unbelievable sequence of overlapping bureaucratic activities in attempting to get the job done.

Proposition D will bring our personnel system into line with most other public personnel systems. The improved system will create the potential for being more responsive to the needs of operating departments. It will improve labor relations by transferring this function to the executive branch of government where it belongs.

Proposition D will streamline certain routine procedures resulting in a reduction of cost and time. Under the current system delays are experienced due to lengthy appeals during which time the departments’ objectives are delayed.

Proposition D will create an atmosphere of increased accountability for department managers in the areas of affirmative action, discipline and job performance.

Proposition D has been endorsed by the San Francisco Council of Human Resource Managers, the association of over one hundred personnel managers in City government.

Proposition D strengthens merit system principles. Civil Service commissioners will have more time to enforce and protect these principles rather than being bogged down in the day-to-day activities of administration.

Proposition D will help bring about improved methods and practices in personnel administration and should result in a more competent and effective workforce which the citizens of San Francisco have a right to expect.

Alvin W. Schaaf
Personnel Director
Recreation and Park Department
Marsha Ramirez
Personnel Officer
San Francisco Port
Edward M. Gazzano
Personnel Director
Department of Health
James Horan
Senior Personnel Officer
Department of Social Services
James Ilnicki
Personnel Director
San Francisco International Airport

Andrea R. Gourdine
Manager, Bureau of Personnel & Training
Public Utilities Commission
Mori Noguchi
Senior Department Personnel Officer
Mary Smith
Senior Personnel Officer
Laguna Honda Hospital
Thelda Poteet
Senior Personnel Officer
San Francisco General Hospital
John Burke
Personnel Director
Controller’s Office

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will assist the Department of Public Works by streamlining the Civil Service process.

- Under the current system, the duration of eligible lists from 2 to 4 years hampers the Department from hiring graduates of colleges and universities on an annual basis. Consequently, many excellent candidates are not entered into the Civil Service System. Passage of the proposition will improve the quality of the pool of applicants and thereby the quality of public service given by the Department.

- The establishment of a Personnel Director to administer the day-to-day tasks of the system will speed up the decision making process to the advantage of employees and management alike.

The proposition still calls for checks and balances in that the Commission will continue to hear appeals on discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest. The Commission will act as a watchdog while leaving the general administration to the Personnel Director.

The initiative will make for an improved system for employees, management and the citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Donald Birrer
Director of Public Works

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Passage of this amendment will update our civil service system. These changes will make it comparable to other merit system agencies. Some of these changes are:

(A) removal of administrative details from the charter which inhibit timely and effective personnel actions.

The following subjects will be placed in personnel regulations:

- Protests of written questions and answers
- Protests of tentative employment lists
- Promotional examinations

- Examinations for employees on military leave
- Certification of eligibles — Rule of three
- Duration of employment lists
- Temporary employee appointments
- Temporary employee appointments
- Continues up-dating of employment lists
- Equitable treatment of job candidates with same test score.

(D) realigns responsibilities: the Civil Service Commission dealing primarily with compliance and adjudication activities (continued)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Initiative, is a long-overdue reform to streamline antiquated hiring practices in San Francisco's fifty-year-old charter. Proposition D will ensure that the best and brightest job candidates are chosen to serve our city, thus promoting excellence in job performance and helping to eliminate incompetence. This initiative builds management accountability in the city system, while giving the Civil Service Commission the independence to protect the rights of women and minorities.

A Better, More Efficient System at Less Cost

Proposition D consolidates personnel functions, including hiring, under a new Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. The Director has final authority over content of examinations given city job applicants, so more flexibility is possible in finding truly qualified candidates.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

For more than a half-century, San Francisco Mayors have abided by the employee examination, hiring and promotion policies administered by a strong and independent Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D is a deceptive and dangerous scheme that would give future Mayors and top-level bureaucrats the power to ignore competence and reward political loyalty.

Proposition D would take key Civil Service employment rules out of the City Charter and make them subject to wheeling and dealing by City Hall politicians.

There's an old saying — "if it ain't broke, don't fix it."

Civil Service has worked well for more than 50 years. Proposition D is unnecessary, ineffective and even counter-productive.

It's not just deceptive, it's dangerous.

Joseph L. Altito
Former Mayor of San Francisco
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Time and time again, different groups have put various propositions on the ballot to weaken our Civil Service System and reintroduce political patronage into City employment practices. And every time the voters have wisely rejected these schemes, no matter how cleverly they have been disguised. Proposition D is just another power grab by bureaucrats at the top in City Hall.

We’ve said NO! loud and clear in the past. Let’s say NO one more time.

Submitted by:
TAXPAYERS FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT
Thomas Scanlon
City Treasurer, Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “D”!!!

During the eight years while a member of the Board of Supervisors, I fought hard to reform the Civil Service Commission and to bring working conditions and city workers’ pay equitable to both workers and taxpayers. I fought to insure an independent Civil Service Commission that would remain just that— independent and free from political influence and political patronage of particularly the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

I am truly saddened by the Mayor’s insistence in bringing this disastrous Proposition “D” before the voters. Some of the Supervisors rejected this misguided measure for what it is; an unwise consolidation of authority to hire, fire and promote city workers by the Mayor and newly created personnel officer.

My efforts to bring pay equity to both taxpayers and city workers were continually squashed by then Supervisor Feinstein and Supervisor Molinari. Finally, in 1975, shortly after a disastrous city strike, I was able to place on the ballot, for voter approval, a measure that almost eliminates the power of the Mayor and Supervisors to manipulate the pay of city workers. This measure was overwhelmingly passed by the voters that year and we have not had any labor unrest since that date.

Vote No on “D”!
“D” stands for disaster. It will undo many of these reforms. Also, right now, the City is almost broke, thanks to the manipulation of Mayor Feinstein and her chief ally Supervisor Molinari.

If “D” passes the cost of operating our city government will increase in the next 24 months by not less than $60,000,000. Contrary to the provisions of Proposition 13, property taxes would be increased, thus forcing up rents.

Vote No on “D”.
Don’t weaken our Civil Service Commission, whereby least deserving city employees could be promoted because of connection or clout.

Vote No on “D”.
We now almost have more problems than we can handle. We don’t want our city turned into another Chicago, where for nearly half a century a corrupt political system flourished under Mayor Richard Daley.

John Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We join San Franciscans for Fair Employment in opposing the Civil Service Initiative, Proposition D.

This measure will severely hamper the well-being of the San Francisco Fire and Police Departments. These departments are two of the finest in the Country and have consistently protected life and property in a professional manner. They must continue that tradition with a civil service system based on MERIT and not political patronage.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.
Andrew C. Casper
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired
Keith P. Caden
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired
William F. Murray
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Our present Civil Service system was designed to keep corruption out of government. It has generally served that purpose well. This proposition would dismantle that system and in my opinion open the doors to nepotism, favoritism, patronage and corruption. Better a city government that is bureaucratic than one that is corrupt. Vote NO on D.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is an attack on the merit system and an attempt to return patronage to the Mayor’s office by eliminating the authority of the Civil Service Commission and its built in checks and balances.

The present Civil Service system is not perfect, but corrections can be made within the Charter without destroying a system that has worked for over 50 years and has been free from fraud and corruption.

This proposition will do nothing to improve the caliber of police performance and could have the opposite effect.

I urge you to vote NO on PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by
The San Francisco Police Supervisors and Investigators
Association

Don Good, Captain SFPD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D could be a dangerous first step toward weakening the independent, impartial administration of our City government.

Proposition D would transfer power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor. The Director’s decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline and certification would be final. The Commission would have no right to hear examinations or disciplinary appeals.

With the transfer of duties and responsibilities from the Commission to the Mayor’s appointed Personnel Director, the Mayor would have control over personnel functions. Currently, commissioners have independent status and can be dismissed for cause. The Personnel Director could be dismissed at will.

The Merit System could be replaced by a patronage system. Proposition D could open the door to rules permitting the Personnel Director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his or her position on the list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Proposition D is NOT a reform package. The checks and balances for efficient City government would be lopsided, with too much power in the hands of unknown future Mayors.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
John L. Molinaro, President
Harry G. Britt
Richard Hongisto
Willie B. Kennedy
Wendy Neider
Nancy Walter

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Beware of PROPOSITION D!

Powerful special interest groups are attempting to remove key City employees from the independent and impartial Civil Service system in the name of “reform”.

They want instead to make these employees answerable directly to future Mayors and politically-appointed Personnel Directors and department heads.

PROPOSITION D got on the ballot because the Chamber of Commerce and such companies as Pacific Bell and PG&E paid a professional southern California campaign firm, $70,000 to collect signatures.

They’re trying to destroy the merit system and replace it with an old-fashioned patronage system.

Department heads will be able to ignore examination scores and reward loyalty rather than competence in promotions and hiring.

Don’t let the Chamber of Commerce, big business and their allies in the City bureaucracy dictate who’s hired, fired and promoted among public employees.

PROPOSITION D is not just deceptive, it’s dangerous!

Vote NO on PROPOSITION D!

Libby Deneheim
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Ron Huberman
Vice-Chairman, Democratic Central Committee
Jim Wacob
Democratic Central Committee
Roberto Estes
President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Rick Parcur
President, Harvey Milk Lesbian Gay Democratic Club
Walter L. Johnson
Exec. Secy., S. F. Labor Council
Michael Bernick
Linda Post
Sal Roselli
Deborah Stein
John Mehring
Pat Norman
Nancy Walker
Gwen Craig
Harry Britt
Louise Minnick
Carole Migden
Agar Jaicks
Jack Morrison
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D places too much power in the hands of ONE. Proposition D will provide for a personnel director to be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. The Mayor now appoints five members of the Civil Service Commission who also serve at her pleasure.

You work for years to climb the civil service ladder and then somebody comes along with an idea to cut you off at the pockets.

Proposition D will lock in all the employees employed in the Mayor’s office and will control the appointments of any new staff by the next Mayor elect in 1987 and years thereafter.

Like controlling your estate from the grave.

Vote NO on D.

Marguerite Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service Merit System has served our City well, giving San Franciscans an equal opportunity. It has helped us obtain employment and earn promotions based on objective examinations.

The Civil Service Merit system replaced the old patronage system that rewarded political loyalty more than competence.

Now the supporters of PROPOSITION D want to create a new Personnel Director, accountable only to the Mayor, and give department heads the absolute power to decide who works for the City and who gets promoted.

If PROPOSITION D passes, equal opportunity would give way to opportunity based on membership in the bureaucratic “establishment”.

Keep our Civil Service Merit System strong and free from the political abuses of the past.

Vote NO on D!

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly
Ben Tan
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Johnine Miller
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
A. Richard Cerbato
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Sodonia Wilson
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, President
S. F. Community College Governing Board
Julie Tung
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Alan S. Wong
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Henry Der
Albert Chang
Budy Meraz
Robert “Bob” Morales
Yori Wada

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Can you imagine studying for a civil service examination, being rated at the top of the eligible list and never receiving the promotion? That’s exactly what Proposition “D” will do should the electorate adopt this amendment.

The civil service merit system has defects, but to totally eliminate the system and replace it with a patronage system where promotions are based on who you know, rather than what you know is scandalous.

Civil service was put into place to prevent scandal and the “favor seeking” individual from getting a paid position because he/she happened to support the right elected official.

Proposition “D” will allow one person, chosen by the Mayor, to decide who will be promoted, hired and fired. This is awesome power for one single individual to have at any level of government.

Our current Mayor may choose a fair person for this position, but will future Mayors be as careful? As each new Mayor assumes office, the civil service system will again change. The potential to favor one individual or group over others is great.

Proposition “D” has a great potential to diminish the quality of services we now provide to our citizens, as the future of how people are hired and promoted in the San Francisco Police Department is completely unknown.

It’s true our promotional system is fraught with delays and delays frustrate us all, but Proposition “D” is not the answer. Proposition “D” will only add to our existing problems. Several years ago, our citizens elected a Charter Commission to streamline city government and make civil service work more efficiently. The voters eventually rejected those proposals. The checks and balances that make our government stable were no longer present. It simply went too far.

Proposition “D” goes even further. It brings about a system of patronage and should be defeated lest we want to engage in “free-wheeling and dealing” of civil service jobs and promotions.

We urge a strong No vote against Proposition “D”!

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS’ ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry, President
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The purpose of the Civil Service Commission is to ensure that the merit system would be the only criteria in any examination process.

If Proposition D passes, all authority concerning examinations would be taken from the Civil Service Commission and given to a Personnel Director, who is appointed by the Mayor. This Personnel Director would have the authority to hire and fire at his discretion, with no appeal available. This proposition is contrary to everything the Fire Department and all City employees have strived for over the years.

The Civil Service Commission in its present form was instituted to prevent any possibility of a patronage system, where one person has complete control.

This proposition would do nothing to improve your Fire Department. If you are satisfied with the work and make up of the San Francisco Fire Department in its present form, “Vote No On Proposition D”. You will be doing a service for the San Francisco Fire Department, and the people of San Francisco.

Submitted by the San Francisco Fire Chiefs’ Association
John Flaherty, Battalion Chief SFFD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is bad government and bad politics, changing our independent civil service system into a system dominated by the Mayor:

...By shortening the six year terms of Civil Service Commission to conform to the Mayor’s four year term of office.

...By transferring most of the Commission’s powers to a Personnel Director who serves solely at the Mayor’s pleasure.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D fails to offer enough new and improved procedures to cure the current defects in the civil service system. Charter sections and civil service rules are repealed without specific known replacements.

Proposition D transfers power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created personnel director appointed by, and to serve at the pleasure of, the Mayor. The director’s decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline, and certification would be final. The commission would have no right to hear examination or disciplinary appeals.

There are hidden costs with Proposition D because the new Personnel Administration Department will employ a personnel director, and other employees “as may be necessary to carry out (its) functions and duties.”

The Merit System could be replaced by an old style Patronage System. Proposition D could open the door to rules which permit the personnel director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his/her position on the civil service testing list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Police and Fire Commissions would lose functions as a result of the personnel director’s new power. The director’s unlawful employment discrimination policy would be binding upon department administrators. The director’s procedure for employee dispute resolution must be used by all department heads and appointing officers.

Proposition D is not the answer. The checks and balances for efficient city government would be lopsided.

I urge a no vote on Proposition D.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, 17th Assembly District
Sara Burton
Congresswoman
Art Agnos
16th Assembly District
Milton Marks
State Senator

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

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

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?

YES 292  NO 293

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission declared Balboa Reservoir South (located across Phelan Avenue from San Francisco City College) surplus in 1984 and made the site available for low, moderate and market rate housing. In July 1985, a City-community advisory committee chose a developer to build 203 single-family homes on the 13 acre site. Construction has not yet begun.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would prohibit granting new building permits and would revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site (Assessor’s Block 3180, Lot 1) between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit granting any new building permits and you want to revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to allow building permits to be granted for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “E” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for a three-year ban on development of the Balboa Reservoir site had qualified for the June ballot.

Sidney Kass and Jesse David Wall, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 12,430 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 10,012 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 77
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Having been responsible for providing leadership at City College from 1947 to 1977, we cannot stand by and see this site converted to housing. We must speak out. Such a move would preclude forever the logical and much needed campus expansion to what was once our West Campus. We left that site reluctantly to make way for water storage. If it is no longer required for that purpose, let us return it to City College.

Thousands of San Franciscans — high school graduates, dropouts, veterans, re-entering women — representing all of the city’s diverse ethnic groups, have been prepared for transfer to four-year colleges, profitable careers, and have had their lives enriched at the City College of San Francisco. Without City College’s open door and easy access, many would have been deprived of these opportunities.

Its 56 acre campus originally housed 3,000 students. Now it serves over 23,000. This campus, compared to other community colleges, can be best described as cramped, inadequate, and second rate. The condition of the campus is to be contrasted with the excellence of its programs — which are recognized as among the best in the nation.

Lou Batmale
Chancellor 1970-1977
Louis G. Conlan
President 1947-1970

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION ‘E’

We question:
1. Why no EIR was required when the proposed development could have a substantial impact.
2. Whether the future needs of City College for classrooms, housing, and parking have been considered.
3. What the impact on taxpayers is with below market land sale and construction financing by bonds.
This moratorium will permit adequate study of these issues.
Vote YES on Proposition ‘E’.

Bruce Bonacker, President
Board of Directors, Glen Park Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don’t let a developer make a mint on land across from the most overcrowded college in the Bay Area! Parking is already an impossibility for residents near City College...adding 200 homes to this land would make the situation much worse.

It’s simple: a college which can’t find room for more students at a time when more people are returning to education doesn’t serve the community.

This land is being sold at much less than its true value. The development wouldn’t do much to ease the City’s housing crunch, but it would undercut the future of City College and the peace of mind of the neighborhood.

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot.

The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

You’d probably be upset. We certainly are. Please help us protect our neighborhood. Please vote YES on proposition E.

Westwood Park Residents: Sunnyside Residents:
Edna Tooker Ellen Wall
Minnie Darvin Melissa Voluntad
Eugene Eden David Wall
Donna Nicoletti
Robert Armstrong
Pauline Armstrong
Joel Martinez
Richard & Lisa Patterson
David Bean
H. Bezzotte
William Burke
Richard Rebek
Clyde Thernid
Danene Manus
Esmo Manus

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let the greedy developers take this potentially picturesque open space.
A yes vote means you want more time to consider its future use. All we ask is time to think and plan.

John Barbagelata
Former member, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Suppose there was a publicly owned open space across the street from the main U.C. Berkeley Campus.
Can you imagine for one moment that it would be passed into private ownership?
Vote Yes on E for Equality and Excellence in Education

City College Students:
William Lew, Student
Tim McGuire, Student Council Member
Joseph Goldstein, Student Council Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

In 1952, the “Experts” said we needed reservoirs. They felt so strongly that they condemned the City College West Campus, destroyed the buildings, and constructed the reservoirs—all at taxpayer’s expense.
Now, in 1986 with more demand for water, the “Experts” say the reservoir is no longer needed. What is the concerned taxpayer to believe?
When in doubt, the city should hold on to the expensive things already paid for.

Stop the reservoir giveaway. Vote YES on E.

Taxpayers for Preserving the Reservoir.
Richard Patterson
Dorice Murphy
Lucille Carson
Daniel Gutierrez
Franz Witte
Bernhard Scholand
Ruth Hanson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This is a Planning issue
We have been accused of trying to stop housing for poor people. Not true. In the first place, the price levels are certainly middle income and above, but our main objection is that this badly done plan is damaging to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as to the over-crowded community college across the street.

WHAT WE WANT
Even our critics point out that we originally SUGGESTED housing for that site, but they don’t talk about what else we suggested. We want two levels of parking under a City College Li-

brary, Bookstore, and Auditorium, with housing on top. Furthermore, let the housing be TRULY affordable—for students and seniors. We are trying to stop the bureaucrats’ subsidized middle income housing project because it makes our dream impossible.
We ask for three years to give the neighborhood and the college a chance to produce a better plan.
SNaP (Sensible Neighborhood Planning Committee)

Helen Crizer, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council, representing 17 neighborhood associations in the area of the surplus reservoir property in question has voted to endorse the three-year stop of private construction on the old West Campus of City College. Dr. Louis Batmale, Chancellor of City College from 1970-1977, has persuaded us that City College needs the lands.

Juanita Raven, President
W"est of Twin Peaks Central Council
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Be a sport.
Give City College a vote of support.
City has 23,000 students and badly needs a library. The only place to put it is in the reservoir site. City College has walked closely with San Francisco for five decades. The reservoir site has always been understood to be reserved for City College.

Until now when someone wants it for housing. Housing is important, but it can be anywhere in town. But a City College library can only be located at the College.

Vote yes to support a book—and a reader.
Reading, studying, writing and research make up our town also.

It is hard to understand criticism of City for wanting to keep this area for a library. Sure, housing sites are at a premium—but even more so a library site for City which is one of the largest schools in the Nation.

Some people blast City for wanting a library because of the need for housing. Housing is needed. But some of those very same people want a big battleship stationed here that will bring in 15,000 new family members.

The Educational and cultural growth of San Francisco mandates living space for the City College library.

If this measure gets a no vote, it means there will be no site for a Library. This is the last chance. Vote YES to help out a book—and a reader.

State financing, when approved, will construct this building. It is the top building priority at City College.

A YES vote here means there will be time to think about the use of the site. During that three year period, cooler heads may realize this is the only site for a Library. If the housing goes in there will be no library there.

Vote yes for a book, for a good school and a better City.

John Riordan, Board of Governors
San Francisco Community College District.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Sunnyside Neighborhood Association is not against housing, but we are trying to stop a hasty and short-sighted plan. We are asking for this moratorium to get time for a better plan that will answer a variety of needs and benefit the entire city as well as our community.

This is a planning issue.

The release of the reservoir property as surplus by the water department came as a surprise to our neighborhood. The June 1984 “Residence Element” of the city’s Master Plan did not even list the land as surplus. By 1985 major decisions were being made for use of the land without adequate neighborhood input.

There were some meetings attended by a few people carefully selected for their zealous pro-housing views or potential financial gain. The resulting plan has gone out of control. Now it benefits only the developer and the lucky few who will get houses on free land.

Proposition E is not an attack on housing.
Please help us save our neighborhood against poor planning by voting YES on Proposition E.

Joe Mahoney, President
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION E

All the talk in the world can’t change the fact that City College has fewer acres of land relative to its student population than any college in the Bay Area.

Enrollment at City College is INCREASING, as is the enrollment of the San Francisco public schools from which City College draws most of its students. It is obvious that City College needs and deserves the reservoir land. The three year moratorium will gave time to produce a better plan which will have in-

put by faculty, students and alumni who know the college’s needs and want to support it.

Sid Kass
Susie Langdon Kass
Phil Kass
City College Student

Frank Mauro, President
Arnell Rodrigues

Maggie Kroll
Dorothy Evers

B. Sullivan
Dale Jones
Homer Bradford
Kathryn A. Small
Harry Small

R. Sullivan
Dale Jones
Homer Bradford
Kathryn A. Small
Harry Small

Mr. & Mrs. Henry Taylor
Berni Watanabe
Susan Pasciutti
Dale Brown

ARGUMENTS PRINTED ON THIS PAGE ARE THE OPINION OF THE AUTHORS AND HAVE NOT BEEN CHECKED FOR ACCURACY BY ANY OFFICIAL AGENCY.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The homeowners of Westwood Park, a neighborhood adjacent to the Balboa Reservoir, support the ballot initiative calling for a 3 year development moratorium. We believe that the City and City College should take additional time to determine their needs and how they might be met by using the Reservoir. In the event that City College does not need this property, we support its development as open space or as single family detached housing.

Westwood Park Association
Don C. Swander
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Let's not aggravate the traffic problem around City College before we first develop solutions for the existing problems. A three-year moratorium only buys our neighborhood and elected officials time to find solutions; it doesn't say no to housing. A YES vote is a vote for prudent development. A YES vote helps to preserve the family character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ken Hoegger
Realtor and community Activist

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As representatives of the students of City College, we understand first-hand, the intense need to reserve a site for future school expansion. Preservation of the Balboa Reservoir, a site directly adjacent to the campus, is particularly crucial. The facilities that CCSF requires, such as a library and an auditorium, are essential to the main structure of the campus. Unlike classrooms, it would be unreasonable to build an auditorium as a library on an off-campus site, since these facilities are integral to the main function of the school.

Jack Lee, Vice President of Associated Counsel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Local 2121 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, representing City College faculty, urges a yes vote on Proposition E.

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

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is twice as crowded as any community college in northern California. It needs a much larger library, bookstore and auditorium, and more parking.

The college has always expected to use the empty SOUTH reservoir for educational needs. That land is finally surplus. Neither the college Governing Board nor the Chancellor attended the Mayor's planning sessions for the property and the faculty was not informed. When the 12.3 acre site was offered to a developer for $36,900 for subsidized housing, the Chancellor said, "We are at a crossroad and the correct path is for the Board of Supervisors, with the Mayor's support, to deed this surplus land to City College so that the college may continue to serve the city effectively for the next 50 years as it has for the past half century." The Mayor refused. Now only Board member John Riodan supports the correct path.

The Water Department says it may need the NORTH reservoir now used for student parking. If that crisis occurs, the Chancellor says, "We'll deal with the situation then." How, if the south reservoir is gone?

(continued)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College needs land now for desperately needed facilities, one of which is a library. City College has an enrollment of 23,000 students but our library has seating for 450. There are other possible locations for new housing, but City College can’t be moved. Give us an opportunity to plan a development for the community and the college.

Annie M. Young
City College Library Faculty and Staff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty and staff members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco’s community college for our students’ needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Darlene Alloto
Mary Allen
Mary Amater
Tom Angeloff
Robert Balesteri
Don Batini
Diana Bernstein
Joe Berry
Anna Broun
James Bristol
Richard Bronger
Laurent Broussal
Philip Brown
Barbara Cabral
John Callen
John Caris
Frank Carrato
Rosemary Clark
Perry Close
Kurt Common
Walter Cribis
George Crippen
Patricia Davis
Guy DePrimo
Edward DiEmanuele
Sharon Edwards
Larry Ernst
Mary Ervin
Kuye Fong
William Finke
Terry Greenfield
Robert Griffin
Michael Guthrie
Mary Hanna
YenKuang Ho
Peter Hoch
Ronald Hochschild
Myrna Holden
Katherine Hormel
Michael Hubert
Edward Hunt
Frank Ingersoll
Elaine Johnson
Wendy Kaufman
Jo Kennedy
Mercedes Kow
Rosalinda Kook
Don Lafferty
James Lallas
Steve Levinson
Sue Light
Gary Ling
Anneli Lipi
Dave Lubar
Leon Lucy
Damosnowe Macaulay
Marion McManus
Patricia Madigan
Michael Malachowsky
Mary Mari
Maria Mariant
Sylvia Marshall
Valerie Meahan
Joe Mejia
Mary Mejia
Denise Miller
Cindy Moody
Thomas Munro
David Myse
Deborah Nagle
Glen Nance
Herbert Naylor
William Neff
Dennis Ploeg
Francine Podowski
Theresa Popples
Solomon Rajah
Mary Riddle
Fariborz Salian
Valerie Schmehl
Fred Schmieder
Earl Scriver
Andy Scriver
Ken Shen
Robert Struckman
McSherry Tom
Edward Taylor
Pierce Therry
Barbara Thomas
Clare Thompson
Willie Thompson
Mary Thurber
Robert Trinario
James Truemler
Joanne Tamminen
George VonBoszay
Charlie Wetzler
Austen White
Johm Wilson
Rosalie Wolf
Christina Yee

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Water Department has begun a resource study of water use, due for completion in two or three years. The study may well indicate that one or both reservoirs will be needed. The American Water Works Association states that reservoirs should be used in pairs. This is particularly important because it is the only reservoir at an elevation of 305 feet.

The Mayor twisted the arm of the Water Department to declare one of these reservoirs surplus before the water resource study is completed. Don’t let her get away with this kind of political manipulation.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Kurt Common
Ken Crizer
Ed Dierauf
Herb Naylor
CCSF Engineering Professors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The South Balboa Basin has been unused since college leased buildings, including a large auditorium, were torn down on that site thirty years ago. We hope that three years of thorough planning would explore the possibility of returning a part of that property to the college for the development of a multi-purpose medium-sized auditorium which could be shared with community groups.

Robert Bozina
Mack Crooks
Bob Davis
Helen Dilworth
Franz Enciso
Richard Esterman
Richard Fenn
Lawrence Ferrara
Ted Fleming
Peggy Gerham
William Grothkopf
David Hardiman

Judy Hubbell
Charles Hudspeth
Sieglinde Isham
Baruch Klein
John Kongismark
Joshua Law
Steven Lopez
Jerry Mueller
Madeline Mueller
Marvin Tanak
Frank Townsend
City College Music Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition E. This moratorium is necessary because there are too many worthy uses for this land to make a hasty and potentially very costly decision. Only through careful planning can the limited land available for development be best used.

Nicolas Alexander
Paul Hewitt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, as Physical Education Instructors, have always been committed to a diversified program for our students and community. The reservoir space is a natural land resource for a Multi Educational and Cultural Center.

Your YES vote on E will allow us the freedom to explore ways that this property could most constructively benefit all.

Gail Barton
Curis Decker
Brad Duggan
Tanako Hagiwara
John Hahn
Daniel Hayes

Lene Johnson
Grover Klemmer
Paula McCullum
Art Octavio
Louise Scourkes

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, full-time faculty of the Computer and Information Science Department of City College, urge a YES vote to postpone the decision until additional planning and surveys can be conducted. The current proposal would negatively impact the College’s enrollment.

William Beaver
Ronald Cerruti, Chairman
Kirk Gibson
Howard Granger
Frank Holden
Michael Kelly

George Lany
Norbert Ludkey
Charles Metzler
Charles Miller
Marilyn Schnake

Notes:
Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

A YES vote on Proposition E helps STOP a scheme to GIVE AWAY $12,300,000 worth of City land for $1,800,000 (or less) to a Redwood City real estate developer.

A YES vote will SAVE taxpayers $550,000 per year. The housing project will produce $240,000 in taxes, but supplying City services will cost $790,000 per year.

The Controller's cost estimate does NOT account for the $12,300,000 land value, since land sale below value is NOT technically a cost of government. The Controller also is NOT permitted to assume that the housing project will be constructed, since construction has NOT yet been ordered by the Board of Supervisors.

The plan does NOT restrict housing sales to moderate-income first-time buyers. The plan only restricts use of tax-subsidized funds. Any person favored by the developer or politicians can buy these dwellings and get the benefits of the public land giveaway.

The houses are made "affordable" by giving away the land far below market value, by City-backed low interest, and by cutting construction corners.

The real beneficiaries of the subsidized housing project are the financiers (NOT the project dwellers). Bondholders receive 9.6% average tax-free interest, which is equivalent to 24.6% taxable interest at 61% maximum tax. The developer and bond establishment receive $5,340,000; this is $26,300 (22.40%) for each $117,400 unit.

The City loses $51,700 worth of land GIVEN AWAY for each unit.

Vote YES on Proposition E for good fiscal management.

William Marquardt
Financial Analyst, SNaP
Helen Crizer, Treasurer, SNaP

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

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

Name of College                      Number of students | Campus (acres) | Area/1000 students
City College of SF                  22,624             | 56              | 2.47
Laney College, Oakland              9,805              | 59              | 6.02
Chabot College, Hayward             18,000             | 147             | 8.17
Contra Costa College                8,500              | 83              | 9.76
College of San Mateo                13,820             | 153             | 11.07
College of Marin                    6,663              | 77              | 11.56

Given these facts, why does the Governing Board not try to get the old West Campus back? Why don't they support this moratorium to delay the land grab?

The Governing Board is under political pressure from City Hall. They have been threatened with the loss of the north reservoir parking lot and funding for special projects. Forgive them. Vote Yes on E.

Friends of City College
David Newton
Glen Simpson
Jack Baker
Thomas Velazquez
Tillie McCullough

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The student population at City College is increasing. This semester's enrollment is up 1,265 students over last semester.

The enrollment in the San Francisco public schools has been increasing by 1,218 per year for the last three years. City College draws most of its enrollment from public schools in San Francisco.

Obviously, City College will have a larger enrollment in the future years, and will be in desperate need of space if we do not give it back its old West Campus.

Please reserve this public land for the college.
Please vote YES on E.

Barbara Holman

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON E

In 1981, I launched a six-point program to expand San Francisco's housing supply and the voters had approved a City policy to add 20,000 new housing units within five years. This Proposition would destroy a major portion of the effort to build affordable, single-family housing in our city.

The Balboa Reservoir Site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now a site for development of 203 new single-family homes, most with three bedrooms and two baths. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed as other homes built under the City's program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom could not afford homeownership. It is believed that these new homes will sell rapidly.

The Balboa Reservoir site is one of the few sites large enough to accommodate a substantial number of new homes. Please do not let a few people stop a major opportunity for new housing. Vote no on Prop E.

Not only would Proposition E halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site, but the 9.8% fixed-rate, 30-year mortgage money set aside for the housing would also be lost.

Nothing constructive is accomplished by this measure—it does not provide additional land or facilities for City College. As a matter of fact, City College has neither plans nor money to use the property. Further, the Community College Board of Directors, the governing body for City College, has voted overwhelmingly to oppose the initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting "No on E."

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the site of the unused Balboa Reservoir and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost.

These homes are desperately needed for San Franciscans who can’t afford to buy in the city where the average house is selling for over $160,000. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

The homes would be built on land that belongs to the City. Over two years ago, it was declared surplus and available for housing. It is not part of City College, and City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

We urge you to vote no on Proposition E if you want more affordable housing for San Franciscans.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

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

The 203 affordable owner occupied single family units slated for the southern portion of Balboa Reservoir are part of the 1988 total. Our progress in addressing the City's housing shortage will be curtailed if this ill-advised initiative is approved. SUPPORT OWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Housing production is essential to check rising prices and to maintain our social, economic, and ethnic population diversity. AS A SAN FRANCISCO VOTER, YOU CAN BE PART OF OUR HOUSING PROGRESS BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

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

WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT THE CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY HOUSING BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

Proposition E would halt construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. We need more housing in San Francisco, not less. Please join me in voting "NO" on Proposition E.

Doris M. Ward, Member
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

A critical issue facing San Francisco today is the lack of housing middle class San Franciscans can afford.

That is why I have joined these neighborhood associations to support the Balboa Reservoir neighborhood housing proposal. Those participating in the development of the proposal includes:

O.M.I. Community Association
Dorado Terrace Association
Outer Mission-Ingleside
Political Action Committee
Greater Ingelside Community
Mount Davidson Manor
Ocean Avenue Merchants Association
Ingleside Terrace Association
The San Francisco Open Space Committee
City College of San Francisco

From early in 1985 I worked closely with these neighborhood groups in the discussions between city government and community leaders concerning the development plans for this desperately needed new housing at the unused Balboa reservoir site.

THOSE ARE THE REASONS YOU SHOULD VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

1. The neighborhood housing proposal that this initiative seeks to stop is the result of months of hard work by the largest coalition of neighborhood associations ever to join together to plan a housing development in San Francisco.

2. The housing at the Balboa Reservoir site was designed with the involvement of the coalition of neighborhood associations to enhance the surrounding community.

3. The governing Board of the Community College District has made clear that they have no plans for the site and no ownership rights to it. City College does not oppose the construction of this development and opposes this initiative.

4. Self-proclaimed "Friends" of City College want to stop the proposal in order to preserve the site for future faculty parking. A clique of City College staffers involved in a neighborhood association pose as community opposition to this development even though a representative from this organization, the Sunnydale Neighborhood Association, had helped plan and support the proposal.

5. By masquerading as concerned neighbors these self-appointed "friends" of City College hope to prevent the construction of 204 critically needed units of housing and pull off one of the biggest land grabs in San Francisco's history.

DON'T BE FOOLED. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Residence Element of the Comprehensive Plan of the City and County of San Francisco assesses the City's housing needs and lays out specific steps to meet those needs. This document was adopted by the City Planning Commission in 1984 after extensive public review at neighborhood meetings and public hearings, and consideration of the detailed Environmental Impact Report.

The first objective of the Housing Element is "to provide new Housing for all income groups" in locations appropriate for residential development. To meet this goal, the development of housing is to be aggressively pursued and encouraged on surplus, underused and vacant public land.

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

If you want more affordable housing in San Francisco vote no on Proposition E.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Susan J. Bieman, City Planning Commissioner

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

Vote NO on E.

Proposition E deprives San Franciscans of one of their last real chances to become homeowners at an affordable price. At the South Balboa Reservoir we have City-owned land on which 203 units of three-bedroom, two-bath homes can be built at low prices which average San Franciscans can afford to pay. These homes need to be built now, not in three years. In three years the low interest rates on mortgages and the bond financing will be gone. Two hundred families will have lost the opportunity to become homeowners, and the City will have lost the opportunity to ease the tight market in rental housing.

Nor does this ill-conceived initiative help City College in any way. City College does not need this land. Speculation that the College may at some future date find a use for the land is not founded on fact. The College may never be able to build on the reservoir. Their enrollment has dropped by over 4000 students in the last few years.

This initiative is designed to confuse you. It will make our housing shortage worse for three long years. If you support affordable housing in our City, Vote NO on Proposition E.

Bill Maher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Balboa Reservoir site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now planned for development of 203 new single family homes. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed—other homes built under this program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom would not otherwise be able to afford home ownership.

San Francisco has the most expensive housing in the nation where last year the average home sold for over $160,000. Housing is difficult to produce because the obstacles are great—little land on which to build, high construction costs and uncertain interest rates.

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost. The initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional land or facilities for City College. The Community College Board, the governing body of City College, in fact recently voted to oppose this initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No” on Proposition E.

John L. Molinari

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

In 1980, the voters of the City and County of San Francisco approved a measure making it City policy to add 20,000 new units of housing within five years. In 1984 in an effort to satisfy this objective, the Board of Supervisors adopted a policy encouraging the expansion of the City’s housing supply. Making surplus City-owned land, such as the site at Balboa Reservoir, available for affordable housing was an important part of that policy. A proposal to build 203 homes on the unused Balboa Reservoir site was advanced to help implement the pro-housing policy.

Approval of Proposition E would HALT construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.

The Balboa Reservoir homes would be built on land currently belonging to the City and County of San Francisco. The property IS NOT part of the City College, and City College has neither plans or money to buy the property and convert it for City College use.

The only debatable issue is the future of affordable housing on the Balboa Reservoir site.

As we are all aware, San Francisco has the most expensive homes in the United States. The average cost of a home is $152,000. Not many can afford such prices. However, the housing proposed for the Balboa Reservoir will give many more citizens the opportunity to become homeowners. The homes to be built will be sold to first-time buyers at prices ranging from $83,000 to $145,000.

Other homes built in San Francisco under the direction of similar affordable housing programs have been snapped up quickly by San Franciscans. Without the program, most would not have been able to purchase the home and become homeowners.

Again, if you desire to preserve the construction of more affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site, vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Willie B. Kennedy
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Additional single family housing is undeniably San Francisco’s most acute social need.
When some vacant surplus City land (12 acres) finally becomes available for 203 additional new private homes there will always be some selfish individuals who are in favor of new housing “just so long as it is not built across the street from me!”
This unused, vacant City reservoir land hasn’t generated a dime of taxes for over thirty years! Let’s add 203 NEW home-owner taxpayers to the City’s rolls as quickly as possible.
Stop these self-serving no-growth obstructionists! Please vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Prop E would halt affordable housing construction at the Balboa Reservoir site. Many gay people need affordable housing, too, and we join with other community groups urging you to vote NO on Prop E.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Robert Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E, if approved, would block the construction of 203 badly needed single-family homes on the south portion of the Balboa Reservoir in San Francisco. Sixty percent of these homes would be available for purchase by moderate and middle income families at purchase prices between $80,000 and $120,000. They would be constructed on surplus public land and financed by the sale of mortgage revenue bonds to enable the developer to sell the homes at below market prices.

A neighborhood group headed by two city college faculty members is responsible for placing Proposition E on the ballot. The group contends that the land which is intended to be used for the project should be made available instead to City College for the construction of new teaching facilities even though enrollment at City College is declining and the City College Board has voted 6 to 1 to oppose the initiative.

Like many other areas of the country, San Francisco suffers from a shortage of housing. Purchase prices here are among the highest in the nation. The use of surplus public lands and revenue bond financing provide a means for making single family homes available to a broad spectrum of families at affordable prices.

The Balboa Reservoir project is supported by the leaders of 8 neighborhood groups in the area surrounding the location of the proposed project and by a majority of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, as well as by Mayor Dianne Feinstein. We urge you to encourage the construction of this type of housing in San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition E.

San Francisco Board of Realtors
William L. Jansen, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

SAVE OUR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS!
BERNAL HEIGHTS SAYS, “VOTE NO ON PROP E!”
We are residents of Bernal Heights in San Francisco. We’ve worked hard to build affordable family and senior citizen homes in our neighborhood.
We need more affordable housing in our City to survive. The real issue in Prop E is affordable family housing—a “yes” vote prevents the construction of 203 family homes. That’s crazy!
Join us in preserving what’s best in our City.
Vote “no” on Prop E!

Sylvia M. Yee, Bernal Heights Community Foundation Board of Directors***
Frank Hutchins, BHCF Board*
Mary Lou Beroletti, BHCF Board*
Lela Havener, BHCF Board*
Elizabeth Egger, BHCF Board*
Sister Janet Simon, BHCF Board*
Stephen Antonaros, BHCF Board*
Lorenzo R. Dill, BHCF Board*
Barbara Bagot, BHCF Board*
Margaret C. Randolf, Northwest Bernal Block Club*
Maureen Lamb, NWBBC*
Tim Molinare, BHCF Planning & Dev’t Committee*
Buck Bagot, BHCF P & D Committee*
***Organization for identification purposes only.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco Needs Affordable Housing — Vote No on Proposition E

Everyone agrees that San Francisco needs affordable housing. The questions are how and where that affordable housing can be built.

The Balboa Reservoir housing development, to be built on the site of a reservoir built thirty years ago and unused since that time, answers those important questions for more than 200 San Francisco first-time homebuying families by providing:

— 203 new affordable three-bedroom, single family homes
— 9.8% fixed-rate financing
— A mix of 30% low-income, 30% moderate-income and 40% market-rate first time buyers
— A convenient site that has been declared “surplus” by the City and “available for development of affordable housing”

The Balboa Reservoir housing development is a small but significant step in the effort to generate affordable housing in our City.

Thousands of San Franciscans from every community, neighborhood group and viewpoint agree that the Balboa Reservoir development is good for San Francisco. Virtually every elected official, including the Governing Board of City College also agree.

All these San Franciscans ask you to say “yes” to affordable housing and “NO” to Proposition E.

San Francisco Coalition for Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar, Executive Director

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The viable plan for affordable single family housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site is being threatened by Proposition E. If Proposition E passes, 203 single family homes will be lost to the citizenry of San Francisco at a time when they are greatly needed.

The facts about the proposed housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site argue strongly against Proposition E. All 203 homes will be for first time home buyers. One-third of the homes will be available to households earning $27,000. Another third of the homes will be available to households earning $36,000. Adequate parking will be provided within the development itself, thus answering any concerns that traffic in the area will be congested.

City College has no need or plan to use South Balboa Reservoir for its facilities. City College’s priority is to develop its existing campus. South Balboa Reservoir should therefore be used for one of the City’s greatest needs: increased and affordable housing which is available to lower and middle income families.

As homeowners who live in the vicinity of South Balboa Reservoir, we welcome its planned use for single family housing and feel it will become an integral and contributing part of the community. We therefore urge you to vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Submitted by:
Stephen Graham, Chairman of the Housing Sub-committee of the Citizen’s Committee for Community Development
Roderick A. McLeod, Vice-Chairman of the Citizen’s Committee on Community Development

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing is a group of neighbors which consists of many of the renters of Westwood Park and Sunnyside neighborhoods as well as owners and renters of Ingleside which are the closest neighbors to the Balboa Reservoir along with some of the students and teachers of City College.

We strongly support the Balboa Reservoir for housing. We believe that the Balboa Reservoir is an ideal spot for housing.

Our neighborhood wants homes in the South Balboa Reservoir.
Vote No On Prop. E.

Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughey
Submitted by Patricia Vaughey

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

As Merchants as well as residents of Ocean Avenue, Greater Ingleside and San Francisco, we support the Development of the Balboa Reservoir as housing.

A Traffic Survey has stated that there will be minimal impact on the existing patterns of traffic by this development.

Additional City College Parking being considered on another location off I-280 to keep the college congestion away from the neighborhood’s streets.

City College has 44 more acres in which to expand and existing buildings at City College have viable means to expand.

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

Proposition E would stop construction on much-needed affordable, single-family housing at the long vacant south Balboa Reservoir site. This proposition would also block a major housing development that would bring jobs into an area of the city that has little industry or private business.

Sale prices for these units are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the San Francisco housing market, where the average home is selling for $160,000. Construction of these homes will help all young, first-time home buyers and will require only 5% down, instead of the 20% down payment on houses bought with conventional home mortgages.

This plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by nine nearby neighborhood organizations. If Proposition E is approved and this project is blocked, more young adults will purchase their first home in Vallejo or some other outlying area, further draining San Francisco of the young families that every growing community needs.

San Francisco residents will gain apprenticeships, jobs, contracts and subcontracts from this development.

This plan calls for 2 and 3 bedroom, family-sized houses, with space for another bedroom which can be finished when needed. Each house will have 2½ parking spaces in front and would not cause parking problems in the area. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

City College of San Francisco has no plans to buy the property, has no money for institutional expansion, nor any mention of this land in any master plan. Some supporters of this proposition are motivated by racist notions and have said they fear that this development will become another “Geneva Towers.” This type of thinking is similar to support for apartheid practiced in South Africa and must be defeated by progressive San Francisco voters. Property values will increase, instead of a decrease as a result of this project.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition E.

Larry Uball Johnson-Rudd — President, O.M.I. Pilgrim Community Center Inc.
Maria Campbell-Casey — Program Director, Bay Area Engineering Societies Committee for Manpower Training, Inc.
Clara Mills-Bratford — Program Director, O.M.I. Senior Center
John C. Jackson
Linda Rose-Gipson
Jon Still — Secretary, Young Adult Committee
Kenneth Butler

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Affordable Housing Alliance — Mitchell Omerberg, Director
Bay Area Urban League — Gregory Best, Field Representative
Bernal Heights Community Foundation — Andre Lennell Daye
Community Educational Services — Dorothy Chen, Executive Director
Japanese Community Youth Council St. Francis Square Apartments, Inc. — Sandra Mayor-Jenkins, Secretary
Minority Contractors Association of Northern California — James Haugabrook, Secretary, Board of Directors
National Community Congress — Dr. Eddie C. Welch
Parkmerced Residents Organization, Inc. — Ricardo A. Callejo, Esq.
Potrero Hill Neighborhood House — Enola Maxwell
San Francisco Building Trades Council — Sam Smith
San Francisco Housing & Tenants Council — Joseph Lacey
San Francisco Tenants Union — Jim Faye
Rev. James C. Brown — Local Pastor & Community Servant
Greg Day — Chairman, Citizens Committee on Community Development
Polly V. Marshall — Commissioner, San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
Regina A. Steed
Jim Wachob — San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Michael E. Willis, AIA — Fleming Corporation

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

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Greater Ingleside Political Club — Frank Noto, Treasurer
Housing Conservation and Development Corporation — Lonnie Lawson,
Board of Directors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Greater Ingleside Political Club — Frank Noto, Treasurer
Housing Conservation and Development Corporation — Lonnie Lawson,
Board of Directors

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?

YES 296
NO 297

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: With certain exceptions, City officers, including elected officials and commission members, may represent clients before City boards and commissions other than their own, and be paid for their services. State legislators may represent clients before City boards and commissions, and be paid for their services. Any person may contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would prohibit City officers from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay. This proposition would prohibit State legislators from appearing before City boards, commissions and departments on behalf of clients for pay. City officers would be prohibited from discussing with these officers and legislators matters that the City is deciding. Proposition F would also prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit City officers and State legislators from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to allow City officers and State legislators to represent clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to allow any person to contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 77

How “F” Got on Ballot

On February 26 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for limitations on compensated advocacy and campaign contributions had qualified for the June ballot.

Quentin Kopp, Marth Gillham and Cheryl Arenson, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 9,400 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,986 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The purpose of Proposition F is to cut campaign contributions by large contributors (and thus reduce campaign spending) and eliminate undue influence by officeholders retained as paid lobbyists for projects requiring City approval.

Let's take a minute to analyze the untrue arguments against Proposition F.

- The opponents claim that Proposition F will force half the City's Commissioners to resign. In fact, Proposition F does not force any Commissioner to resign. It simply says they can't be a paid lobbyist and a City Commissioner at the same time. Does a commissioner value making money by lobbying more than public service?
- Some have also alleged that Proposition F will prevent duly-elected union leaders from serving as City Commissioners. No it won't. Proposition F prohibits "compensated advocacy"—that means lobbyists hired by an organization, not members of the organization itself. Proposition F does not apply to salaried employees of labor unions, corporations, or non-profit agencies. Moreover, Section 8.105 of the Charter precludes it specifically from applying to any member serving as a representative of any profession, trade, business, union or association on any board or commission which requires membership of representatives of specific professions, trades, businesses, unions or associations.
- Another untrue argument against Proposition F is that it prohibits City officials only from discussing pending issues with other City officials or State Legislators who are also acting as paid lobbyists in a matter and doesn't stop those officeholding lobbyists from writing City officials about their clients' objectives. That's not so. Proposition F applies to all such lobbying, written or oral. (The dictionary defines "discuss" as "to examine by means of speech or writing.")

End government decision-making by "insiders" and reduce the influence of money on local campaigns.

VOTE YES ON F.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
San Franciscans for Good Government

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

In all our years of observing San Francisco City government, we have found one maxim to be true time after time: a good idea gets copied, especially among politicians.

For no sooner did Quentin Kopp promise to bring Proposition F to the voters than did Mayor Feinstein come up with an informal, administrative version of her own. Fine, you say (and the Mayor says), then why vote Yes on Proposition F?

(1) The Mayor's remedy of asking City Commissioners who also act as lobbyists before City agencies to resign is nothing more than a hand slap, and is good only as long as she is mayor. It's not binding on future mayors and could be changed without any vote of the Board of Supervisors, let alone the people of San Francisco. Proposition F prohibits this kind of conflict-of-interest, and it will be the law, no matter who is mayor.

(2) The Mayor's action did nothing to state legislators who can also act as lobbyists before City Boards and Commissions, nor did her action stop the law or business partners of City Commissioners from picking up the slack in big-money lobbying. Proposition F will stop these practices in their tracks.

(3) What about the other half of Proposition F, which reduced the campaign contribution limit to $500 so that all San Franciscans can enjoy equal access to City officials, not just the ones with the big bucks? The Mayor can't do anything about this, and she hasn't. Only a Yes vote on Proposition F will reduce the weight of big money and ensure our full voice in City elections and City government.

VOTE YES on Proposition F. If it's important enough for the Mayor to copy part of it administratively, it's important enough to do the job right and make it a law.

John J. Barbagelata
Harry Aleo
June Cahn
Dorothy Partridge

Robert Arenson
Rudolph Lohneis
Janet Wentworth

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The worst and most persistent problem in American politics is that politicians and political races can be "bought". Reducing the size of campaign contributions will be a step forward in reducing the role of money in elections. Vote yes for more honest government.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

RESTORE to the people their rightful and equal power as individual voters by reducing the monetary clout and influence of private interests who make the laws and the policies as City officials and Commissioners or State legislators.

TELL the special interests that their money and influence can no longer interfere with representative government.

TELL the special interests that the voters will no longer tolerate the influence-buying which comes with large campaign contributions.

TELL the special interests that this measure will encourage highly talented citizens to serve San Francisco honestly and responsibly.

VOTE YES ON F.

Cheryl Arenson
Anne Renfrew
David Pacheco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

"Government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

These noble words from Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, cast in bronze at the entrance to City Hall, seem to have escaped the attention of some City officials who pass by them every day. For in San Francisco City government, Lincoln's simple formula for representative government would read quite differently: "Government of the powerful, by the lobbyists, and for the wealthy."

Government of, by, and for the privileged few is bad government. Government of, by, and for all the people is good government. It's as simple as that—as simple as Lincoln first put it.

Proposition F, the Good Government Initiative, will help San Franciscans maintain control of their government and will prevent undue influence by City officeholders.

To reduce undue influence, Proposition F outlaws the practice of City Commissioners and State Legislators representing special interests for pay before City Commissions and Boards. City Commissions should render their decisions deliberately and impartially, not be swayed by the political clout of the lobbyists appearing before them, or by any political favors those lobbyist/politicians might promise. "I'll scratch your back if you scratch my back" bargains do not belong in government. And until such backroom bargains are made illegal, City government will not belong to the rest of us either.

Proposition F also reduces the maximum amount that anyone can give to a local candidate from $1,000 to $500. If large contributors and other special interests can't give as much money, they can't buy as much influence with elected officials. And the lower the contribution limit, the less campaign spending and the more City government will be responsive to all San Franciscans.

You can "buy back" City government from the privileged and powerful with the most precious of all political commodities: your vote.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Mary Lohneis
Peter Fatooh
Judith Thorson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F, an initiative of the people, is needed to protect the voters and the integrity of the legislative process from being corrupted by the power of money and influence. It prevents City officials and State Legislators from lobbying the City on behalf of high-powered special interests. It also lowers the campaign contribution limit from $1,000 to $500, thus reducing the influence of those same special interests over our elections and elected officials.

The bogus argument that the Mayor won't be able to find qualified people to serve on City commissions if Proposition F is adopted ignores the plain fact that there are 700,000 people in San Francisco, a pool of civic-minded citizens more than large enough to accommodate the 250 commission appointments available in our City government. For example, there are plenty of architects to fill the one architectural appointment on the Art Commission, just as there are plenty of non-lobbyist business people and lawyers available to serve on other commissions.

Thousands of San Franciscans, not just the "insiders", are ready, willing, and able to serve the public.

Proposition F deserves your vote. Restore integrity to City government. Restore the confidence of the citizens of San Francisco in that government. Let's have no more Wilkes Bashford situations.

VOTE YES ON F.

Oscar Sutro
Martha Gillham
Marguerite Warrent
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE "NO" ON F

This proposition disguises itself as "good government" but, in reality, would drive good people out of government. It is so crudely drawn—so sweeping in its implications—that it would bar from government almost anyone with even a remote business or community tie to government.

It would purge from City commissions anyone who "directly or indirectly" receives compensation from any "interests" with an issue before any City agency. Effectively, this could discriminate against employees from community and neighborhood groups, civil rights organizations, non-profit corporations, labor unions, merchant and business groups, as well as architects, lawyers and other professionals.

Actually, there currently are no commissioners who represent any clients before any City agency. All who are appointed in my administration sign a statement saying they will not advocate for any paying client before any official body of the City while they are commissioners. This proposition simply is not necessary.

Proposition F also would lower the limit for any individual campaign contribution from $1000 to $500. Although this sounds good, it would permit a wealthy person with various businesses and numerous family members to contribute many thousands of dollars through different sources. This would encourage "hidden" contributions. We must strive for disclosure of contributions, not a system which drives contributions underground. Candidates must be able to raise funds enough to put their message before the voters. Reducing the contribution limit can be a tactic to discourage persons from challenging incumbents.

Vote no on Proposition F.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition F purports to achieve a noble objective: The removal of "influence peddling" from City Hall. In fact, Proposition F is so poorly-crafted, it may have exactly the opposite effect on City government. It is not a "good government" initiative. It is bad legislation.

Proposition F provides no definitions and no standards for the public to judge whether City officials comply with its restrictions. Its uncertainties will be chaotic and lead to endless, needless lawsuits.

A measure similar to Proposition F was rejected by the Board of Supervisors because no public hearings were ever held on the legislation. If the public had had a chance to comment on this initiative, it might not have the critical shortcomings, deficiencies and uncertainties that now warrant its rejection by responsible San Franciscans.

In the coming months, the Board will review good government measures that are comprehensible, effective and, most important, certain. Proposition F is a misguided disaster.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

This should properly have been titled the "SINK WILLIE BROWN ORDINANCE"! The "meat of the coconuts" is in Section 4.

Supervisor Kopp's intentions are good, however this sloppily drafted and incomprehensible measure succeeds in "burning down the barn" to eliminate a couple of rats!

Under this proposal, to avoid any potential INDIRECT conflict of interest, (which is undefined), one would have to be a destitute, unemployed welfare recipient to qualify for service on any City Board or Commission! The Mayor has already solved this "hired advocacy" problem with the "conflict of interest" affidavits she demands IN ADVANCE from any prospective appointee.

Quentin's proposed $500.00 campaign contribution limit is an "inside joke" and he, of all people, knows it! It merely obliges a heavy contributor to have his wife, children, business associates, or friends send in SEPARATE $500.00 checks if he wants to contribute more than $500.00 to a politician's campaign.

These proposals require additional City employees for enforcement and wind up doing far more harm than good. Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr., President
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Union members and labor officials have legitimate reasons for meeting with City officers. It is unfair and wrong to lump them in the same category as special interest lobbyists, yet that’s exactly what Proposition F does. Working people deserve representation on City boards and commissions. VOTE NO!

Walter Johnson
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council
Leroy King
James Elliot
Keith Eckman
Reeva Olson

Jeff Greendorfer
Stan Smith
Larry Griffin
Steve Rubissa
Terrence Ryan
Jack Beggs
Tony Marovich

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

If you want to ban business owners and executives from serving on City boards and commissions, then vote for Proposition F.

If you think board members of non-profit corporations and employees of community agencies have nothing to contribute to City government, then vote for Proposition F.

If you believe union members and labor officials should not have a voice at City Hall, then vote for Proposition F.

But if you share our belief that these individuals have legitimate concerns and expertise that is valuable in running major City departments, then join us in voting NO on Proposition F.

Proposition F is a simplistic, sloppily-drafted, meat axe approach to a problem already resolved by Mayor Feinstein’s ban on commissioners lobbying on behalf of private clients.

Proposition F is not good government and it is not reform. Proposition F is bad legislation. VOTE NO.

Hon. Douglas Engelmann
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Eugene Friend
Hon. Phyllis Lyon

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

We’re sympathetic to the need for political reform. But it’s a complicated problem, and Proposition F just isn’t the way to go.

Frankly, we can’t tell who is and isn’t affected by this measure. While a handful of people sometimes might abuse their positions, that’s no reason to question the integrity of so many solid citizens who give tirelessly to public service. Proposition F is simply the wrong approach. Please join us in voting NO.

Hon. Amy Meyer
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Walter Jibe
Hon. Bruce Lilienthal
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Jean Kortum
Hon. Thomas Horn
Hon. Henry Berman
Hon. Robert McCarthy
Hon. Richard Guggenheim
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Hon. Patrick McGrew
Hon. Kirk Miller
Hon. Melvin Lee
Hon. Jerry Berg
Hon. Bonnie Gibson
Hon. Mary Noel Papp
Hon. Mark Beull
Hon. Tim Carrico
Hon. Jo Hanson
Hon. Kevin Malone
John Sanger
Tom Moore

Donald Disler
Jim Machob
Anne Daley
Linda Pest
Lynne Williams
Todd Dickinson
Peter Hanson
Herbert Kurian
William Scoorits
Van Hart
Iris Fluellen
Noam Rand
John Schmidt
James Muck
Thomas Karwaki
Wendy Goldberg
Joseph Schwartz
Belle Lasarus
Antonio Barrios
Bruce Barrett
Charles Howell
Walter McGuire
Sharon Davall
Joyce Mauriello

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Concerned about elected officials spending $400,000 to run for supervisor and $1 million on a mayor’s race? Then vote NO on Proposition F.

That’s right. NO.

Proposition F isn’t going to do anything about campaign spending. Prop F simply limits the size of contributions, reducing the current limit from $1,000 to $500. Supervisors can and will continue spending outrageous sums on their re-election campaigns. With Proposition F they’ll just spend twice as much time raising money from twice as many sources, and that makes special interests even more powerful. They can always find ways around campaign limits.

We need campaign spending reform, but Proposition F doesn’t provide it. Please join us in voting No on F.

William E. McDonnell
Frances May McAteer
N. A. Sapanar
Caroline and Michael Figoni

Martin D. Murphy
Eugene C. Payne III
Suzanne B. McCarthy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Concerned about elected officials spending $400,000 to run for supervisor and $1 million on a mayor’s race? Then vote NO on Proposition F.

That’s right. NO.

Proposition F isn’t going to do anything about campaign spending. Prop F simply limits the size of contributions, reducing the current limit from $1,000 to $500. Supervisors can and will continue spending outrageous sums on their re-election campaigns. With Proposition F they’ll just spend twice as much time raising money from twice as many sources, and that makes special interests even more powerful. They can always find ways around campaign limits.

We need campaign spending reform, but Proposition F doesn’t provide it. Please join us in voting No on F.

District 8 Democratic Club
Stephen L. Taber
Ruth Gravanis
Alan Raznick
Miriam Blaustein

Linda Chapman
Dale Carlson
James Firth
Debra Barnes
Lew Serbin
Debra Stein

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

When campaign contributions are limited, political freedom suffers. Your right to free speech includes not only your right to express your views, but also your right to support as much as you want, any candidate who speaks for you.

Minority viewpoints depend heavily on the contribution of a few dedicated supporters to get your message out. To limit your financial support of your beliefs is to silence your political voice.

Only incumbents, who have many opportunities for free media exposure benefit from this assault on free speech. The dangers of a campaign contribution limit far outweigh any possible benefit from this proposition. Defeat Proposition F!

San Francisco Libertarian Party
Michael R. Fowler, Secretary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

You may think Prop F only applies to big-time lawyers and a few legislators who represent developers. Think again!

Prop F would prohibit many community leaders from public service. If it passes, board members and employees of community and charitable organizations could be banned from serving on City boards and commissions.

We appreciate the public need for a government free of "influencing peddling." But restrictions on "compensated advocacy" ought to be clearly and carefully crafted to protect the voices of community leaders who argue on behalf of the public interest, not private special interests.

Vote No.

Hon. Juanita Del Carlo
Mission Hiring Hall

Bob Ross
Publisher, Bay Area Reporter

Hon. Jeffrey Ken Mori
Japanese Community Youth Council, Inc.
Bill O'Callahan
American Red Cross
Hon. George Suncin
Horizons Unlimited
Hon. Jean Rita Alviar
Mission Education Project
Hon. Greg Day
Polk Street Town Hall
Hon. Naomi Gray
Hon. James Foster
Carol Wong
Marlena Marseille
Lee Woods
Jo Daly
Dennis Collins
Hon. H. Welton Flynn
(Organizations listed only for purposes of identification.)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will have no effect on developers' lawyers. None.

It won't make any difference to state legislators either.

Don't kid yourself. This is not "reform" and it isn't "good government." Proposition F will allow the special interests and influence peddlers to continue exercising influence over our elected officials. It has so many loopholes, lobbying will actively continue, untouched, in the back rooms of City Hall.

And developers will always find ways around campaign contribution limits. As Common Cause has noted, Prop F simply makes tracing their dollars more difficult for the public.

Real reform would directly attack the source of huge contributions—the developers and other special interests that employ the lobbyists to peddle their influence.

VOTE NO.

Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
David Looman
Michael Mason

Rich Waller
Susan Klugerman
Rene Cuzenave
Margie O'Driscoill

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

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

PROPOSITION G

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid? YES 300 → NO 301 →

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has adopted an ordinance prohibiting the City, with certain exceptions, from purchasing goods or services from companies doing business with South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a declaration of policy that says the City must try to avoid doing business with companies that significantly profit from or help maintain the Apartheid system in South Africa. It calls on other public bodies and private groups to adopt similar policies. It directs the Board of Supervisors to identify the companies which have the greatest ties to Apartheid so that the public can also boycott those companies.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to avoid doing business with companies that help maintain Apartheid, and you want a public boycott of those companies.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

“The proposed Declaration of Policy be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “G” Got on Ballot

On November 6, 1985 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for the City to boycott businesses with significant ties to South Africa had qualified for the June ballot.

Arlo Hale Smith, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,546 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on October 11.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,941 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:
It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This measure calls for a public boycott of companies that aid apartheid.

Any claim of "conflict" between Proposition G and existing anti-apartheid legislation is imaginary: It is the legislative intent of supporters of this measure that it can be construed as a directive for making existing law tougher.

Personal attacks have no legitimate place in a ballot measure campaign. As a proponent of this measure, I repudiate all such tactics.

Vote NO on apartheid. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Arlo Hale Smith

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Boycotts are grassroots politics. They've helped the farmworkers, they've helped win integration, and they can help end the legal racism called "Apartheid".

A Gallup poll found 77% of South Africa's black majority favoring international economic boycotts to force the Apartheid regime to accept reform peacefully.

After the Boycott Initiative made the ballot, the San Francisco Supervisors unanimously passed a similar city purchasing policy. The issue that remains is whether to call on the general public to join in, boycotting companies identified by the Supervisors as the worst offenders in each industry.

The companies that would be targeted consider profits to be the "bottom line". Economic pressure is all they understand.

The AFL-CIO, NAACP, and NOW have called a boycott of Shell Oil because of its profiteering from South Africa's oppressive economic conditions. Proposition G supports that and would put the same pressure on other industries as well.

This proposition is supported by the elected county central committee of the Democratic Party, the Peace-and-Freedom Party and the Humanist Party, and by leading attorneys, such as Terry Francois, Terence Hallinan, Tony Serra, Lewis Hope Lee, Marc Van Der Hout, Abby Ginsberg and Terence Redmond.

If South Africa were a democracy, its majority would long ago have voted to end Apartheid. We need to vote Yes — because they can't.

Attty. Arlo Hale Smith, Democratic Party County Central Committee
Paul Kangas, Peace and Freedom Party
Loris Salisbury, Public Advocates*
Dr. Kevin Daniker, Food First*
Jesse James, Mission Rebels
Terry Collins, Community Activist
Stony Gebert, Election Action
Robert McCall, Hotel & Restaurant Employees
Executive Board Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Attorneys speak out against Apartheid:

South African police can arrest anyone without charge. They can hold you incommunicado — no contacts with family, lawyers or press.

They regularly censor news, books, music. They have banned Christmas caroling, funerals and other peaceful gatherings. Groups which criticize the government are forbidden to hold meetings.

Blacks are subject to legal segregation; their property and employment rights are greatly restricted; often, they are simply murdered.

As attorneys, we help people who have legal rights that are being violated. But what can we do for those who have no legal rights?

Boycotts and other economic sanctions are the only way to make the Apartheid government accept reform peacefully.

In the Court of World Public Opinion, Apartheid has been convicted of crimes against humanity. By imposing a sentence of economic isolation, we can end Apartheid.

Vote Yes — take a stand for justice.

Terence Hallinan
Arlo Hale Smith
Terry Francois
Karen Anderson Ryan
Robert R. Bryan

Ann Menasche
Rachel Ginsburg
Leo Poli
Gabriel Gesmer
Ora Prouchovnick

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is a moderate, responsible but effective proposal to bring economic pressure on the South African government to establish constitutional rights for all of its citizens.

Vote Yes.

---

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

All decent Americans abhor apartheid. However, boycotting U.S. investment in South Africa is counterproductive; it only penalizes the actual victims of apartheid.

U.S. international firms have acted as progressive agents for change through the Sullivan principles. Their investments have improved the social and economic condition of the labor force. It is improper to penalize their positive contributions.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

We are individuals and organizations working actively to end the racist system of apartheid in South Africa. And we are voting NO on Proposition G.

Why?

(1) Because Proposition G will weaken San Francisco’s present divestment law. This law requires companies doing business with the city to sign affidavits that they will make no new contracts with South Africa.

Proposition G has no such provision.

(2) Proposition G provides no mechanism or funding to carry out its declared purpose of “boycotting” South Africa.

Proposition G will not stop South African products from entering the Port of San Francisco.

Vote against this useless, confusing, and deceptive initiative.

---

Preserve the stronger divestment law San Francisco already has.

Vote NO on Proposition G!

---

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1983 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!
AIDS Research

PROPOSITION H

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?

YES 303
NO 304

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Several city and private agencies conduct various programs related to AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a declaration of policy that says San Francisco should support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council, consisting of a Committee on Education and a Fund-Raising Committee. The Research Committee would make recommendations on the most useful AIDS research projects and try to prevent duplication of efforts. The Education Committee would inform the public about the latest research and about ways to prevent AIDS. The Fund-Raising Committee would seek donations and grants for AIDS research and education projects.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

“The proposed Declaration of Policy for an AIDS research and education council and the formation of advisory committees of civic leaders would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, additional expenditure of public funds for AIDS research may result, the amount of which cannot be determined.”

How “H” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for AIDS research had qualified for the June ballot.

Stony Gebert, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 10,540 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on December 6, 1985.

A check of each signature on the petition showed that 7,564 of the signatures were valid. This is more than 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We need a council to expose and address major AIDS issues without the impasse of present medical/political bias.

As taxpayers, we are subsidizing a treadmill of continual AIDS casualties. There are major oversights where AIDS is concerned. Only recently was it learned that CDC statistics suggest 79% of early AIDS cases appear drug-related. We hear AIDS is 100% fatal. Perhaps that is because death may also be drug-related in the way of immuno-suppressive antibiotic and radiation overloads to already compromised immunity systems. Prevailing medicine is both tunnel-visioned and high-profit motivated. Also well-funded. This solution may be part of the problem. Some physicians are beginning to feel where AIDS is concerned many current practices are ethically, medically bankrupt.

Remissions occur. Largely through immunity-enhancing, holistic medicine. Significantly, only 1% of AIDS cases occur among people at risk in the Asian community. Perhaps this is due to less drug abuse or use of an unfunded, ignored resource: herbology as part of diet. More options: homeopathy, acupuncture, etc.

If, as anticipated, upwards of 40% of those testing positive come down with AIDS, we may become overburdened. To ignore all of the above becomes part of the problem. Vote Yes on Proposition H.

Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Rich McKirkeby, Former Orderly,
Marketing Associate, Pacific Bell
Joseph P. Clady, AIDS Hospice, Shanti Counselor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There is great need for research and education about AIDS and related conditions.

We need to attack the disease, not its victims.
Knowledge is the only vaccine available today.
Vote Yes.

John Lorenzini, President,
People With AIDS Alliance
Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Jan Beck, Steven Russell, Eugene Ewins, ARC/AIDS Vigil

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There are many possible treatments for AIDS and related conditions which are not being examined by the federal government, especially therapies based on natural substances and processes.

Vote Yes for an AIDS Research Council open to all viewpoints.

Scott Gregory, M.D.
Paul Kangas

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

A tape recording (Talking Book) of the San Francisco Voter Information pamphlet is available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

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

Name ____________________________________________________________

Address ___________________________________________ Apt. # ______

Telephone No. (required) __________________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any) ______________________________________

Signature ________________________________________________________
PROPOSITION I

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the Freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a policy statement asking whether or not the Embarcadero Freeway should be torn down.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City's policy to remain as it is, and you want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to change the City's policy, and you do not want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway demolished, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by at least $10.2 million in local funds. Potential private sector financing and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “I” Got on Ballot

On March 3 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy placing the question of demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway before the voters had qualified for the June ballot.

Richard Hongisto, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 11,119 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,720 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land now under the Broadway ramps is put back on the tax rolls, with low-rise buildings limited by restrictive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when united with Proposition J, recognizes these facts:

1) The Embarcadero Freeway is what is left of a never-completed elevated freeway that would have ringed the City through North Beach and Marina neighborhoods to the Golden Gate Bridge.

2) Today this massive freeway, which separates us from our waterfront, would never be built.

3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.

4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf will be preserved.

5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked for this new system.

6) Only that portion of the Embarcadero Freeway east and north of the Main and Beale Street ramps — basically the portion directly on the waterfront — will be removed to make way for the new system. The removal cost, approximately $10 million to be paid for with privately-generated new revenues, is a relatively small part of the overall new system.

As for Proposition I, vote "YES, let's tear down the Embarcadero Freeway." Then turn to Proposition J and support the plan for a beautiful waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Removing the Embarcadero Freeway will allow San Francisco to:

- Create a six-lane, tree-lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero.
- Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway.
- Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula.
- Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero.
- Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.
- Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won't benefit San Francisco. Don't let outsiders determine our future. Vote YES on I.

Honor Toby Rosenblatt
Jack Wooley
Roger Boyer
A. Lee Knigbt
Robert Bradford
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Donald A. Crosby, AIA
Rai Y. Okamoto
Robert Meyers
Ralph Hurtado
Hon. Saxon Berman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Douglas G. Wright
Anita Sanchez
Chuck Forester
Fritz Arko
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Delhart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones
Randall Rossi
Karl Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bromkema
Jon Twichell
Jane Winslow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK — VOTE YES ON I

This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY — VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds — without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city's fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.
ABSENT VOTER BALLOT APPLICATION
Application must be received by the registrar of voters no later than 5/27/86.
Election Date June 3, 1986

PLEASE PRINT REGISTERED NAME:

FIRST NAME   MIDDLE NAME   LAST NAME

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

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

X

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

(AREA CODE) RESIDENCE TELEPHONE

THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT PROPER SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

STREET OR BOX

CITY     STATE     ZIP

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Prep. No.  ________________
A.V. Prep. No.  ________________
Ballot Type/Party  ________________
Affidavit No.  ________________

Signature and Registration Verified as Correct:

Date  ________________  Deputy Registrar

This form was provided by the San Francisco Registrar of Voters Office.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT—VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to 15.7 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown, Fisherman's Wharf and the financial district would be reduced.

Hon. Doris W. Kahn
Monica H. Halloran
Lisa Klairemont
Jeffrey Heller
Nancy Katz
Robert Katz
Bob Isaacs
John Behanna
City Lights Books, Inc.
Kenneth R. Lorch

Travel within the city would be slowed down at all hours. Vote no to the destruction of the freeway.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:

• Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.

• Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.

• If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that—By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.

—Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.

—MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 63% increase in person hours of travel.

—Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City’s plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Judith Tornese

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Tear it down? The concept is preposterous! There are 70,000 cars a day whizzing by on this high speed downtown elevated waterfront freeway! Where will they all go?

Aside from the outrageous demolition costs involved, (some engineers estimate $40,000,000 of taxpayer money!), eyeball observation, logic, and just plain “common sense” dictates that ground level “total gridlock” will result if this expensive freeway is now destroyed.

W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Nostalgic individuals must realize that the times have changed! We can’t bring the Bay back up to Montgomery Street! On behalf of San Francisco’s overburdened taxpayers, we urge a NO vote!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled.

Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

Anna M. Guth
Republican Committeewoman
K. Martin Keller
State Central Committeeman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY
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Embarcadero Freeway Policy

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?

YES 310  NO 311

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a policy statement that says that the City would replace the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt a policy statement which says that the Embarcadero Freeway would be torn down if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt a policy statement to replace the Embarcadero Freeway under these conditions.

Controller's Statement on "J"

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

"The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway replaced with a tree-lined six lane boulevard and other traffic and transit improvements, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by approximately $27.5 million. This includes a one-time freeway demolition cost of $10.2 million plus $17.3 million required to match potential federally-funded transit improvements. Potential financing by the State and private sector and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost."

How "J" Got on Ballot

On March 5 a declaration of policy regarding the future of the Embarcadero Freeway was delivered to the Registrar from the Mayor and several supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows the Mayor or four or more supervisors to submit a declaration of policy to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

In addition to Mayor Feinstein, the March 5 document was signed by Supervisors Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker, Molinari, Kennedy and Nelder.

POLLS ARE OPEN
FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J gives the voters a chance to be heard on an important and timely issue. This issue is the replacement of a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway as one element of a comprehensive package of transportation improvements in the Waterfront area.

Last fall, the Board of Supervisors adopted for further study a set of traffic and transit improvements for the Waterfront. These improvements include:
- A new landscaped surface-level boulevard
- Replacement of the Clay/Washington and Broadway on and off ramps with new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom
- Removal of the unused stub of I-280 and construction of new ramps connecting the new waterfront boulevard to Route I-280
- A new light rail transit line linking Fort Mason with the Caltrain Depot
- Extension of the Muni Metro to the train depot, improving access to the Peninsula Commute Service

A YES vote on Proposition J does not allocate funds for these projects. It does allow for further design and engineering studies, including cost analysis, assessment of impacts on traffic, and other matters. The studies will then be presented to the Supervisors so that they can make an informed decision on the plan. If the studies prove positive, San Francisco will be able to transform its Waterfront for the benefit of all.

Proposition J will insure that the City will not proceed with the removal of any of the Freeway until all the studies are completed and all potential consequences are assessed. This is the responsible approach. Vote YES on J.

SPUR
League of Women Voters
Embarcadero Citizens Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SAN FRANCISCO'S NEIGHBORHOODS ASK YOU TO VOTE YES ON J.

REDUCE TRAFFIC CONGESTION — YES ON J!
Traffic backed up by the Embarcadero Roadway slows travel and creates congestion in North Beach and other nearby neighborhoods. J will speed traffic flow.

IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION — YES ON J!

Proposition J will provide regular streetcar service along the Embarcadero and extend Muni Metro service to the south, ultimately extending to Bayview-Hunters Point.

PROMOTE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY — YES ON J!
If Proposition J does not pass, San Francisco could lose $88 million in federal funds for traffic improvements.
RESTORE THE WATERFRONT — YES ON J!
San Francisco's waterfront could become a focal point for the city, graced by a grand promenade, instead of the dismal, deteriorating eyesore it is now.
San Francisco's neighborhoods join together to ask your support for an improved Embarcadero. We guarantee the freeway will not be removed unless it is replaced by facilities that will assure a smoother, more efficient traffic flow. YES ON J!

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Robert Bradford, Hon. Toby Rosenblatt, Anita Sanchez
Ruth Gravantis

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SUPPORT PUBLIC TRANSIT— VOTE YES ON J.
SAVE SAN FRANCISCO FROM GRIDLOCK— VOTE YES ON J.

The revitalization of the Northeastern Waterfront...as included in San Francisco's Master Plan and transit plans, as overwhelmingly approved by the Board of Supervisors and as urged by Mayor Feinstein...will allow almost $90 million in unused federal highway funds to be used for vital downtown and waterfront transit and street improvements which will be a key to reducing needless auto congestion in San Francisco.

PROPOSITION J SUPPORTS IMPORTANT TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS TO THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT. It will:
— extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific/CalTrain depot
— create a new rail line (possibly using historic streetcars) to connect the entire waterfront from Mission Bay to the Ferry Building to Fishermans Wharf and Fort Mason
— set the stage for a possible streetcar line along Third Street
Since the city of San Francisco adopted the Transit First policy in the early 1970's, transit investments in the Muni Metro, in new electric trolley an articulated bus service, and in BART and Golden Gate Transit, have saved downtown San Francisco from gridlock!

IF you are concerned about the future of transit in San Francisco, IF you are concerned about reducing needless auto congestion, THEN we urge you to join Mayor Feinstein and the majority of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in voting Yes on Proposition J.

Norman Rolfe
San Francisco Muni Coalition
California Transit League
Jack Wholey
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Regina Sneed
Tony Kilroy
Hon. Jack Morrison
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Bay Area Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Hon. Amy Meyer, Recreation and Park Commissioner
Alan Lubliner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A SOUND BUSINESS PROPOSITION—YES ON J:
Common sense and good business demand we make the most of our resources. San Francisco's waterfront is an economic and civic asset unrivaled anywhere—yet much of it is cut off by an ugly, noisy, elevated roadway. The traffic improvements called for by Proposition J will benefit workers, tourists, property owners, neighborhoods...and business.
—Traffic flow and transit will move quickly on a realigned, reorganized Embarcadero Roadway, allowing easier, more pleasant access to waterfront businesses.
—An improved and beautified Embarcadero will create new commercial opportunities and increase the value of existing property and businesses.
—New jobs and an expanded tax base will generate increased revenue for the city as several lots now covered by freeway ramps return to productive private ownership. Though limited to low rise development (40 to 65 feet), tax revenues from development will more than make up the city's share of the project.

Robert Meyers
Dennis J. Potts
Kenneth R. Lerch
M. Arthur Gensler, Jr., FAIA
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones

Randall Rossi
Carl A. Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsrud
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
Jon Twitchell
Fritz Arko
Michael J. O'Shea

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Proposition J offers residents of San Francisco a once in a lifetime opportunity to recapture their waterfront.

Converting the Embarcadero into a tree-lined boulevard and building a new streetcar line will make the waterfront more pedestrian and transit oriented, that is, more people oriented.

A freeway structure that is a source of objectionable noise and casts a pall over a large part of the waterfront will be removed. The waterfront will be opened up to sunlight and fresh air and made more inviting and cheerful to those who wish to walk on one of the world's outstanding waterfronts. Air pollution that is now retained by the existing elevated structure will be dissipated.

The transit orientation of the new waterfront will encourage energy conservation. Proposition J will:

- Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero.
- Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway.
- Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula.

-Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero.
-Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.
-Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won't benefit San Francisco. Don't let outsiders determine our future.

Vote Yes on J for a better San Francisco.

Sierra Club
Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage
Willinda McCrea*
Bob Cramer*
Rebecca Evans*
Richard Livingston*
Marilyn Clements*
Jennie Lew*
Jeffrey Henne*
Jane Winslow*
Roger Boyer

A. Lee Knight
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Patrick S. Hobin
Monica Halloran
Walter K. Morris
Lisa Klairmont
Jeffrey Heller
Bob Isaacson
George T. Rockrise, FAIA
Jon Twichell
Marc Kasky

Argument in Favor of Proposition J

Proposition J gives us a chance to correct a colossal mistake!

The Embarcadero Freeway should never have been built. The original plan was to build a freeway from bridge to bridge, destroying the Northern Waterfront, Fisherman's Wharf, Fort Mason, and Marina Green in the process. When the people of San Francisco saw what was happening, they stopped it in mid-air—literally.

Walk under it. Hear the noise. Feel the gloom. See how it cuts out light.

It's time to remove this mistake. The new waterfront plan will give us a tree-lined boulevard, a new streetcar line, and a Muni Metro extension to the Southern Pacific/Caltrain depot. It will give us a transit and pedestrian oriented waterfront that will give us pride and pleasure.

Vote Yes on Proposition J!

San Francisco Tomorrow

Argument in Favor of Proposition J

The American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, with a membership of 1700 working architects in San Francisco, urges a "YES" vote on Proposition J. In 1968 the citizens of San Francisco stopped highway planners from ringing our waterfront with freeways. Today voters have another opportunity to return the waterfront to our citizens. Removal of the Embarcadero Freeway is one part of a carefully researched transit plan for San Francisco. This proposition supplies an unique opportunity to carry out a broad range of transportation improvements that will have many positive effects on the City of San Francisco.

Removal of the freeway will:

1. Return the waterfront to the people by removing this barrier to access and view.
2. Facilitate needed MUNI improvements.
3. Encourage development of the Embarcadero as a grand civic boulevard unifying the City of San Francisco.

The members of the American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, urge you to vote "YES" on Proposition I and "YES" on Proposition J.

Donald Kennedy, FAIA
President
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Embarcadero Freeway Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans love Their City, the ambiance, the Bay, waterfront, the views, the healthy neighborhoods.
Freeway builders did their damnest to destroy the City and divide our neighborhoods.
Now we can remove that damned spot, the concrete dinosaur, the hideous barrier that destroys our scenic views, the fence that keeps us from the Bay, the concealer of the Ferry Building.
Correct a mistake.

VOTE YES ON J.
Miriam Blaustein
Charlene Clark
Marie Cleasby
Zach Cowan
Dick Grossbush
Rick Hauptman

Tony Kilroy
Jean Kortum
Ira Karlander
Jack Morrison
Andy Nash
Norman Rolfe

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

NO ON PROPOSITION J.
"J" is for JOKE—a cruel joke on us. What will J really do?
Add traffic to every street east of Gough. Delay the construction of waterfront streetcar service. Cost millions in local dollars needed to improve MUNI. Create a ground-level freeway on the waterfront as big as Van Ness, with more cars.
I'm a private citizen who's concerned about traffic and what it's doing to our City. If you are too, vote NO on Proposition J.
Steve Colman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
• Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
• Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
• If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
—By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
—Queueing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
—MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
—Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.
Blair C. Pascoe
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Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:
1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by boldface type.

3.202 Office of Risk Management

There is established under the chief administrative officer an office of risk management which shall have the responsibility of investigating, evaluating and processing for the several boards, commissions and departments all claims for money or damages made upon the city and county pursuant to section 7703 of this charter or the general law of the State of California. Claim investigation functions of the police department in existence on June 4, 1986, shall continue as an adjunct to the bureau established under this section. Claims functions of the public utilities commission shall remain under that commission unless transferred to the bureau of claims investigation and administration by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the bureau shall also have the power to investigate events and occurrences giving rise to potential civil liability against the city and county and adjust and settle demands, within dollar limits to be established by ordinance, prior to their presentation as claims. There shall be established by ordinance a revolving fund to satisfy such demands adjusted prior to their presentation as claims. The bureau shall be responsible for the investigation of all claims and the analysis of city policies and practices upon which the bureau shall report and advise the several departments.

The city attorney shall appoint a chief of the bureau who shall serve at his or her pleasure. The chief of the bureau may appoint, subject to confirmation by the city attorney, investigators who shall serve at the pleasure of the chief, provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of civil claims investigator or any equivalent classification on the date of approval of this amendment by the electorate shall continue to have civil service status to said position under the civil service provisions of this charter.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION A

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by boldface type; deletions are indicated by horizontal strikethrough.

7.100 Materials, Supplies and Equipment

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreements for all contractual services required by the several departments and officers of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract. All purchases in excess of one thousand dollars ($1,000) shall be by written contract; provided, however, that the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases and a permanent record of all such quotations shall be kept. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) shall be by written contract; provided, however, that the recommendation of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases and a permanent record of all such quotations shall be kept. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) shall be by written contract; provided, however, that the recommendation of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases and a permanent record of all such quotations shall be kept. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) shall be by written contract; provided, however, that the recommendation of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases and a permanent record of all such quotations shall be kept.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of materials, supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two or more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned and may advertise for
bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall direct the rejection of all articles which may be below standards, specifications or samples furnished. He shall not approve any bill or voucher for articles not in conformity with specifications, or which are not in variance with any contract.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall also have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for and in use in all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report the same to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.

7.103 Requisition, Contract and Payment

All purchase orders and contracts shall be based on written requisitions, or, for materials, or supplies in common use in the various departments, on the purchase orders and contracts for use in all departments.

Purchase orders and contracts in excess of fifteen-thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) must be approved by the chief administrative officer. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by not more than the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchase of supplies shall approve all bids and vouchers for materials, supplies, equipment, and contractual services before the controller shall draw and approve warrants therefor. All contracts for the purchase of supplies, equipment and material shall be entered into after investigation of bids by publication. All sealed bids received shall be kept on file. When an award of contract is made, notice that the same has been made shall be given by one publication, and any interested person may examine the bids and records at the purchaser's office.

The purchaser of supplies shall by rules and regulations, approved by the chief administrative officer and the controller, designate and authorize appropriate personnel within the purchasing department to exercise the purchaser's signature powers for purchase orders and contracts approved as provided in this charter.

7.200 Public Works and Purchasing Contracts

The construction, reconstruction, repair of public building facilities or other public works or improvements, and the purchasing of supplies, materials and equipment, when the expenditure involved in each case shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), shall be done by contract, except as otherwise provided by this charter. It shall constitute official misconduct to split or divide any public work or improvement or purchase into two or more units for the purpose of evading the contract provisions of this section. In an emergency, provided an actual emergency be declared by the board of supervisors to exist, and when authorized by resolution of said board, any public work or improvement may be executed in the most expeditious manner. Notwithstanding any other provision in this section or this charter contained, upon the approval of the chief administrative officer declaring the work to be emergency in character, there may be expended by the department of public works the sum not to exceed five hundred dollars ($500) for new construction of any type in or upon unimproved or unaccepted streets.

Any public work or improvement estimated to cost less than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) may be performed under contract or written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county.

Any public work or improvement executed by the city, other than routine repair work, shall be authorized by the chief administrative officer when the cost exceeds fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or by the employment of departmental labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies not under the chief administrative officer, only after detailed estimates have been prepared and submitted by the head of the department concerned.

There shall be separate accounting for each work or improvement so executed, which accounting shall include all direct, indirect and supervisory elements of cost chargeable to such work or improvement, and each cost accounting shall be reported to the chief administrative officer, or to the mayor when such work shall have been performed by departments not under the chief administrative officer. All such accounts shall be reported to the controller. Any public work or improvement costing less than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) and not performed by the use of city and county labor, materials, and supplies shall, if not performed under contract, be covered by written order or agreement which shall be based on not less than three bids, notice of which shall be given by three days' posting. Records of such bids shall be kept by the department.

When the expenditure for any public work or improvement shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), the same shall be done by contract, except as otherwise provided in this charter. The head of the department in charge of the work for which a contract is to be let, or the purchaser of supplies in the case of purchases of materials, supplies and equipment, shall let such contract to the lowest reliable and responsible bidder not less than ten days after advertising by one publication for sealed proposals for the work, improvements or purchase contemplated. Such proposal shall contain the reservation of the right to reject any and all bids. The officer responsible for the awarding of any such contract shall require from all bidders information concerning their experience and financial qualifications, as prescribed by general law relative to such investigations authorized by department of public works.

The purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer for bids in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or the department head concerned, with the approval of the board of supervisors, to which he is responsible may reject any and all bids and readvertise for bids.

The department head or the purchaser of supplies, as the case may be, shall have power to sign such contract for the estimated expenditures thereunder not in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000). Any contract involving the expenditure of more than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), if for the purchase of materials, supplies or equipment, shall require the joint approval of the purchaser of supplies and the chief administrative officer. If such contract is for any public work or improvement, it shall require the joint approval of the department head and the chief administrative officer for amounts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), relative to departments under his jurisdiction, or the signature of the department head and the approval by resolution of the board or commission concerned, in the case of departments not under the chief administrative officer.

The board of supervisors, by ordinance, shall establish procedure whereby appropriate city and county departments may file sealed bids for the execution of any work to be performed under contract. If such bid is the lowest, the contract shall be awarded to the lowest bidder. Accurate units costs shall be kept on all direct and indirect charges incurred by the department under any such contract, which unit costs shall be reported to and audited by the controller monthly and on the completion of the work.

In any case where the lowest gross price or unit cost bid is not accepted, and a contract is entered into with another bidder, written report shall be made to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the controller by the officer authorized to execute the contract, with the reasons for failure to accept such lowest bid.

If any provision of this section is in conflict with any provision of section 7.900 of the charter, the provisions contained in section 7.100 shall govern and control.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.

7.201 Public Works Contract Procedure by Ordinance

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter and, in particular, the provisions of section 7.200, the board of supervisors shall by ordinance determine the monetary limits to not exceed fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), within which the construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements may be done by contract or by written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county, consistent, save as to monetary limits, with the manner provided for in section 7.800 and section 7.100.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.

---

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.
point two commissioners to terms of one year each, one commissioner to a term of two years, one commissioner to a term of three years and one commissioner to a term of four years. The terms of the commissioners shall be for four years from the commencement thereof. Not less than one-four members of said commission shall be of the same sex, and one member shall have prior experience representing labor and one member shall have prior experience representing management.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of one hundred dollars ($100).

Section 3,500.-The commission shall have the power of the police commission for the purpose of considering and adopting examinations questions shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission, on the regular weekly working hours of 8am to 5pm. Such persons or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

In accordance with section 3,500, the commission shall have the power and it shall be its duty to appoint an executive assistant to be the administrative head of the affairs under its control who shall serve at its pleasure; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of assistant secretary to the civil service commission on the effective date of this section as amended shall continue to have civil service status in the employ of the city and county under the civil service provisions of this charter.

3.661 General Powers and Duties-
(a) The civil service commission shall be the employment and personnel department of the city and county and shall determine appointments on the basis of merit and fitness, as shown by appropriate tests.
(b) The commission shall classify, and from time to time, may reclassify, in accordance with duties and responsibilities of the employment, and training and experience required, all places of employment in the departments and offices of the city and county not specifically exempted from this chapter from the civil service provisions thereof, or which may be created hereafter by general law and not specifically exempted from said civil service provisions. The commission shall likewise classify all other positions or other places of employment in the city and county-service specifically exempted from the civil service provisions of this chapter, but which, by the provisions of section 8,400, thereof, are made subject to classification for salary standardization purposes on the scale of duties and responsibilities of the employment and training and experience required. The civil service commission shall be the judge of such classification.
(c) The civil service commission may require periodic reports from the personnel director in a manner and form which it shall prescribe.

(d) The civil service commission may hear appeals from an action of the personnel director with respect to:
- Dismissals.
- Collaborations of discrimination. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this chapter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the civil service commission regarding allegations of discrimination shall forthwith be enforced by every officer and employee.
- Allegations of fraud; and
- Allegations of conflict of interest, pursuant to section 8,105.
(e) No action by the personnel director which is the subject of any appeal shall be stayed during the appeal process except by the unanimous vote of the civil service commission.
(f) The commission shall be notified of the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal of personnel regulations and may comment on such proposals. The adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing fraud or allegations of discrimination shall be subject to ratification by the commission. In addition, the adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfers, resignations and terminations shall be subject to ratification by the commission. The commission shall ratify or reject any such regulation within 60 days of receipt. The commission's failure to act shall be deemed approval.

3.662 Department of Personnel Administration
There is hereby established a department of personnel administration which shall consist of a personnel director and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. Any employee who is a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the civil service commission and whose job function is placed under the department of personnel administration shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job function had not, by amendment to this charter, been placed under the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration.

The department of personnel administration shall be the personnel department for the city and county and shall provide a means to recruit, select, certify, appoint, train, evaluate, promote career development, classify positions, administer salaries, and direct and direct and related personnel activities in order to maintain an effective and responsive work force.

3.663 Personnel Director
(a) A personnel director shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the mayor; provided, however, that the personnel director shall be selected from candidates nominated by any civil service commissioner and confirmed by vote of the board of supervisors. The nominee of the mayor may be appointed acting personnel director pending confirmation. The person so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am appointed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of personnel director in the spirit of this declaration."
(b) The personnel director shall conduct appropriate examinations for employment, establish eligible lists based on their results and provide for certification of eligibles. The action of the personnel director on examination matters including,
but not limited to, announcements, minimum qualifications, classes of applicants, components, construction, weighting, content, type, list length, duration and certification shall be final.

(c) The personnel director shall adopt personnel regulations which, except as otherwise provided in this charter, shall govern both the administrative matters within the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration and the exercise of the authority granted in this section, including, but not limited to, recruitment; applications; examinations; eligibility; duration of eligible lists; certification of eligibles; personnel; permanent and probationary appointments; regular performance evaluations; promotions; transfers; resignations; layoffs or reduction in force due to lack of work or lack of funds, reorganization, retraining or completion of work; and classification. No personnel regulations shall be adopted, amended or repealed without a prior public hearing held at least two weeks in advance of the hearing by the personnel director and after meet and confer sessions with recognized employee organizations as required by state law. All civil service commission rules relevant to the foregoing as well as the provisions of former sections 8.322, 8.323, 8.326, 8.326.5, 8.329, 8.330, 8.331, 8.332 and 8.334 of this charter shall become personnel regulations on the effective date of this charter amendment.

(d) The personnel director shall conduct the salary surveys for the civil service commission as set forth elsewhere in this charter.

(e) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall establish procedures to review and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the personnel director shall be final and may not be enforced by any employee or office, unless the decision is appealed to the civil service commission in accordance with personnel regulations.

(f) The personnel director shall investigate all employee complaints concerning job-related conduct of City and County employees and shall promptly report to the source of the complaint the decision of the personnel director.

(g) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall promote effective and efficient management through personnel programs that encourage high productivity and exemplary performance.

(h) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall provide a procedure for resolution of employee disputes which shall be conducted in accordance with other provisions of this charter and shall be utilized by department heads and appointing officers upon the expiration of the existing term of any otherwise binding agreements.

(i) Consistent with the foregoing and other applicable provisions of this charter, the personnel director shall delegate to the various appointing officers appropriate responsibilities, including but not limited to appropriate disciplinary procedures, and consult with appointing officers with respect to personnel regulations affecting their operations.

(j) Personal services contracts shall be reviewed and approved by the personnel director in accordance with the provisions of an appropriate personnel regulation. Personal services contracts reasonably expected to involve payment by the city and county of more than twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000) shall also be reviewed and approved by the Commission. Failure of the Commission to act within 30 days of submission of the contract by the personnel director shall be deemed to constitute approval by the commission.

(k) The personnel director shall establish a system of job classification. The provisions of section 8.200 shall govern which positions are classified, which classifications are created, and which positions are reclassified. The personnel director shall be the judge of such classification determinations.

(l) From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the department of personnel administration shall determine whether a position within a classification is eligible for temporary or permanent appointment. Appointments may be made on a permanent, temporary or, where confirmation is required, a provisional basis.

(m) Excepting sections 8.500, 8.600, 8.601, 8.105, 8.107, all but the second to the last paragraph of section 8.344, section 8.346, the last sentence of section 8.408, all but the second paragraph of section 8.409, all but the second paragraph of section 8.409, sections 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.406, 8.407 and this section, wherever the words "civil service commission" or "commission" appear in the personnel provisions of this charter, they shall be replaced by the words "department of personnel administration", "department", "personnel director" or, as the context permits, the word "rule" or "rules" shall be replaced by words "personnel regulation" or "regulations," the words "general manager, personnel" and "secretary of the civil service commission" shall be replaced by the words "personnel director" and the words "section 3663" shall be replaced by the words "section 3662.5" or "section 3663," as appropriate.

The clerk of the board of supervisors, after consultation with the city attorney, is hereby directed to conform the language of the charter as herein amended when next the charter is submitted for republication.

8.322 Protest of Written Questions and Answers

(a) After the completion of a civil service examination held, the questions used and the answers thereto shall be available for review by the examinees. This review period shall not apply to questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written test. During the review period, the examinees shall have the opportunity to protest questions or answers they believe to be incorrect or improper. After all protested items have been acted on and after the official rating key has been adopted, the identification sheets have been opened, further changes in the rating key shall not be made.

8.323 Protest of Tentative List of Eligibles

(a) Following the completion of the examination, a tentative list of eligibles shall be posted for the inspection of the public and of participants. The posting period shall be for a minimum of three (3) working days for the entrance examinations or five (5) working days for promotional or combined entrance and promotional examinations. During this period a fee shall be charged for the inspection of the list. The amount of such fee shall be established by ordinance of the board of supervisors. The fee shall be waived for eligibles who wish to inspect their own papers. Inspection of papers shall include all documents supporting the eligibles' rank and score except either the identity of the examinee giving any such information or grade in any oral examination or any answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written test shall be provided. Only participants in the examination may review the questions used in the examination. If no protests are received during the posting period the eligible list is automatically adopted. If protests are received during the posting period the examination and action of the general manager, personnel, shall be expedited so that final adoption of the eligible list is not delayed beyond sixty (60) days after the date of receipt of the last protest. As a result of the ranking, there would receive a notice of appointment regardless of the outcome of the protest(s) may be offered employment from among eligible lists pending the resolution of any protest(s) and amendment to the adopted eligible list.

8.325 Promotions in General

(a) Except as specifically provided for in section 8.375, the City Civil Service Commission shall provide for promotions on an entrance, competitive or combination—entrance and competitive—basis. Consideration shall be given to permanent employees in separate promotional examinations and in promotional examinations which are combined with entrance examinations for city and county service when the passing mark has been attained by the highest performer in the examination of work performance and other credits. When an examination announcement is issued for a class on a both a promotional—entrance basis, there shall be one result of eligible lists which shall include all successful candidates both promotive and entrance in order of relative performance.

(b) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this or any other part of this charter, an employee who has been certified from a regularly adopted eligible list to a non-permanent position in a civil service classification shall be permitted to participate in promotional examinations on the same terms and conditions as a person holding a permanent appointment to a position on a competitive basis and have the opportunity to a determination of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the civil service commission. This position as herein amended shall only be applicable to promotional examinations announced after its effective date.

8.326 Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave

(a) A person under permanent civil service appointment who, because of absence on duly authorized military leave after June 27, 1950, did not participate in a promotional examination held after June 27, 1950, and during time of war as defined in section 8.324 of this charter, and in which examination the employee would have been otherwise eligible to participate for promotion, and which examination is hereinafter referred to as the original promotional examination, shall, after abridgment of military leave, have the right to participate in a similar promotional examination. Provided, that persons and employees who were on entrance or promotional eligible lists, shall for the purpose of this amendment be deemed to be eligible in their classifications from the time their names were reached for permanent certification while in the military service.

(b) In order to qualify for participation in a similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section, such employee who desires to participate therein must make application in writing to the civil service commission thirty days after the abridgment of his military leave; or, within thirty days after the effective date of this amendment. Failure to file such written request to participate in a similar promotional examination as herein provided shall be deemed a waiver of all rights of the employee to participate in such similar promotional examination.

(c) The civil service commission shall hold such examinations within a reasonable time after employees eligible to request participation in any such similar promotional examination as herein provided shall be deemed a waiver of all rights of the employee to participate in such similar promotional examination.

(d) The civil service commission shall be the sole judge of the adequacy of such similar promotional examination. If the employee obtains in the similar promotional examination a score rating equal to or
more than the minimum passing mark established by the civil service commission for inclusion on the list of eligibles resulting from the original promotional examination. The name shall thereupon be entered on the name list for the position for which the original examination was held, and the commission shall arrange for the administration of the examination. Such employees shall be eligible for appointment from such list of eligibles in accordance with civil service rules to any vacancy thereafter occurring, and subject to satisfactory completion of a probationary period as provided in section 8.340 of this charter for a period of four years after the date on which their name is entered on the eligible list and before eligible processing standing through examinations held subsequent to the original promotional examination.

If it is determined by the civil service commission that the name of such person would have been reached for permanent appointment from the list of eligibles established as a result of the original promotional examination during his term of military service had the name of such person appeared thereon, then such employee, upon appointment to a permanent position as herein authorized, shall retain the seniority of-their place on such appointment date from the date of appointment as a result of qualifying in the similar promotional examination as herein authorized.

- Such employees who qualify for appointment as a result of a similar promotional examination as herein provided, and who are appointed to permanent positions or who are promoted to permanent positions, shall be entitled to participate in other competitive examinations for which they are eligible, while serving under probationary appointment in the position to which they were appointed as a result of the similar examination conducted.

- The civil service commission shall adopt rules to govern the administration of similar promotional examinations herein authorized, and appointments and other matters resulting therefrom.

- 8.329 Certification of Eligibles—Rule of Three

When a position is not filled by the civil service provisions of this chapter to be filled, the appointing officer shall make a requisition to the civil service commission for a person to fill it. Thereupon, the commission shall certify to the appointing officer the names and addresses of the persons standing highest on the list of eligibles for such position. In case the position is granted permanent seniority, the commission shall certify names of the three persons standing highest on such list. If there are fewer than three names on the list from which to certify, there shall be the number therein.

The appointing officer shall fill the position by appointment of the person certified. The position shall be designated "two-year provisional service as herein provided under the provisions of section 8.329 of this charter on or after the effective date of this amendment. In making such certification, there shall be determined a grade or standard, a rule of the commission or the appointing officer's discretion.

- From the requisition of the appointing officer, the commission shall determine whether the position is in character, temporary, seasonal or permanent, and shall notify the candidate in accordance therewith to the end that the candidate may have knowledge of the probable duration of employment. The commission shall provide for such waiver of temporary or seasonal employment as may be deemed advisable in the interest of such candidate.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this or any other provision of the charter, an employee who has been certified from a regularly adopted eligible list to a non-permanent position in a civil service classification shall be entitled to appointment to a permanent position within that same classification. The commission shall provide for such waiver of temporary employment as may be deemed advisable in the interest of such employee. The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to the acquisition of permanent positions filled from the list of eligibles before January 1, 1980.

- 8.330 Duration of Lists of Eligibles

- The civil service commission may remove all names from the list of eligibles after they have remained on the list of eligibles for more than two years and all names that were appointed shall be removed from the list after four years. The commission may, however, provide in the examination announcement that the list of eligibles to which the commission shall have appointed shall automatically expire at a date not less than two or more than four years after the adoption of such list.

- 8.331 Limited-Tenure Appointments

- When in war declared by the Congress of the United States, eligibles are not available for appointment from registers established through the regular examination procedure as provided under Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof, the civil service commission may extend eligibilities for the purpose of filling wartime appointments to positions through informal and non-competitive tests. Such tests and appointees resulting therefrom shall be governed solely by the provisions of this section and by rule of the civil service commission adopted pursuant thereto and the tests shall be adequate in the judgment of the civil service commission to determine the capacity of applicants to perform the duties of the positions to be filled under the exigencies prevailing. Such wartime eligibilities shall be filled through the regular examination procedure as provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof but in no event to exceed six months beyond the cessation of hostilities. Limited tenure appointments may be terminated by the appointing officer at any time for lack of work or funds. Limited tenure appointments may be terminated by the appointing officer for good cause at any time with the approval of the civil service commission without reference to the procedures governing removals set forth in Section 8.342 hereof. Persons serving under limited tenure appointments in this section provided shall be re-eligible for appointment on the regular examination procedure as provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof. Existing employees of the municipal railway, shall not be included in the calculation of service of such employees for the purpose of determining assignments of runs when such assignments are made on the basis of seniority of service.

- Non-civil service appointments in the absence of eligible employees as provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 of this charter shall not be filled if applicants qualified for limited tenure appointments are available. The civil service commission shall make every effort consistent with current conditions to maintain adequate registers of eligibles established through the regular examination procedure as provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules to carry out the provisions of this section and to govern the administration of limited-tenure appointments.

- In time of national emergency declared by the President of the United States or by the Congress or while any act authorizing compulsory civil service or training in an emergency is in effect, the provisions of this section may also be made operative upon recommendation of the civil service commission and approval of the board of supervisors of the ordinance enacted by both counties of the board. Authority for limited tenure appointments, if established pursuant to the authority of this paragraph, shall cease six months after repeal by the board of supervisors of the ordinance which authorized such appointments.

- 8.332 Temporary and Emergency Appointments

- When no list of eligibles exists or no eligible is available on an existing list for a position in the class requisitioned by the appointing officer, and immediately after the requisition, by the appointing officer and another list exists which is duly certified by the civil service commission to be suitable to provide temporarily the service desired, the commission shall certify for civil service temporary appointment an eligible from such list; if no such list is certified by the commission to be suitable from the list of eligibles, the commission shall authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment thereto for a period not exceeding one hundred and thirty working days. Non-civil service or emergency appointments extended beyond ninety days must be approved by the civil service commission. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such one hundred and thirty working days at the time a civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in section 8.329 of this charter.

- If a list of eligibles exists for the position requisitioned as immediately after the requisition, by the appointing officer pending the time an eligible from such list is certified and reports for duty as provided in section 8.329 of the charter, the commission may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment thereto for a period not exceeding thirty working days. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such thirty working days at the time a civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in section 8.329 of this charter.

- No person shall be compensated under any non-working day in any fiscal or calendar year, and no claim or warrant therefor shall be approved, allowed or paid for any compensation in excess of such one hundred and thirty working days in any fiscal or calendar year.

If no eligible is available for appointment to a permanent position in the class requested by the appointing officer the commission shall immediately hold an examination and establish a civil eligible list for such position. If its annual appropriation is insufficient to cover the cost of said examination, it shall report to the mayor the estimated thereof, and the
governmental jurisdictions and private employment for like work and like service, based upon job classifications as provided in section 366.5 and 3662 of this charter and shall make its findings, based on facts and data collected, as to what are the generally prevailing basic pay rates for each benchmark class of employment solely in the manner hereinafter provided. A benchmark class is defined as a "key class" in an occupational series for which a representative sample of data will be collected.

Basic pay rate data for public and private employment shall be collected solely from the Bay Area counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, San Francisco and Santa Clara; provided, however, that for any benchmark class of employment for which no survey is conducted, the personnel director determines there is insufficient data from Bay Area public jurisdictions the commission/personnel director shall survey major public agencies in the state employing such class, major public agencies to be defined as these employing more than 3,000 persons.

The personnel director shall collect basic pay rate data for like work and like service from Bay Area public jurisdictions as follows:

(a) The counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara.

(b) The ten most populous cities in these five Bay Area counties based on the latest federal decennial census.

(c) Agencies of the state and federal governments and from school districts and other special districts in the six Bay Area counties as determined by the civil service commission personnel director. The commission personnel director shall collect private basic pay rate data from recognized governmental Bay Area salary and wage surveys of private employers in San Francisco, San José, San Mateo, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. The data collected shall be limited to basic rates of pay and salaries actually being paid by public and private employers for like work and like service.

The term "prevailing rates of wages" for employers governed by section 8402 and this section shall be defined as the rate ranges developed from the weighted average of the midpoint of the basic pay rates, excluding fringe benefits, for surveyed public employers and the median of the pay rates for private employers to be determined as follows:

1. Multiply the medians from the private and the midpoints from public employers data base by the number of employees in the given classification from each data base;
2. Add the products of (1);
3. Divide the sums in (2) by the total number of employees surveyed for that classification; and
4. Extend this figure by 10 percent to establish the maximum of the range and reduce this figure by 10 percent to establish the minimum.

When fixing rates of compensation the board of supervisors shall fix basic pay rates as close as reasonably possible to prevailing rates, provided, however, that the board of supervisors shall not set the maximum rate of pay for any class in excess of the maximum prevailing rate for that class; provided further, however, that no employee shall have his basic pay rate reduced to conform to prevailing rates except as provided for in section 8406. For those classifications of employment in which the practice is customary, the schedules of compensation shall provide for minimum, not less than three intermediate, and maximum salary steps and for a method of advancing the salaries of employees from minimum to intermediate to maximum with degress for seniority of service.

The term "basic pay rate" as used in this section is hereby defined as applying only to the basic rate of wages, with included range scales, and does not include any other benefits of employment or working condition benefits.

It is the declared intent of the qualified electors of the city and county that neither the board of supervisors nor the mayor have any power to provide any benefits of employment except those enumerated already provided for in the charter. Any addition, deletion or modification of benefits of employment enumerated in the charter shall be submitted, as a charter amendment, to the qualified electors of the city and county. The qualified electors expressly state that they understand that benefits of employment are sometimes referred to as "fringe benefits" of employment and the qualified electors expressly reserve the right to deny such benefits except those conditions of employment commonly referred to as "working conditions". Any reference to "working conditions" shall mean those compensations which must necessarily be provided in order for the employee to perform his job description duties efficiently and safely, and shall include but not be limited to such working conditions and benefits as are typically included in the administrative provisions of the salary standardization ordinance and the salary ordinance.

The board of supervisors may, in his or her discretion, may provide working condition benefits for employees covered under this section and section 8407 of this charter only in accordance with the following provisions:

(a) The civil service commission personnel director must determine, certify and recommend to the board of supervisors that the working condition benefit is equitable or necessary for the efficient and safe performance of the employee's duties as enumerated in his job description.

(b) The working condition benefit, as recommended by the civil service commission personnel director, is substantially comparable to like work and like service to that provided for the job classification and is provided to not less than 50 percent of the employees of the class in the jurisdiction covered by the salary survey.

9.108 Initiative, Referendum, and Recall
(a) The registered voters shall have power to propose petition, and to reject at the polls, any ordinance, act or other measure which is within the power conferred upon the board of supervisors to enact, or any legislative act which is within the power conferred upon any other board, commission or officer to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinance, act, charter amendment or other measure must be so proposed by being signed by registered voters or, in the case of a petition setting forth said measure in full, signed by registered voters of the city and county as many in number as the percentages hereinafter required of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor cast at the last preceding regular municipal election.

Any declaration of policy may be submitted to the voters in the manner provided for the submission of ordinances and acts; and when a majority of the qualified electors voting on said declaration, it shall thereupon be the duty of the board of supervisors to enact an ordinance or ordinances to carry such policies or principles into effect, subject to the referendum provisions of this charter.

Any ordinance which the supervisors are empowered to pass may be submitted to the electors by a majority of the board at a general election or at a special election called for the purpose, said election to be held not less than ninety days from the date of the call. Such ordinance may be proposed by one-third of the supervisors, or by the mayor, and when so proposed shall be submitted to the electors at the next succeeding general election. No ordinance passed by the supervisors granting any public utility franchise
or privilege, shall go into effect until the expiration of sixty days from the date it becomes final. At the end of such sixty days such ordinance shall be in force and effect, unless within such period there shall be filed with the registrar a petition signed by registered voters equal in number to five percent of the entire vote cast for mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election, requesting that such ordinance be submitted to the electors. In case such petition is filed, such ordinance shall not go into effect until approved by a majority of the voters voting thereon at a general or special election.

If, before the time any other ordinance involving legislative matters becomes effective, there shall be filed with the board of supervisors a petition signed by qualified electors of the city and county equal in number to at least ten percent of the entire vote cast for all candidates for mayor at the last preceding general municipal election at which a mayor was elected, protesting against the passage of such ordinance the same shall be suspended from going into operation, and it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to reconsider such ordinance, and if the same be not entirely repealed, said board shall submit the ordinance to the vote of said electors either at the next general municipal election or at a special election to be called for that purpose, and such ordinance shall go into effect or become operative unless and until a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon shall vote in favor thereof. The provisions of sections 9.109 and 9.110 of the charter shall apply to and govern the verification and certification of such petition.

Annual budget and appropriation ordinances, supplemental appropriation ordinances, the annual salary ordinance, or ordinances amending the same, the ordinances levying taxes, any ordinance appropriating money from the emergency reserve fund, ordinances authorizing the city attorney to compromise litigation, and ordinances necessary to enable the mayor to carry out any of the powers vested in him in the case of public emergency as defined in section 3.100 of the charter, or ordinances enacted pursuant to section 8.400 of the charter, or ordinances relative to purely administrative matters, shall not be subject to referendum.

Any elective official, the chief administrative officer, the controller, or any member of the board of education or public utilities commission may be recalled by the electors. The procedure to effect such recall shall be as follows: A petition demanding the recall from office of the person sought to be recalled shall be filed with the registrar. Said petition shall contain a statement of the grounds on which the recall is sought. Any insufficiency of form or substance in such statement shall in no way affect the validity of the election and proceedings held thereunder. No recall petition shall be filed against any officer until he has held his office for at least six months.

(b) In the event the representative of the board of supervisors and the representatives of recognized employee organizations do not reach an agreement through the meet-and-confer process on matters contained in the annual salary standardization ordinance by March 15 of any year, the mayor shall recommend and the board shall either approve or reject a schedule of compensation which reflects currentprevailing rates for the classifications covered by Section 8.401 of this charter and the last good faith offer presented by the mayor or his or her representative.

In any year when an agreement on matters contained in the salary standardization ordinance has not been achieved, the civil service commission personnel director, upon receipt of a written demand from a recognized employee organization made upon the mayor and the personnel director shall prepare, prior to April 1, a schedule of compensation and administrative provisions which reflect additional rates that would be payable, and working conditions, based upon the last demands made by the recognized employee organization(s) which participated in the meet-and-confer process.

Said schedule shall be transmitted to the registrar of voters for submission to the electors of the city and county at a general election or a special election called for the purpose, and said special election shall be held no less than sixty (60) days from the date of the call. No such schedule shall be withdrawn after it has been received by the registrar of voters. At said election, the ballot shall contain the following two alternatives:

(1) Approval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

(2) Disapproval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

If a majority of the valid votes cast in the election favor the additional rates set forth in the schedule of compensation based upon the last demands of the recognized employee organizations which engaged in the meet-and-confer process, it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to amend the salary standardization ordinance to reflect said increased

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION E

NOTE: All sections are new.

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

Section 1. This ordinance may be called the "City College Public Lands Preservation Ordinance."

Section 2. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall approve or deny, WITH NO EXEMPTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS, any building permit application for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, located across Phelan Avenue from the presently occupied campus of City College and consisting of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

Section 3. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall revoke or rescind, WITH NO EXEMPTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS, any building permit application previously granted for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, which consist of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

Section 4. The term "building permit" includes building permits, site permits and any other permits for the performance of construction work.

Section 5. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of the ordinance shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. No provision of this ordinance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent implementation of the policy stated above.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION F

NOTE: All sections are new.

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

Section 1. The People of the City and County of San Francisco desire and are entitled to a local government whose officers do not engage in, assist or promote compensated advocacy on behalf of private interests before City and County commissions and boards while also serving as City and County officers.

Section 2. No officer of the City and County may, during the term of office, engage in compensated advocacy before any City and County board or commission, or any member of the board or commission or its staff, in order to represent any private interest, for which representation the officer receives, directly or indirectly, any compensation, reward or gift.

Section 3. Officers of the City and County shall not discuss matters pending before their commission or department with other City and County officers or state legislators when those other officers or state legislators are acting as compensated advocates for a private interest.

Section 4. No member of the California State Legislature shall appear before any City and County board, department or commission as a compensated advocate representing a private interest.

Section 5. In the financing of city and county campaigns: (a) No person other than a candidate shall make, and no campaign treasurer shall solicit or accept, any contribution which will cause the total amount contributed by such person with respect to a single election in support of opposition to such candidate, including contributions to political committees supporting or opposing such candidate, to exceed $500.00. (b) If any person is found guilty of violating the terms of this section, each campaign treasurer who received part or all of the contribution or contributions such constituent would be for penal purposes, from available campaign funds, if any, the amount received from such person in excess of the amount permit-

continued on page 78
The provisions of sections 3.800 and 3.100-I, relating to the emergency powers of the mayor, shall not be applicable to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

11.105 Effective Date of Amendments
The effective date of the amendments, additions and deletions to the civil service provisions of the charter shall be ninety (90) days after the acceptance and filing thereof with the Secretary of State.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION G

We the people of San Francisco declare this to be our policy:
1. IT IS IMPROPER TO PROFIT FROM OR PROVIDE SUPPORT TO THE RACIST POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SYSTEM IN SOUTH AFRICA, KNOWN AS APARTHEID.
2. COMPANIES HAVING SUBSTANTIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH APARTHEID MUST BE CONSIDERED IRRESponsible.
   a. The Board of Supervisors must determine which companies doing or seeking business with the City have the greatest ties to Apartheid. Companies that have a significant involvement in profiting from or maintaining the Apartheid system, may, on that basis, be deemed "irresponsible bidders.
   In purchasing goods and services and awarding other contracts, the City must give priority to avoiding such companies; the degree of the preference must be in proportion to the company's complicity with Apartheid, according to the following criteria:
      — how much the company profits from Apartheid governmental contracts, loans, payments or other funding;
      — how much the company profits from other Apartheid governmental contracts, loans, payments or other funding;
      — the nature of the company's South Africa business;
      — the degree of the company's cooperation with South African political censorship or secrecy agreements;
      — the degree to which the company provides the South African government with technology, materials, and other means to maintain and enforce Apartheid.
   b. City funds must not be deposited or invested with any bank or other company which does business in or with, or makes loans to, South Africa.
   c. If any exception to the above policies is found to be necessary or appropriate, the responsible official must promptly and publicly report it to the Board of Supervisors, clearly describing the exception and the reasons for it.
   d. We CALL ON ALL OTHER PUBLIC BODIES AND PRIVATE OR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS TO ADOPT SIMILAR POLICIES.
   e. We CALL A GENERAL PUBLIC BOYCOTT, FOCUSING ON THOSE COMPANIES HAVING THE GREATEST TIES TO APARTHEID.

The Board of Supervisors must determine and announce which company or companies are the worst offenders within each major industry, so that the public can focus its boycott on those companies.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION H

SUMMARY: THIS INITIATIVE STATES THAT THE AIDS EPIDEMIC IS A MAJOR PUBLIC HEALTH PROBLEM WHICH CONCERNS EVERYONE, REQUIRING INCREASED SUPPORT FOR RELATED MEDICAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION. IT CALLS FOR A COUNCIL FOR AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION OR SIMILAR UNIFIED EFFORT TO STOP AIDS.

We the people of San Francisco hereby adopt the following policy:
1. The AIDS epidemic has rapidly become a major public health problem, costly both in human lives and in general community resources.
2. The first steps in dealing with such a crisis are:
   —the scientific research needed to discover and understand the nature, causes, co-factors, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of the disease, and
   —the education of the public about the lessons of that research;
3. A proper program of research and education pays for itself in the long run;
4. Prompt action is urgent, because of the rapidly growing number of persons affected, increasing not only the suffering but also the difficulty of eradicating the disease;

The leadership and support of such an effort is everyone's responsibility;
While San Francisco's role in the overall effort against AIDS has been viewed as a positive example to other areas, the continued rapid increase in the spread of the disease means that we cannot afford to rest on our laurels or leave further responsibility to others;

Therefore, it is RESOLVED:
1. We call on all appropriate government bodies as well as medical, professional, charitable and community organizations and concerned individuals to join together in an all-out effort to stop AIDS;
2. We call for support to an organized unified effort along the lines of an AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION COUNCIL, including, in some form:
   —A COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, to provide informed evaluations as to priorities among research projects and proposals, recommending those which are most cost-effective and most likely to produce early results useful in the prevention or treatment of the disease, to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts or neglect of promising approaches, and to provide the council with complete and up-to-date information regarding comparative results of experimental treatments, prevention programs and other existing research;
   —A COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, to inform the public regarding prevention and other research findings, and to inform relevant government officials and the general public, concerning the factual basis for a re-ordering of current public funding priorities toward an increased war against disease, including research and education against AIDS and related conditions;
   —A FUND-RAISING COMMITTEE, to solicit donations, lobby for grants, organize benefits and other fund-raising projects spreading the financial burden by appealing to many sources;
3. We ask the council and committees to be responsive and accessible to public input, to include representation of all interested groups, to consider all viewpoints, and to determine the final course of action;
4. We ask appropriate city officials to determine whether a suitable form of such a council already exists; if it does, we wish the city to support it actively; if not, we wish the city to seek to encourage its formation by such means as may appear proper.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION I

SUMMARY: This initiative asks "Shall we tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?" The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated portion of Route 480 known as the Embarcadero Freeway. This initiative declaration of policy will give the voters the opportunity to establish the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco regarding the proposed teardown of the Embarcadero Freeway.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION J

Shall the City replace a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if such replacement would open up the Waterfront to its citizens, improve the tax base, and create a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic?
Candidates

FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER
JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco
My age is 42

My qualifications for office are: The Bill of Rights guarantees that every person accused of a crime shall have the effective assistance of counsel. Whether an individual is rich or poor, that person is entitled to a competent and dedicated attorney.

In San Francisco it is the duty of the Public Defender to uphold this sacred right. In every case, we provide the client with the best defense under the law.

In the last 7 years, my outstanding staff has done this work with the highest degree of professionalism. In the next 4 years, that same strong, professional, independent and ethical representation will continue.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John D. Bards, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative In Congress, 5th District
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
George Christopher, 170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Clerk
Linda T. Fries, 830 25th Ave., Artist/Community Organizer
Brian Getz, 55 22nd Ave., Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson, Sheriff of San Francisco
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Matti J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., International Vice President, ILGWU
Jean Jacoby, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for Children & Youth
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070 26th Ave., Executive Assistant to Sala Burton M.C.
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Community Health Director
Linda Ann Post, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative
Jim Rivaldo, 430 Steiner St., Political Consultant
Julia Tang, 788 18th Ave., Member, SF Community College District
Governing Board
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel W. Walker, 562 Campbell Ave., President — Local 250-A Transport
Workers Union of America
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliiris Ave., Minister
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Retailor
C. R. Zanca, 1966 Pacific Ave., Auto Repair Proprietor

FOR ASSESSOR
SAM DUCA

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor

My qualifications for office are: I was elected your Assessor in 1978 and re-elected in 1982. My years in the Assessor’s Office were spent in a professional appraisal capacity personnel and administration. I have two university degrees, the coveted MAI designation, and am the recipient of a special Congressional Advisory Board award from the United States Congress. I have served in an advisory capacity, both nationally and internationally, in property tax administration and will continue to serve the taxpayers of the City and County of San Francisco in dealing with Article XIII A of the State Constitution. My community involvement includes participation in cultural, civic business organizations.

Sam Duca

The sponsors for Sam Duca are:
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
Eugene L. Friend, 2910 Lake St., Investor
Nancy Pelosi, 40 Presidio Ter., Housewife and volunteer in politics
Walter H. Shorenten, 740 El Camino del Mar, Chairman, Milton Meyer & Co.
Stanley Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Emma W. Louie, 1257 Jackson St., Housewife
Alfred S. Wills, 2590 Jackson St., Chr. of Exec. Comm. of Diversified Holding Co.
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arthur H. Coleman, II Hinckley Hall, Physician
Gerson Bakar, 2320 Hyde St., Investor
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management
Jane McKaskell Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired
Joseph C. Orongo, Sr., 866 Faxon Ave., Publicity Dept. — S.F. Giants
James A. Scatena, 101 St. Elmo Way, Chairman of the Board, Scatena York Co.
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher
Frances May McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Recreation & Park Commissioner
Frederick F. Campagnoli, 2609 Larkin St., Attorney
Betty Brooks, 1738 26th St., Field Representative
Jess Teruel Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Businessman
Cyril L. Maginn, 994 California St., Merchant
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John H. Swanson, 145 Lake Merced Hill South, Bowling Alley Owner
Frances G. Goldmann, 745 El Camino Del Mar, Child Guidance
Irma M. Bernardo, 282 34th Ave., Housewife
Leo J. Murphy, 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Charles M. Cunningham, 475 Connecticut St., Self Employed
Lawrence V. Epipinette, 815 Fell St., Conf. Secretary
Mary M. O’Connor, 72 Merece Ave., Volunteer & Homemaker
Elizabeth R. Duca, 16 Wawona St., Homemaker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Application for Absentee Ballot

is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

Name

Residence Address

Mailing Address

Signature

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

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

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

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

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

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
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YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 5, 1986.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
  • are a U.S. Citizen,
  • are at least 18 years of age on election day,
  • are a resident of California, and
  • are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours, you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election or a local election, you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, such as this one, you can only choose among the candidates of your party.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Senator, State Assemblymember, County Central Committee, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your polling place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 3, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

Q—Can a worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
  • Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
  • mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see enclosed card).

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

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
  • your home address,
  • the address where you want the ballot mailed,
  • then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail by absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 3, 1986.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS CONCERNING VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

A 第一步
如您用自動投票機
如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。

B 第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

C 第二步
請確記選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

D 第三步
請把帶錶之選票針，由小孔內垂直插入，打孔選票。

E 第四步
投票選舉後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。

STEP 1
USING BOTH HANDS INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

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

STEP 2
BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

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

STEP 3
HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

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

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

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTING RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate’s name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person’s name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the “YES” or after the word “NO”.

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

TO COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
### Governor

**Hugh G. Bagley**  
Businessman  
Hombre de Negocios

**Frank L. Thomas**  

**Eileen Anderson**  
Singer and Dancer  
Cantante y Bailarina

**Charles "Chuck" Pineda, Jr.**  
State Hearing Officer  
Oficial de Audiencias Estatales

**Tom Bradley**  
Mayor, City of Los Angeles  
Alcalde, Ciudad de Los Angeles

*Note: For a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*

### Lieutenant Governor

**Leo T. McCarthy**  
Lieutenant Governor  
Vicegobernador

*Note: For a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*

### Secretary of State

**March Fong Eu**  
Secretary of State of California  
Secretario de Estado de California

*Note: For a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>JOHN GARAMENDI</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Senator, Businessman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senator Estatal, Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California State Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tesorero del Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney General, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procurador General, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Member, State Board of Equalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BERT DE LOTTO</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLIS</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### United States Senator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES GREENE</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIAN LANTZ</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN CRANSTON</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT J. BANUELOS</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

---

**Democratic Party**

**Primary Election**

**June 3, 1986**
## United States Representative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW KLEIN</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL MOBERG</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALA BURTON</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### State Senator

**There is no contest for State Senator in this district.**

(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal)

本區沒有州參議員選舉。

## Member of the State Assembly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WILLIE L. BROWN, JR.</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CATHARINE DODD</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNE BELISLE DALEY</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RON HUBERMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERENCE HALLINAN</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESSE J. IVY</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSAN J. BIERMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAR JACIKS</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNETH JOHN AZBILL</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WADE “SPEEDY” WOODS</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONY KILROY</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES LEGARE</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLE MIGDEN</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LULU M. CARTER</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(WRITE-ON)* To vote for candidates not on the ballot, write the name and office title on the long side of your ballot.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>DANIEL NUSBAUM</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>JEANNE BAIRD</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>SAM DUCA</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $850,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>COMMUNITY PARKLANDS ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for acquiring, developing, improving, rehabilitating, or restoring urgently needed local and regional parks, beaches, recreational areas and facilities, and historical resources.</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>WATER CONSERVATION AND WATER QUALITY BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $150,000,000 to provide funds for water conservation, groundwater recharge and drainage water management, and clarifies language in the Clean Water Bond Law of 1984.</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>DEPOSIT OF PUBLIC MONEYS IN CREDIT UNIONS. Authorizes Legislature to provide for deposit of public moneys in any credit union. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect. Legislation already approved implementing measure could result in greater interest income to state and local governments.</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. Provides exception to property tax limit when acquisition or improvement of real property approved by two-thirds of voters. Fiscal Impact: By itself, measure has no fiscal effect. No increase can occur in local property tax rate unless bond issue is approved by two-thirds vote. State costs for tax relief programs could increase. State income tax revenues could decline as taxpayers deduct greater amounts for property tax payments.</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>ALLOCATION OF VEHICLE LICENSE FEE TAXES TO COUNTIES AND CITIES. Requires allocation of Vehicle License Fee taxes to local governments. Fiscal Impact: Measure would have no direct fiscal effect. Prevents Legislature from changing the law to take vehicle license fees away from counties and cities. Measure would not prevent state reducing other forms of aid to local governments or changing existing formula for dividing vehicle license fee revenues between counties and cities.</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>LEGISLATORS' AND JUDGES' RETIREMENT SYSTEMS. Limits retirement allowances for persons entering Legislators' and Judges' Retirement Systems after January 1, 1987. Fiscal Impact: Minor savings to state in future years if rate of inflation exceeds increase in salaries paid to current officeholders.</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

236 SI 赞成
237 NO 反对

ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1986. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $500,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en la compra de granjas y casas para los veteranos de California.

239 SI 赞成
240 NO 反对

ACTA DE TERRENOS DE PARQUES DE LA COMUNIDAD DE 2006. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición, desarrollo, mantenimiento, rehabilitación o la restauración urgentemente necesitada por parques, plazas, áreas e instalaciones de recreación, y los recursos históricos locales y regionales.

242 SI 赞成
243 NO 反对

LEY DE BONOS PARA LA CONSERVACIÓN DE AGUA Y CONTROL DE LA CALIDAD DEL AGUA DE 1986. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $500,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la conservación del agua, restauración de agua subterránea, manejo apropiado del agua de lluvia, y clarificación del lenguaje en la Ley de Bonos para Agua Limpia de 1984.

246 SI 赞成
247 NO 反对

DEPÓSITO DE FONDOS PÚBLICOS EN COOPERATIVAS DE CREDITO. Autoriza a la Legislatura para que disponga del depósito de fondos públicos en cualquier cooperativa de crédito. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. La legislación ya aprobada que pone en efecto la medida podría resultar en mayor ingreso de intereses para los gobiernos locales y estatales.

249 SI 赞成
250 NO 反对

FÍNANCIACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD: Dispone exenciones a los límites de impuestos a la propiedad en el caso de adquisición o mejoramiento de la propiedad inmueble al ser comprada por dos terceras partes de los vecinos. Impacto Fiscal: Por sí sola, la medida no tiene ningún impacto fiscal. Ningún aumento en la tasa de los impuestos locales a la propiedad puede ocurrir a menos que una medida de bonos sea aprobada por los dos terceros de los residentes. Los costos menores por programas de despistamiento de impuestos podrían aumentar. El redito de las tasas estatales y de la renta podría disminuir a medida que los contribuyentes de impuestos descuentan mayores cantidades por pagos del impuesto a la propiedad.

254 SI 赞成
255 NO 反对

ASIGNACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS POR PÁDOS DE LICENCIA DE VEHÍCULOS A LOS CONDOMINIOS Y CIUDADES. Requiere la asignación a los gobiernos locales de los impuestos recaudados en pagas por Licencias de Vehículos. Impacto Fiscal: La medida no tiene ningún impacto fiscal directo. Implica que la Legislatura pueda cambiar la ley para tomar los fondos provenientes de licencias de vehículos de las ciudades y condominios. La medida no evitará que el estado pueda reducir otras formas de asistencia a los gobiernos locales o que pueda cambiar la fórmula actual de dividir los réditos provenientes del pago por licencias de vehículos entre las ciudades y condominios.

258 SI 赞成
259 NO 反对

SISTEMAS DE JUBILACIÓN DE LOS LEGISLADORES Y JUECES. Limita las pensiones de jubilación para aquellas personas que se afilian al Sistema de Jubilación de los Legisladores y Jueces después del 1ro de enero de 1987. Impacto Fiscal: Ahorrará menores para el estado en años futuros si la tasa de inflación excede el aumento en los salarios que se pagan a los que actualmente ocupan cargos.

염문 및 유의사항: 본 시안은 1986년 1월 1일부터 적용되는 법률의 원칙에 따라 작성되었습니다. 설명서에 따라, 이 시안의 내용은 그 뿐만 아니라, 현재의 편집 기준에 따라 작성되었습니다.
### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

#### STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Proposition Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>NONPARTISAN OFFICES. Prohibits a political party or party central committee from endorsing, supporting, or opposing a candidate for nonpartisan office. Fiscal Impact: No direct state or local government fiscal impact.</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. DISASTERS. Base-year value of property damaged or destroyed by disaster transferable to comparable replacement property in same county. Fiscal Impact: Local property tax revenues would decrease by an unknown amount. County assessor and tax collectors would have nonsignificant higher administrative costs. State would replace revenues lost by school and community college districts. State income tax revenues could increase due to lower property tax deductions on replacement properties. These state costs and revenues cannot be estimated.</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>MULTIPLE DEFENDANTS TORT DAMAGE LIABILITY. Plaintiff's non-economic damage recovery limited to defendant's liability based on defendant's percentage of fault. Fiscal Impact: Substantial savings to state and local governments. Savings could be several millions of dollars in a year, varying significantly from year to year.</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>COUNTY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county correctional facilities and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of four hundred ninety-five million dollars ($495,000,000).</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgments against the City?</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>PROPOSITION C HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THE BALLOT BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposición</td>
<td>Voto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262 SI</td>
<td>買成</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266 SI</td>
<td>買成</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273 SI</td>
<td>買成</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES**

**CARGOS NO PARTIDARIOS.** Prohibe a un partido político o a un comité central de un partido político patrocinar, apoyar u oponerse a un candidato a un cargo no partidario. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo a los gobiernos estatales o locales.

**IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE DESASTRES.** El valor en el año base de propiedad inmueble dañada o destruida por un desastre puede ser transferible a propiedades inmuebles de reemplazo comparable en el mismo condado. Impacto Fiscal: Los rindióles provenientes de impuestos locales a la propiedad disminuirán en una cantidad desconocida. Los contribuyentes y recaudadores de imuestos del condado tendrían incentivos a Wynestall, o si el estado reemplaza los rindióles que los distritos escolares y de colegios de educación superior dejan de percibir. Los rindióles del impuesto estatal a la renta pueden aumentar debido a menores deducciones en el impuesto a la propiedad en las propiedades de reemplazo. Estos costos y rindióles estatales no pueden ser calculados.

**RESPONSABILIDAD CIVIL DE MULTIPLES PARTES DEMANDADAS EN JUICIOS DE AGRARIOS INMENSALES.** Limita la indemnización que puede recibir el demandante por daños no económicos a la responsabilidad del demandado basándose en el porcentaje de la culpabilidad del demandado. Impacto Fiscal: Ahorros sustanciales para los gobiernos estatales y locales. Llevan los daños de algunos millones de dólares al año, que variarán significativamente de año en año.

**ACTA DE RONOS PARA DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA INSTALACIONES DE CONDADO DE 1988.** Es la acta dispuesta para la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelación, e reemplazo de instalaciones correccionales de los condados en la ejecución del mantenimiento diario en las mismas en conformidad con una aportación de fondos por cuaciones noventa y cinco millones de dólares ($95,000,000).

**PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONTADO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Voto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>278 SI</td>
<td>買成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281 SI</td>
<td>買成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OFICIALMENTE ELIMINADA**
### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VOTER SELECTION CARD

PRIMARY ELECTION
JUNE 3, 1986

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.

Fill out this card and take it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR CANDIDATE SELECTION
Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>(IF any)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. Public Inst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Central Committee*</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to your sample ballot for the number of County Central Committee members to be elected. The number varies with each district.

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR PROPOSITIONS.
PRÓPOSITIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

288 SI 负成
289 NO 反对

288. "¿Deberá la Ciudad transferir la administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil a un departamento de administración de personal que tenga poder para cambiar las normas del servicio civil que el presente constan en la Carta Constitucional?"

292 SI 负成
293 NO 反对

292. "¿Deberá la Ciudad negar o revocar cualquier permiso de construcción para edificar en la Represa Balboa en las Avenidas Ocean y Phelan en los próximos tres años?"

296 SI 负成
297 NO 反对

296. "¿Deberá la Ciudad prohibir la defensa remunerada efectuada por oficiales de la Ciudad y legisladores estables ante cualquier comisión de la Ciudad, y limitar la cantidad con la que una persona pueda contribuir para un candidato a una oficina municipal en $500?"

300 SI 负成
301 NO 反对

300. "¿Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el bulleter al urge de empresas que tengan mayor vinculación con la segregación racial sudafroamericana?"

303 SI 负成
304 NO 反对

303. "¿Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el auxiliar a todas las organizaciones apropiadas, públicas y privadas, para establecer y mantener un Consejo para la Investigación y Educación sobre S.I.D.A. (A.I.D.S.)?"

307 SI 负成
308 NO 反对

307. "¿Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el demoler al Autopista Embarcadero?"

310 SI 负成
311 NO 反对

310. "¿Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el reparte al Autopista Embarcadero, si esto aumentara el acceso del público a la zona de los Museos y mejorar el tráfico?"
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

**BALLOT**—An official list of candidates and propositions.

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

**VOTE BY MAIL**—See Absentee Ballot, above.

**POLLING PLACE**—The place where you go to vote.

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

**MEASURE**—Another name for proposition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**PERMIT (noun)**—A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building. Proposition E concerns the issuance of a permit.

**COMPENSATED ADVOCACY**—Compensated means being paid for doing something; Advocacy means speaking or writing on behalf of someone else. Proposition F concerns the issue of compensated advocacy.

**RISK MANAGEMENT**—This field covers two areas: (1) deciding on when it is better to buy insurance and when it is better to be self insured or uninsured, then shopping for the insurance; (2) identifying hazardous conditions on one’s property and seeing that they are corrected so that liability and damage claims will be avoided. Proposition A concerns risk management.

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

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

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

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

PROPOSITION A

Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgments against the City?

YES 278

NO 279

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Consultants hired by the Chief Administrative Officer are available to City departments that have questions about “risk management”, such as how to keep damage claims to a minimum and how to find the best insurance rates. In some cases, the departments use these consultants. In other cases, the departments make their own decisions. When damage claims are filed, some are handled by the City Attorney’s Office and some are handled by City departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would amend the City Charter to create an Office of Risk Management, under the Chief Administrative Officer. The office would set risk management guidelines for all City departments, boards and commissions. Proposition A would also establish a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration in the City Attorney’s Office. The bureau would be responsible for investigating, evaluating and processing all damage claims made against the City, except those claims made against the Public Utilities Commission and the Police Department. The bureau would also have the power to investigate potential suits against the City and to make settlements within dollar limits to be set by ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer and a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want damage claims and risk management decisions to continue to be handled the way they are now.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

“Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not affect the cost of government. However as a result of its potential future application and the exemption of certain employees from the civil service provisions of the Charter, costs may be affected in an amount presently indeterminate.”

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 10 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 71
VOTE YES ON A

Last fiscal year, over 6,400 claims and law suits were filed against the City, costing us more than $10 million in settlements. I believe that it is time to change the way we handle our claims, secure insurance, prevent risks and settle legitimate claims against the City.

Last summer, we appointed a task force of citizens, under San Francisco Bar President Jerry Falk, to make recommendations on how to streamline our procedures and save money at the same time. The present system is very slow, costly, and inefficient.

Currently, all claims are investigated by the department involved. The City Attorney cannot act on any claim until the department is ready. This results in delay and duplication of effort and increased costs. A centralized and accountable Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney would be more efficient, cost-effective, and professional. It would enable the City to settle many claims quickly, before litigation is begun, saving the City the costs of defending itself in court and lowering the average cost of settling a case.

This can be accomplished without creating new jobs by simply moving into one office the city positions presently scattered throughout the government.

Vote "Yes" on A. Reduce the cost of City government.

Adoption of this measure would also formally establish responsibility for Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer, where it has been unofficially since 1978. With this strengthened authority, the Risk Management Office would be responsible for the gathering of claims data on a City-wide basis, the creation of incentives for both reducing the possibility for injuries and damage and the number of claims for each department, the coordination of insurance purchasing and specific suggestions to avoid and reduce risk.

This amendment is presented with the recommendation of the Mayor's Task Force on Claims and Judgments, the Chief Administrative Officer, City Attorney, the President of the San Francisco Bar Association, and the President of the Lawyers' Club of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Each year the City spends almost $10 million to settle damage claims. It is estimated that the overall costs to the City for all risk-related activities exceeds $125 million a year. It is time for action to be taken to reduce these huge expenditures. This charter amendment is designed to do just that.

Claims Investigation and Adjustment

Right now, the City claims investigation process is decentralized and largely unorganized. Each department investigates its own claims. Investigators may or may not be specially trained for their duties. There is no uniformity of investigation procedure or claims reporting. In only a few departments do investigators contact injured parties within days of an accident in order to settle the claim quickly and economically.

This amendment will create a claims investigation and adjustment bureau in the Office of the City Attorney. Claims investigation and adjustment activities will be centralized, economized and made much more efficient. The new bureau will be able to respond immediately to accidents and claims, providing quick compensation to deserving persons while at the same time producing a prompt, professional investigation. This reform is greatly needed.

Risk Management

Presently, there is no overall plan for the management of the City's risk exposure: insurance purchasing, avoidance of industrial accidents, gathering data on accident patterns, etc. Again, risk management as a function is fragmented among the various City departments. As a consequence, departments cannot develop the necessary expertise to manage themselves to reduce risk-related costs.

This measure will establish a risk manager under the Chief Administrative Officer. For the first time, overall City planning will be possible in order to control risk. Departments will be told what activities are producing injuries or damage and advised on corrective measures. Private industry has been utilizing risk managers of this type for years. It is time that the City did the same.

This amendment will reduce the cost of government and insure a more efficient delivery of City services to all San Franciscans. We urge you to give it your unqualified support.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This charter amendment was proposed by a citizens' task force appointed by Mayor Feinstein. Its mission was to propose ways of reducing the number and financial costs of claims and lawsuits against the City.

The amendment has two principal features. The first is to centralize within the City Attorney's office the investigation of claims filed against city departments. This will allow for improved training and supervision of the investigators, who presently are scattered throughout city government. The result will be more efficient, cost-effective and professional investigation of claims. By improving the quality of claims investigation, the City can identify those claims which have merit and attempt to reach early—and less costly—settlements. Meritless claims will be denied with greater confidence that if suit is filed it can be defended successfully.

The second major feature of the amendment will establish a Risk Management office under the Chief Administrative Officer. Risk management is a concept widely used in private business. Risk managers are professionals skilled in reducing the overall cost of claims. The Risk Manager would be responsible for coordinating the City's insurance program, data collection, and correcting problems within the City which lead to claims. The Risk Manager would review those claims which have been filed against the City. Where it appears that an unsafe condition or practice has led to a claim, the Risk Manager would suggest to the affected department that corrective measures be taken. Reports to the Mayor and to the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors of the recommended corrections and the actions taken would ensure that the various departments will be responsive.

The City cannot eliminate claims and lawsuits against it. But it can limit its exposure by managing the claims process more effectively. This measure will reduce injuries and reduce claims, and that is good for everyone.

Jerome B. Falk, Jr.
Chair, Mayor's Task Force on Claims and Judgments Against the City

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN
KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, May 31, 1986

12 Noon State Senate, Assembly, Congress and State Propositions
1:00 Proposition A—Risk Management & Claims
1:15 Proposition B—Purchaser & Contracts
1:30 Proposition D—Civil Service
2:15 Proposition E—Balboa Reservoir
2:30 Proposition F—Compensated Advocacy
3:00 Proposition G—Apartheid
3:20 Proposition H—AIDS
3:30 Propositions I, J—Embarcadero Freeway
3:50 Statewide Candidates

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

PROPOSITION B

Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?

YES 281  NO 282

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchaser must get the approval of the Chief Administrative Officer before signing certain contracts for more than $15,000. Only the voters may change that dollar limit. The Purchaser must personally sign every contract that comes through his office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would raise the limit on contracts requiring the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval to $50,000. It would also allow the Board of Supervisors to change that limit by ordinance. Proposition B would also permit the Purchaser to name certain people in his office to sign contracts on his behalf.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval only on contracts for more than $50,000. You also want the Purchaser to be able to name certain people in his office to be able to sign contracts on his behalf.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to require the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval on contracts for more than $15,000. You also want him to sign all contracts himself.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 3 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 71
VOTE YES ON B!

The City’s Charter requires that a permanent, non-elected City official, the Chief Administrative Officer, review all purchases and contracts above $15,000. Of course, CAO approval of major contracts is very important. But, due to inflation, the number of contracts that have to go to the CAO for approval is always increasing. Today there are too many documents requiring CAO approval. This slows down the purchasing process, occupies staff time—and ultimately costs the City money. Proposition B will raise the CAO approval level to $50,000, and help the City to improve the efficiency of its purchasing operations.

The City’s budget includes more than $250 million for purchases on tens of thousands of contracts. At the current $15,000 review limit, the CAO must approve thousands of documents every year—a costly, time-consuming process. In the long run the City loses money because of the inordinate length of time required to complete all the paperwork.

An adjustment must be made to remove the smaller contracts from this cumbersome process. Review and approval of contracts under $50,000 should be under the responsibility of the City Purchaser, a highly trained and experienced professional, who reports directly to the CAO. By changing the present $15,000 to $50,000, it will be possible for the CAO to give each document that comes to him the attention it requires. And, by placing its orders and paying its bills faster, both the City and businesses will benefit—especially small business and those owned by minorities and women.

Proposition B will allow future adjustments to the limit to be made by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility will ensure the City’s ability to adjust to inflation and changes in the market.

This amendment comes to you with the recommendation of auditors, controllers, bankers, and others who exercise top fiduciary responsibility within their own organizations.

VOTE YES ON B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will make essential changes to update the purchasing and payment procedures under the Chief Administrative Officer. These measures are necessary and desirable because they will save the City money by significantly increasing our management efficiency.

Right now, the City loses because it takes too long for contracts to be reviewed and payments okayed, which means that early payment incentives go unutilized. The CAO has to approve every contract greater than $15,000—and with City purchases last year over $250 million, the paperwork logjam is vast and overwhelming.

An increase in the review limit from $15,000 to $50,000 will make an adequate adjustment for inflation—$50,000 now is only about $15,000 in 1967 dollars. Proposition B will also enable the City Purchaser, who reports to the CAO, to maximize potential savings through early payments by designating appropriate personnel to approve contracts up to $50,000. These “Good Business” amendments are consistent with private sector practices and should be incorporated by the CAO in the City’s best interests.

Finally, Proposition B will give the City the ability to respond quickly to changes in the market place by allowing changes in the CAO review limit by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility is necessary to ensure that in the future we will not lose money because of institutional rigidity. Control is maintained with the necessity of Board action and Mayoral approval to adjust the review limit, and this same feature will allow for change when desired.

Vote yes on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON’T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
Civil Service

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?

YES 288

NO 289

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the civil service system of the City of San Francisco. The structure of the civil service system and certain rules governing its operation are written into the Charter and can only be changed by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would make major changes. A Department of Personnel Administration would run the Civil Service system and would be able to change rules with Commission approval. Major features of Proposition D are described below. The complete charter amendment is printed in this voters' handbook.

Department of Personnel Administration

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Certain civil service rules governing the general operation of the system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs, are written into the Charter and carried out by the Civil Service Commission. Only the voters can change these rules.

THE PROPOSAL: A department of Personnel Administration would be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. A Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor would run the Department. Certain rules governing examination, selection and appointment would be taken out of the Charter. The Personnel Director would be able to change these rules with the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

Civil Service Commission

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the general operation of the civil service system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs. The Commission also hears and decides appeals on civil service matters.

THE PROPOSAL: The Civil Service Commission would no longer be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. The Commission could investigate the operation of the system, approve rule changes proposed by the Personnel Director, and hear and decide appeals only on claims of job discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest.

Employee Relations

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors appoints an Employee Relations Director to negotiate contracts with City employees; the Board approves all contracts.

THE PROPOSAL: The Mayor or his or her agent would negotiate with City employees; the Board of Supervisors would still approve all contracts.

What your vote means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing civil service system.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE
CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT ON "D"

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, and of itself it would not directly affect the cost of government, as it removes many civil service policy setting functions from the Charter and an independent Civil Service Commission and transfers responsibility for personnel matters, including labor negotiations, to the Mayor.

"As a product of its inherent flexibility and possible future application, costs could be affected or savings realized in amounts presently indeterminate but probably substantial."

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy
(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. Consistent with the City's and County's affirmative action goals, no applicant or employee shall be selected, appointed, reduced in rank, removed or in any way favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, union activities, political affiliation or sexual orientation.

(b) The purpose of the civil service system is to obtain for the city and county the best qualified persons to fill city and county positions in a timely and economical manner, using professional, fair and equitable personnel selection and personnel management practices with consideration of the following merit principles:

1. Recruiting, selecting and advancing employees on the basis of their ability, knowledge, skills and performance relative to the work to be performed.

2. Establishing equitable and adequate compensation, as provided elsewhere in this charter:

3. Training employees, as needed, to promote productivity and high quality performance and to facilitate career development.

4. Retaining employees during good service and separating employees for good cause.

5. Assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration, with proper regard for their privacy and constitutional rights; and assuring equal employment opportunity, based on the person's ability to do the job.

6. Assuring that employees are protected against coercion for political purposes and are prohibited from using their official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the outcome of an election or a nomination for office.

(c) This charter does not limit the power of departments, agencies, or other subdivisions of the city and county in their exercise of management prerogatives including but not limited to:

1. Directing employees in the performance of their duties;

2. Hiring, promoting, transferring and assigning employees from those qualified;

3. Classifying positions in accordance with Section 3663 (h);

4. Disciplining employees;

5. Laying off employees because of lack of work, lack of funds or other reasonable cause; and

6. Determining the mission of its departments and divisions, and its budget, organization, the number of its employees, and the numbers, types, classifications and grades of positions or employees assigned to an organization unit, work project, shift or tour of duty, and the methods and technology of performing its work.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy
(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. No person shall in any way be favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, age, religion, national origin or other non-merit factors.

NOTWITHSTANDING anything to the contrary in subsection (a) or any other provisions of this charter, it shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, consistent with a policy of acquiring qualified personnel for the service of the city and county, to encourage the hiring of blind persons. It shall further be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that no otherwise qualified blind person shall be discriminated against in employment, re-employment, appointment, re-appointment, waiver of eligibility for appointment or re-appointment, promotion or demotion in any class, subclass or position in the civil service unless eyesight is indispensable for the performance of the duties and responsibilities of the class, subclass or position. It shall be the duty of the commission to classify, and from time to time it may reclassify, places of employment in the civil service and duties of which may be efficiently performed by qualified blind persons, and to conduct appropriate examinations which will fairly test the capacity of blind persons as well as sighted persons to perform such duties.

2.030-2 Employee Relations Director

NOTWITHSTANDING the provisions of section 3.350 of this charter, the employee relations director shall be appointed by the board of supervisors and shall hold office at the pleasure of the board.

3.102 Employee Relations

It shall be the duty of the mayor to meet and confer with employee representatives on behalf of the city and county and all its constituent boards, commissions, departments and agencies as required by applicable law. These duties may be performed by a designee of the mayor who shall serve at the pleasure of the mayor. Nothing herein shall limit the mayor from contracting for the performance of these duties.

NOTWITHSTANDING any other provision of this charter, the mayor shall submit all memoranda of understanding or ordinances to be enacted pursuant to Article VIII of this charter herein to the Board of Supervisors for its approval or rejection.

3.650 Commission; Composition; Meetings

There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county of San Francisco. The commission shall consist of five members appointed by the mayor. The commission shall hold office at the pleasure of the mayor. All of the members of the commission shall be persons who have had experience in the field of personnel administration. In making appointments to the commission, the mayor shall give primary consideration to persons having experience in the field of civil service administration.

POLL CLOSE AT 8:00 p.m.

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative Charter amendment rewriting the civil service provisions of the Charter had qualified for the June ballot.

Robert Bradford, Jonathan Bulkey, Lee Munsen and Mary Hilton, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 36,049 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 25,027 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Vote YES and join 34,000 San Franciscans who signed petitions to get this crucial reform on the ballot. "D" clears the way to modernize Civil Service so that it is fair and efficient. The present system is a 50-year conglomeration of rules that tie the City's hands —

— A protest by one applicant can hold up hiring for an entire job classification for months — even years.

— Often tests cannot be given frequently enough to maintain current tests of qualified employees. This leads to delays and temporary appointments that make hiring top candidates all but impossible.

— Appointments to jobs are restricted to the top three names on a list even though more than three people have the same score!

— Many provisions are out of date. Some deal with hiring during the Korean War. Others limit our ability to carry out affirmative action.

"D" would remove archaic rules from the Charter so they could be changed as the times require — subject to meet and confer and public hearings. Job tests could be expedited; hiring and promotions speeded up; opportunities opened to women and minorities.

Specifically, Proposition D:
1) Creates a Department of Personnel Administration at no additional cost. Like other U.S. cities, day-to-day administration would be the responsibility of a director, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Supervisors.

2) Makes the Civil Service Commission the oversight body to set policy and hear appeals. Rulings would have to be within 60 days, eliminating endless delays.

3) Moves the office of labor relations from the Supervisors to the Mayor, who must make the tough-minded decisions to balance the budget. Never again could the Board give labor $27 million for "comparable worth."

This reform is the product of years of work with SPUR, League of Women Voters, Chamber of Commerce. Members of the Board of Supervisors could have put the reform on the ballot last year but bowed to some labor leaders, and 34,000 San Franciscans had to do the job for them.

Proposition D will enable City government to work better for you. Vote YES.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON 'D'

Proposition D is a complex proposition with a simple goal: remove the archaic restrictions on the hiring, promotion, or firing of city employees and bring San Francisco's personnel system into the modern age.

Archaic is the only way to describe a system that keeps equally qualified people from competing for a job, and that takes months — sometimes years — to fill vacancies.

For example, if 50 people score equally high on a competitive examination, shouldn't they all have a chance for any job for which they are eligible? Not under the current system, which requires complicated tie-breaking rules not at all related to a person's qualifications or abilities.

Or what about being able to hire the best person available for a given job? Currently, eligibility lists are frozen for two years and every person on each list, including the lowest-scoring, must be offered a job before the highest-scoring person on a more recent list. Private businesses couldn't function saddled with such absurdities.

Proposition D cuts through the red tape. It creates a modern personnel department, with a director responsible for carrying out rules to ensure fairness and efficiency. Accountable to the Mayor, the director would be selected from a list provided by the Civil Service Commission, and subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.

The Civil Service Commission remains an independent body, with the right to approve new personnel rules and hold hearings on abuses. Also under 'D', negotiations with employee unions would be under the Mayor, subject to approval by the Supervisors, providing checks and balances in balancing our budget.

With greater accountability and continued checks and balances, Proposition D will open the way to more efficient government in our City.

Bill Maher, Supervisor
Louise Renne, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON 'D'

Proposition D is a necessary reform to the City's Civil System. As the City's Chief Administrative Officer for almost ten years, I have found that quality employee hiring is difficult and the process causes long delays.

The current system is:
• inflexible. The City cannot hire and promote the most qualified persons.
• inefficiently administered by a commission. Other large
cities do not have such a bureaucratic process.
• antiquated. Civil service rules represent practices of the 1950s rather than the 1980s.

The new system:
• allows the Mayor to appoint an effective personnel director, who controls administration and procedures.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

It’s 1986 and we’re still trying to manage City business as if it were 1932. As heads of City departments, charged with the daily responsibility of putting out fires, fighting crime, maintaining hospitals, parks, libraries and providing other essential services, we know from bitter experience about shortcomings of the existing Civil Service System.

Enacted with the City Charter in 1932, the system is foundering in red tape. Outdated rules are the subject of endless challenges. Tests are put off; vacancies go unfilled; promotions delayed; any appeal, however groundless, stops the process in its tracks.

Proposition D would take old procedures out of the Charter so they could be changed in an orderly process by the Civil Service Commission, which also would hear appeals.

Day-to-day administration of the tests — the content, scoring, all the myriad details of managing a complex system, would be put into a modern, highly professional personnel office. Tests would be speeded up. Hiring would keep pace with need. Promotions would be on the basis of competence. High performance would be the standard. Discipline could be imposed with working rights fully protected, and women and minorities would be assured equal opportunity.

Proposition D will help improve management and the quality of City services. Vote Yes on D.

Frank Jordan, Chief of Police
Emnet Condon, Fire Chief
Don Birrer, Director, Public Works
Mary Burns, General Manager, Recreation & Park
John Franze, City Librarian
Eugene Garlfield, Director, Port
Marvin Geistlinger, Purchaser
Wilbur Hamilton, Executive Director, Redevelopment Agency
Claire Isacks, Director, Arts Commission
Ray King, Director, Parking Authority
Dean Maeris, Director, City Planning
Grant Mickins, Director, Human Rights Commission
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, PUC
Joyce Ream, Director, Aging
Ed Sarsfield, General Manager, Social Services
Thelma Shelley, Managing Director, War Memorial
Moea So, Executive Director, Community Development
Louis Turner, Director of Airport
Dr. David Wendegar, Director, Health Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The hiring practices outlined in San Francisco City Charter have been virtually unchanged since 1931, a severe handicap in running a modern city. Proposition D is designed to streamline the charter and ensure that the rights of present city employees and candidates for city jobs are protected, while improving the hiring process itself. The initiative also builds management accountability in the city system.

Proposition D Is More Fair, More Efficient, More Economical

The day-to-day personnel functions, including hiring, will be consolidated under a Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. Decisions of the Director of Personnel on examination content and administration are final, unless a decision is stayed during the appeal process by a unanimous vote of the Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D will make it easier to modernize the many archaic Civil Service rules and procedures now included in the Charter, while maintaining a strong and independent Civil Service Commission to safeguard the merit system and protect the rights of city employees. Many detailed rules will come out of the Charter and will become personnel regulations. These regulations can then be modernized, but only through a process which includes public hearings and meet and confer sessions with the union involved. In addition, the Civil Service Commission must approve any changes or new regulations governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfer, resignation and terminations.

Proposition D Will Improve Performance And Public Confidence

The openness and fairness of the proposition will benefit everyone. Well-qualified job candidates will have a better chance of being hired, and well-qualified job holders will have a better chance of being promoted. This means generally better job performance in all departments, resulting in higher employee morale and more public confidence in city government.

Submitted by
Louis Hop Lee, President
Civil Service Commission
Lee Munson, Member Civil Service Commission and Treasurer, San Franciscans for Fair and Efficient Government

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Cities can survive only with strong management. The greatest budgetary restraint must be exercised to assure that full value is received for each tax dollar spent.

With firm limits on what it can spend and faced with a possible loss of Federal funds next year, the City must be managed with the greatest possible efficiency.

Essential to greater efficiency is the need for Civil Service reform. As members of City Commissions, we constantly confront the torturous delays and confused rules that gridlock the present system. The present system simply can’t respond to the City’s personnel needs.

Qualified applicants become frustrated and seek employment somewhere else. Promotions are blocked. Morale suffers. Temporaries fill in; overtime mounts. The ability to plan is crippled; management is weakened.

Proposition D would put the system on a business-like basis. A personnel department would handle day-to-day administration. The Civil Service Commission would be the watchdog to assure the integrity of the merit system.

This streamlined system would replace what is now inflexible and cumbersome. Testing could be accelerated; hiring made more efficient and promotions made on time. The result would be greater efficiency and elimination of costly waste.

Vote Yes on D.

Jerry E. Berg, President, Board of Permit Appeals
Henry Berman, President, Fire Commission
Moe Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Hector Chinchilla, Rent Board
Rev. Harry Chuck, Housing Authority
Dr. Arthur Coleman, President, Port Commission
Owen Davis, Police Commission
J. Edward Fleishell, Airports Commission
H. W. Flynn, President, Public Utilities Commission
James Foster, Health Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation & Park Commission
James Fussell, President, Housing Authority
Anne Halsted, Port Commission
Tommy Harris, Recreation & Park Commission
Tom Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Walter Ibe, Public Library Commission
Jeffrey Lee, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Philip Lee, President, Health Commission
Bruce W. Lilenthal, Small Business Advisory Commission
Jacqueline Nemirovski, President, Arts Commission
Toby Rosenblatt, President, Planning Commission
Dr. David Sanchez, President, Police Commission
Joan San Jule, Housing Authority
John Patrick Short, President, Parking Authority
Marjorie G. Stern, President, Public Library Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D contains civil service reform measures urged by the League of Women Voters since 1969.

Proposition D will:
— Modernize the City’s outdated personnel system by creating a Director of Personnel, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors
— Preserve the principles of merit through policies set by the Civil Service Commission
— Create a more responsive Civil Service system at no additional cost to the taxpayer

EFFICIENCY AND FLEXIBILITY

Proposition D transfers authority for day-to-day management of the City’s personnel system from the Civil Service Commission to the Director of Personnel. This will:
— Prevent hiring delays
— Ensure only the most qualified individuals are hired and promoted
— Provide City managers with more administrative flexibility

FAIRNESS FOR EMPLOYEES

Proposition D will:
— Safeguard the rights of City workers
— Protect gains made in hiring women and minorities
— Retain the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit appeals board
— Retain the ability of the City’s unions to negotiate working conditions
— Create a system that can respond quickly and fairly to the needs of City workers

Proposition D will bring the Civil Service system into the 20th century by making the Mayor accountable for the management of a system employing more than 25,000 people. Hiring by merit is still guaranteed by the Charter. Please join us in voting for this Reform!

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
Esther Marks, Past President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote Yes on Proposition D the Civil Service Modernization Initiative.

Prevent abuse of a system that was intended to serve the public and protect against favoritism. Prevent situations like this: an employee failed to report to work for a week without explanation; he was telephoned, notified by certified mail and a message left under his door; he was terminated 13 days later; he did not appeal the termination and the civil service commission up-
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held the termination. Two months later, the employee petitioned the commission for reinstatement. The employee got his job back, not because the process of termination was wrong but because the commission had a long standing objection to using "absent without leave" as a reason for firing.

The quality of public services is dependent upon the effectiveness of the staff who deliver them. The primary role of the civil service commission should be to facilitate recruitment and retention of the best available personnel. It must protect against favoritism and must assure that everyone has an equal and fair chance at employment.

The present system does not do that. We feel this initiative will make the system work better, for the managers, for the employees and for the public.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco government is huge, with a budget of more than $1 billion per year and 25,000 employees. It is expected to solve serious problems. This requires that the City have the ability to hire and promote talented people to do the job.

The present civil service system is so tied up in red tape that jobs remain vacant for six months to a year, and all too often someone who is not capable of doing a good job is hired. Your tax dollars are being wasted, and you are not receiving the quality of services you need and deserve.

Proposition D will modernize San Francisco's civil service system. It separates the personnel department from the Civil Service Commission, and puts the department under the Mayor where it belongs. The Mayor is responsible for balancing the budget and delivering city services as efficiently as possible. She cannot do this unless she can find capable people to do the job. That is the task of the personnel department in any organization.

Proposition D will also insure that the independent Civil Service Commission has sufficient authority to require the personnel system to be fair in its treatment of City employees. The Commission will be able to issue subpoenas and require testimony of witnesses on investigations it conducts. Should it find that discrimination has occurred, it can issue orders that must be obeyed.

Most major American cities, and virtually all cities and counties in California, have the kind of civil service system that will be established by Proposition D. San Francisco's present system is still mired in the past. It hobbles the ability of the City to deliver services and spend your tax dollars as efficiently as possible.

SPUR has not placed a statement in the Voter's Handbook for any other issue over the past 15 years. We feel that Proposition D is so vital for San Francisco's future that we are making this appeal for your support.

Vote "YES" on Proposition D.

SPUR—The San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Reform Initiative, will give San Francisco citizens the HIGH PERFORMANCE GOVERNMENT necessary to meet the many challenges of the future. Proposition D corrects the outdated and inflexible requirements originally written in San Francisco's City Charter in 1931. It will eliminate the problems which prevent San Francisco's personnel system from operating with efficiency the City's voters and taxpayers deserve:

Proposition D insures City jobs will be filled from current lists of the most qualified employees.

Proposition D prevents ungrounded appeals from delaying for years the appointment or promotion of qualified employees.

Proposition D eliminates the repetitive tasks currently monopolizing the Civil Service Commission meetings and directs the Commission to serve as an appellate body to protect the City's good employees.

Proposition D centralizes the day-to-day operation of the civil service system and makes the Director of Personnel responsible to the Mayor.

Proposition D simplifies the budgetary process by making the Mayor the City's chief labor negotiator, responsible for setting working conditions within the City's financial capacity.

Proposition D is the result of years of painstaking review by the most experienced, able and respected management experts in San Francisco. It is a plan intended to move City government out of the 1930s and equip San Francisco to enter the twenty-first century without being burdened by the red tape of the past.

After ten years of commitment to improving our City, the Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee is convinced adoption of Proposition D is one of the most important issues facing the voters. CHANGE IS LONG OVERDUE. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by,
The Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee

David Anacker
Jerome Anderson
Richard Blum
Charles Chapman
Arthur Cook, Jr.
Benton Dial
James Edgar
Rahen Garcia

Robert Hayden
Walter Houdley
John Jacobs
Michael McGill
Ellen Newman
Roy Nordman
Frank Tatman
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PERSONNEL MANAGERS SAY YES ON PROPOSITION D

As the personnel managers for City Departments, we are charged with the responsibility of managing the City's personnel system. The activities include examinations, hiring, training, discipline, union-management relations, affirmative action and compensation. No one knows better than we the frustrations experienced in attempting to monitor an unbelievable sequence of overlapping bureaucratic activities in attempting to get the job done.

Proposition D will bring our personnel system into line with most other public personnel systems. The improved system will create the potential for being more responsive to the needs of operating departments. It will improve labor relations by transferring this function to the executive branch of government where it belongs.

Proposition D will streamline certain routine procedures resulting in a reduction of cost and time. Under the current system delays are experienced due to lengthy appeals during which time the departments' objectives are delayed.

Proposition D will create an atmosphere of increased accountability for department managers in the areas of affirmative action, discipline and job performance.

Proposition D has been endorsed by the San Francisco Council of Human Resource Managers, the association of over one hundred personnel managers in City government.

Proposition D strengthens merit system principles. Civil Service commissioners will have more time to enforce and protect these principles rather than being bogged down in the day-to-day activities of administration.

Proposition D will help bring about improved methods and practices in personnel administration and should result in a more competent and effective workforce which the citizens of San Francisco have a right to expect.

Alvin W. Schaaf
Personnel Director
Recreation and Park Department

Marsha Ramirez
Personnel Officer
San Francisco Port

Edward M. Gazzano
Personnel Director
Department of Health

James Horan
Senior Personnel Officer
Department of Social Services

James Inicki
Personnel Director
San Francisco International Airport

Andrea R. Gourdie
Manager, Bureau of Personnel & Training
Public Utilities Commission

Mori Noguchi
Senior Department Personnel Officer

Mary Smith
Senior Personnel Officer
Laguna Honda Hospital

Theo Pater
Senior Personnel Officer
San Francisco General Hospital

John Burke
Personnel Director
Controller's Office

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will assist the Department of Public Works by streamlining the Civil Service process.

- Under the current system, the duration of eligible lists from 2 to 4 years hampers the Department from hiring graduates of colleges and universities on an annual basis. Consequently, many excellent candidates are not entered into the Civil Service System. Passage of the proposition will improve the quality of the pool of applicants and thereby the quality of public service given by the Department.

- The establishment of a Personnel Director to administer the day-to-day tasks of the system will speed up the decision making process to the advantage of employees and management alike.

- The proposition still calls for checks and balances in that the Commission will continue to hear appeals on discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest. The Commission will act as a watchdog while leaving the general administration to the Personnel Director.

The initiative will make for an improved system for employees, management and the citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Donald Birrer
Director of Public Works

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Passage of this amendment will update our civil service system. These changes will make it comparable to other merit system agencies. Some of these changes are

(A) removal of administrative details from the charter which inhibit timely and effective personnel actions.

The following subjects will be placed in personnel regulations:

- Protests of written questions and answers
- Protests of tentative employment lists
- Promotional examinations

- Examinations for employees on military leave
- Certification of eligibles — Rule of three
- Duration of employment lists
- Temporary employee appointments

(B) allows continuous up-dating of employment lists.

(C) allows equitable treatment of job candidates with same test score.

(D) realigns responsibilities: the Civil Service Commission dealing primarily with compliance and adjudication activities.

(continued)
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while the Personnel Department administers the day-to-day operation of the merit system.

Equally important the amendment retains important merit system provisions dealing with:

- Employee salary setting procedures
- Positions subject to merit system examinations
- Public hearing and meet and confer requirements
- Penalties for examination fraud
- Seniority, meritorious service and applicable educational credits for promotional examinations in the Police/Fire De-

partment

- Termination of unsatisfactory employees
- Disciplinary suspensions
- Conflict of interest
- Creation of positions

Proposition "D" merits a 'YES' vote.

John J. Walsh
General Manager Personnel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Initiative, is a long-overdue reform to streamline antiquated hiring practices in San Francisco's fifty-year-old charter. Proposition D will ensure that the best and brightest job candidates are chosen to serve our city, thus promoting excellence in job performance and helping to eliminate incompetence. This initiative builds management accountability in the city system, while giving the Civil Service Commission the independence to protect the rights of women and minorities.

A Better, More Efficient System at Less Cost

Proposition D consolidates personnel functions, including hiring, under a new Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. The Director has final authority over content of examinations given city job applicants, so more flexibility is possible in finding truly qualified candidates.

Proposition D redefines the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit systems appeals board and policy-setting body. The merit principles are spelled out in the Proposition. This allows the Commission to protect the rights of women and minorities at no cost to the public.

More Fair to Everyone

Proposition D greatly improves the city charter. Well-qualified job candidates have a better chance to be hired and well-qualified job holders have a better chance to be promoted. The public is rewarded with the better job performance, efficiency and friendliness one expects from good government employees. All of these improvements are at no additional cost to the taxpayer.

Submitted by
James W. Haas

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service System, as presently constituted, (vintage 1932!), is uncivil, and there is nothing "systematic" about it! It's pure, unadulterated municipal lunacy and chaos! Remarkably, BOTH Management and Labor despise it. It certainly is NOT producing the best qualified persons to fill City jobs!

Let's follow Mayor Feinstein's recommendations. If this operation doesn't dramatically improve, there are always FUTURE ELECTIONS where additional, more Draconian changes can be considered by the voters.

As matters now stand, it is far better to light a candle than just sit and curse the darkness! Any changes will be an improvement! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

For more than a half-century, San Francisco Mayors have abided by the employee examination, hiring and promotion policies administered by a strong and independent Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D is a deceptive and dangerous scheme that would give future Mayors and top-level bureaucrats the power to ignore competence and reward political loyalty.

Proposition D would take key Civil Service employment rules out of the City Charter and make them subject to wheeling and dealing by City Hall politicians.

There's an old saying — "if it ain't broke, don't fix it."

Civil Service has worked well for more than 50 years. Proposition D is unnecessary, ineffective and even counter-productive. It's not just deceptive, it's dangerous.

Joseph L. Alioto
Former Mayor of San Francisco
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Time and time again, different groups have put various propositions on the ballot to weaken our Civil Service System and reintroduce political patronage into City employment practices. And every time the voters have wisely rejected these schemes, no matter how cleverly they have been disguised.

Proposition D is just another power grab by bureaucrats at the top in City Hall.

We've said NO! loud and clear in the past. Let's say NO one more time.

Submitted by:
TAXPAYERS FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT
Thomas Scanlon
City Treasurer, Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “D”!!!!

During the eight years while a member of the Board of Supervisors, I fought hard to reform the Civil Service Commission and to bring working conditions and city workers' pay equitable to both workers and taxpayers. I fought to insure an independent Civil Service Commission that would remain just that—indeed, and free from political influence and political patronage of particularly the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

I am truly saddened by the Mayor's insistence in bringing this disastrous Proposition “D” before the voters. Some of the Supervisors rejected this misguided measure for what it is; an unwise consolidation of authority to hire, fire and promote city workers by the Mayor and newly created personnel officer.

My efforts to bring pay equity to both taxpayers and city workers were continually squashed by then Supervisor Feinstein and Supervisor Molinari. Finally, in 1975, shortly after a disastrous city strike, I was able to place on the ballot, for voter approval, a measure that almost eliminates the power of the Mayor and Supervisors to manipulate the pay of city workers. This measure was overwhelmingly passed by the voters that year and we have not had any labor unrest since that date.

Vote No on “D”!
“D” stands for disaster. It will undo many of these reforms. Also, right now, the City is almost broke, thanks to the manipulation of Mayor Feinstein and her chief ally Supervisor Molinari.

If “D” passes the cost of operating our city government will increase in the next 24 months by not less than $60,000,000.

Contrary to the provisions of Proposition 13, property taxes would be increased, thus forcing up rents.

Vote No on “D”.

Don't weaken our Civil Service Commission, whereby least deserving city employees could be promoted because of connection or clout.

Vote No on “D”.

We now almost have more problems than we can handle. We don't want our city turned into another Chicago, wherefor nearly half a century a corrupt political system flourished under Mayor Richard Daley.

John Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We join San Franciscans for Fair Employment in opposing the Civil Service Initiative, Proposition D.

This measure will severely hamper the well-being of the San Francisco Fire and Police Departments. These departments are two of the finest in the Country and have consistently protected life and property in a professional manner. They must continue that tradition with a civil service system based on MERIT and not political patronage.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Andrew C. Casper
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Keith P. Colden
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

William F. Murray
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Thomas J. Calhill
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired

Donald M. Scott
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Our present Civil Service system was designed to keep corruption out of government. It has generally served that purpose well. This proposition would dismantle that system and in my opinion open the doors to nepotism, favoritism, patronage and corruption. Better a city government that is bureaucratic than one that is corrupt. Vote NO on D.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
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Proposition D is an attack on the merit system and an attempt to return patronage to the Mayor's office by eliminating the authority of the Civil Service Commission and its built-in checks and balances.

The present Civil Service system is not perfect, but corrections can be made within the Charter without destroying a system that has worked for over 50 years and has been free from fraud and corruption.

This proposition will do nothing to improve the caliber of police performance and could have the opposite effect.

I urge you to vote NO on PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by
The San Francisco Police Supervisors and Investigators Association

Don Goad, Captain SFPD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D could be a dangerous first step toward weakening the independent, impartial administration of our City government.

Proposition D would transfer power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor. The Director's decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline and certification would be final. The Commission would have no right to hear examinations or disciplinary appeals.

With the transfer of duties and responsibilities from the Commission to the Mayor's appointed Personnel Director, the Mayor would have control over personnel functions. Currently, commissioners have independent status and can be dismissed for cause. The Personnel Director could be dismissed at will.

The Merit System could be replaced by a patronage system. Proposition D could open the door to rules permitting the Personnel Director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his or her position on the list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Proposition D is NOT a reform package. The checks and balances for efficient City government would be lopsided, with too much power in the hands of unknown future Mayors.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
John L. Molinari, President
Harry G. Britt
Richard Mongiato
Willie B. Kennedy
Wendy Nelder
Nancy Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Beware of PROPOSITION D!

Powerful special interest groups are attempting to remove key City employees from the independent and impartial Civil Service system in the name of "reform".

They want instead to make these employees answerable directly to future Mayors and politically-appointed Personnel Directors and department heads.

PROPOSITION D got on the ballot because the Chamber of Commerce and such companies as Pacific Bell and PG&E paid a professional southern California campaign firm, $70,000 to collect signatures.

They're trying to destroy the merit system and replace it with an old-fashioned patronage system.

Department heads will be able to ignore examination scores and reward loyalty rather than competence in promotions and hiring.

Don't let the Chamber of Commerce, big business and their allies in the City bureaucracy dictate who's hired, fired and promoted among public employees.

PROPOSITION D is not just deceptive, it's dangerous!
Vote NO on PROPOSITION D!

Libby Denehein
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Ron Haberman
Vice-Chairman, Democratic Central Committee
Jim Wacoh
Democratic Central Committee
Roberto Estevas
President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Rick Pucanar
President, Harvey Milk Lesbian Gay Democratic Club
Walter L. Johnson
Exec. Secty., S. F. Labor Council
Michael Bernick
Linda Past
Sal Roselli
Deborah Stein
John Mehring
Pat Norman
Nancy Walker
Gwen Craig
Harry Brit
Louise Mintick
Carolle Migen
Agor Jaicks
Jack Morrison
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Proposition D places too much power in the hands of ONE. Proposition D will provide for a personnel director to be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. The Mayor now appoints five members of the Civil Service Commission who also serve at her pleasure.

You work for years to climb the civil service ladder and then somebody comes along with an idea to cut you off at the pockets.

Marguerite Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service Merit System has served our City well, giving San Franciscans an equal opportunity. It has helped us obtain employment and earn promotions based on objective examinations.

The Civil Service Merit system replaced the old patronage system that rewarded political loyalty more than competence.

Now the supporters of PROPOSITION D want to create a new Personnel Division, accountable only to the Mayor, and give department heads the absolute power to decide who works for the City and who gets promoted.

If PROPOSITION D passes, equal opportunity would give way to opportunity based on membership in the bureaucratic "establishment".

Keep our Civil Service Merit System strong and free from the political abuses of the past.

Vote NO on D!

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly

Ben Tom
Member, S.F. Unified School District Board

Johnne Miller
Member, S.F. Unified School District Board

A. Richard Cerbato
Member, S.F. Unified School District Board

Dr. Sodonia Wilson
Member, S.F. Unified School District Board

Ernest "Chuck" Aydin, President

S.F. Community College Governing Board

Julie Tang
Member, S.F. Community College Governing Board

Alan S. Wong
Member, S.F. Community College Governing Board

Henry Der

Albert Chang

Rudy Meraz

Robert "Bob" Morales

Yori Wada

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Can you imagine studying for a civil service examination, being rated at the top of the eligible list and never receiving the promotion? That's exactly what Proposition "D" will do should the electorate adopt this amendment.

The civil service merit system has defects, but to totally eliminate the system and replace it with a patronage system where promotions are based on who you know, rather than what you know is scandalous.

Civil service was put into place to prevent scandal and the "favor seeking" individual from getting a paid position because he/she happened to support the right elected official.

Proposition "D" will allow one person, chosen by the Mayor, to decide who will be promoted, hired and fired. This is awesome power for one single individual to have at any level of government.

Our current Mayor may choose a fair person for this position, but will future Mayors be as careful? As each new Mayor assumes office, the civil service system will again change. The potential to favor one individual or group over others is great.

Proposition "D" has a great potential to diminish the quality of services we now provide to our citizens, as the future of how people are hired and promoted in the San Francisco Police Department is completely unknown.

It's true our promotional system is fraught with delays and delays frustrate us all, but Proposition "D" is not the answer. Proposition "D" will only add to our existing problems. Several years ago, our citizens elected a Charter Commission to streamline city government and make civil service work more efficiently. The voters eventually rejected those proposals. The checks and balances that make our government stable were no longer present. It simply went too far.

Proposition "D" goes even further. It brings about a system of patronage and should be defeated lest we want to engage in "free-wheeling and dealing" of civil service jobs and promotions.

We urge a strong No vote against Proposition "D"!

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION

Bob Barry, President
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The purpose of the Civil Service Commission is to ensure that the merit system would be the only criteria in any examination process.

If Proposition D passes, all authority concerning examinations will be taken from the Civil Service Commission and given to a Personnel Director, who is appointed by the Mayor. This Personnel Director would have the authority to hire and fire at his discretion, with no appeal available. This proposition is contrary to everything the Fire Department and all City employees have strived for over the years.

The Civil Service Commission in its present form was instituted to prevent any possibility of a patronage system, where one person has complete control.

This proposition would do nothing to improve your Fire Department. If you are satisfied with the work and make up of the San Francisco Fire Department in its present form, “Vote No On Proposition D”. You will be doing a service for the San Francisco Fire Department, and the people of San Francisco.

Submitted by the San Francisco Fire Chiefs’ Association
John Flaherty, Battalion Chief SFFD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is bad government and bad politics, changing our independent civil service system into a system dominated by the Mayor:

. . . By shortening the six year terms of Civil Service Commission to conform to the Mayor’s four year term of office.

. . . By transferring most of the Commission’s powers to a Personnel Director who serves solely at the Mayor’s pleasure.

Keep politics out of employment services. Vote NO on Proposition D!

Alice B. Toklas, Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Roberto Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D fails to offer enough new and improved procedures to cure the current defects in the civil service system. Charter sections and civil service rules are repealed without specific known replacements.

Proposition D transfers power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created personnel director appointed by, and to serve at the pleasure of, the Mayor. The director’s decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline, and certification would be final. The commission would have no right to hear examination or disciplinary appeals.

There are hidden costs with Proposition D because the new Personnel Administration Department will employ a personnel director, and other employees “as may be necessary to carry out (its) functions and duties.”

The Merit System could be replaced by an old style Patronage System. Proposition D could open the door to rules which permit the personnel director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his/her position on the civil service testing list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Police and Fire Commissions would lose functions as a result of the personnel director’s new power. The director’s unlawful employment discrimination policy would be binding upon department administrators. The director’s procedure for employee dispute resolution must be used by all department heads and appointing officers.

Proposition D is not the answer. The checks and balances for efficient city government would be lopsided.

I urge a no vote on Proposition D.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, 17th Assembly District
Sara Burton
Congresswoman
Art Agnos
16th Assembly District
Milun Marks
State Senator

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Balboa Reservoir Development Ban

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?

YES 292  NO 293

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission declared Balboa Reservoir South (located across Phelan Avenue from San Francisco City College) surplus in 1984 and made the site available for low, moderate and market rate housing. In July 1985, a City-community advisory committee chose a developer to build 203 single-family homes on the 13 acre site. Construction has not yet begun.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would prohibit granting new building permits and would revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site (Assessor’s Block 3180, Lot 1) between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit granting any new building permits and you want to revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to allow building permits to be granted for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “E” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for a three-year ban on development of the Balboa Reservoir site had qualified for the June ballot.

Sidney Kass and Jesse David Wall, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 12,430 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 10,012 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 77
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Having been responsible for providing leadership at City College from 1947 to 1977, we cannot stand by and see this site converted to housing. We must speak out. Such a move would preclude forever the logical and much needed campus expansion to what was once our West Campus. We left that site reluctantly to make way for water storage. If it is no longer required for that purpose, let us return it to City College.

Thousands of San Franciscans—high school graduates, dropouts, veterans, re-entering women—representing all of the city’s diverse ethnic groups, have been prepared for transfer to four-year colleges, profitable careers, and have had their lives enriched at the City College of San Francisco. Without City College’s open door and easy access, many would have been deprived of these opportunities.

Its 56 acre campus originally housed 3,000 students. Now it serves over 23,000. This campus, compared to other community colleges, can be best described as cramped, inadequate, and second rate. The condition of the campus is to be contrasted with the excellence of its programs—which are recognized as among the best in the nation.

Lou Batmale
Chancellor 1970-1977
Louis G. Conlan
President 1947-1970

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION ‘E’

We question:
1. Why no EIR was required when the proposed development could have a substantial impact.
2. Whether the future needs of City College for classrooms, housing, and parking have been considered.
3. What the impact on taxpayers is with below market land sale and construction financing by bonds.
   This moratorium will permit adequate study of these issues. Vote YES on Proposition ‘E’.

Bruce Bonacker, President
Board of Directors, Glen Park Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don’t let a developer make a mint on land across from the most overcrowded college in the Bay Area! Parking is already an impossibility for residents near City College. . . adding 200 homes to this land would make the situation much worse.

It’s simple: a college which can’t find room for more students at a time when more people are returning to education doesn’t serve the community.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

You’d probably be upset. We certainly are. Please help us protect our neighborhood. Please vote YES on proposition E.

Westwood Park Residents:
   Edna Tooker
   Minnie Dorwin
   Eugene Eden
   Donna Nicoletti
   Robert Armstrong
   Pauline Armstrong
   Joel Martinez
   Richard & Lisa Patterson
   David Bean
   H. Rejonne
   William Burke
   Richard Rubel
   Clyde Thieriot
   Danae Manis
   Esmit Manus

Sunnyside Residents:
   Ellen Wall
   Melissa Voluntary
   David Wall
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let the greedy developers take this potentially picturesque open space. A yes vote means you want more time to consider its future use. All we ask is time to think and plan.

John Barbagelata
Former member, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Suppose there was a publicly owned open space across the street from the main U.C. Berkeley Campus. Can you imagine for one moment that it would be passed into private ownership? Vote Yes on E for Equality and Excellence in Education

City College Students:
William Lew, Student
Tim McGuire, Student Council Member
Joseph Goldstein, Student Council Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

In 1952, the “Experts” said we needed reservoirs. They felt so strongly that they condemned the City College West Campus, destroyed the buildings, and constructed the reservoirs—all at taxpayer’s expense.

Now, in 1986 with more demand for water, the “Experts” say the reservoir is no longer needed. What is the concerned taxpayer to believe?

When in doubt, the city should hold on to the expensive things already paid for.

Stop the reservoir giveaway. Vote YES on E.

Taxpayers for Preserving the Reservoir.
Richard Patterson
Dorice Murphy
Lucille Carson
Daniel Gutierrez
Franz Wite
Bernhard Scholand
Ruth Hanson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This is a Planning issue

We have been accused of trying to stop housing for poor people. Not true. In the first place, the price levels are certainly middle income and above, but our main objection is that this badly done plan is damaging to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as to the over-crowded community college across the street.

WHAT WE WANT

Even our critics point out that we originally SUGGESTED housing for that site, but they don’t talk about what else we suggested. We want two levels of parking under a City College Library, Bookstore, and Auditorium, with housing on top. Furthermore, let the housing be TRULY affordable—for students and seniors. We are trying to stop the bureaucrats’ subsidized middle income housing project because it makes our dream impossible.

We ask for three years to give the neighborhood and the college a chance to produce a better plan.

SNaP (Sensible Neighborhood Planning Committee)

Helen Crizer, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council, representing 17 neighborhood associations in the area of the surplus reservoir property in question has voted to endorse the three-year stop of private construction on the old West Campus of City College.

Dr. Louis Batmale, Chancellor of City College from 1970-1977, has persuaded us that City College needs the lands.

Juanita Raven, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Be a sport.
Give City College a vote of support.
City has 23,000 students and badly needs a library. The only place to put it is in the reservoir site. City College has walked closely with San Francisco for five decades. The reservoir site has always been understood to be reserved for City College.
Until now, when someone wants it for housing. Housing is important, but it can be anywhere in town. But a City College library can only be located at the College.
Vote yes to support a book—and a reader.
Reading, studying, writing and research make up our town also.
It is hard to understand criticism of City for wanting to keep this area for a library. Sure, housing sites are at a premium—but even more so a library site for City which is one of the largest schools in the Nation.
Some people blast City for wanting a library because of the need for housing. Housing is needed. But some of those very same people want a big battleship stationed here that will bring in 15,000 new family members.
The Educational and cultural growth of San Francisco mandates living space for the City College library.
If this measure gets a no vote, it means there will be no site for a Library. This is the last chance. Vote YES to help out a book—and a reader.
State financing, when approved, will construct this building. It is the top building priority at City College.
A YES vote here means there will be time to think about the use of the site. During that three year period, cooler heads may realize this is the only site for a Library. If the housing goes in there will be no Library there.
Vote yes for a book, for a good school and a better City.

John Riordan, Board of Governors
San Francisco Community College District.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Sunnyside Neighborhood Association is not against housing, but we are trying to stop a hasty and short-sighted plan. We are asking for this moratorium to get time for a better plan that will answer a variety of needs and benefit the entire city as well as our community.

This is a planning issue.
The release of the reservoir property as surplus by the water department came as a surprise to our neighborhood. The June 1984 “Residence Element” of the city’s Master Plan did not even list the land as surplus. By 1985 major decisions were being made for use of the land without adequate neighborhood input.

There were some meetings attended by a few people carefully selected for their zealous pro-housing views or potential financial gain. The resulting plan has gone out of control. Now it benefits only the developer and the lucky few who will get houses on free land.

Proposition E is not an attack on housing.
Please help us save our neighborhood against poor planning by voting YES on Proposition E.

Joe Makoney, President
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Miraloma Improvement Club urges a YES vote on Proposition E.

Frank Mastro, President
Arnell Rodrigues
Maggi Kroll
Dorothy Evers

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION E

All the talk in the world can’t change the fact that City College has fewer acres of land relative to its student population than any college in the Bay Area.
Enrollment at City College is INCREASING, as is the enrollment of the San Francisco public schools from which City College draws most of its students. It is obvious that City College needs and deserves the reservoir land. The three year moratorium will give time to produce a better plan which will have input by faculty, students and alumni who know the college’s needs and want to support it.

Sid Kass
Susie Langdon Kass
Phil Kass
City College Student
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The homeowners of Westwood Park, a neighborhood adjacent to the Balboa Reservoir, support the ballot initiative calling for a 3 year development moratorium. We believe that the City and City College should take additional time to determine their needs and how they might be met by using the Reservoir. In the event that City College does not need this property, we support its development as open space or as single family detached housing.

Westwood Park Association
Don C. Swander
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Let's not aggrivate the traffic problem around City College before we first develop solutions for the existing problems.
A three-year moratorium only buys our neighborhood and elected officials time to find solutions; it doesn't say no to housing. A YES vote is a vote for prudent development. A YES vote helps to preserve the family character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ken Hoegger
Realtor and community Activist

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As representatives of the students of City College, we understand first-hand, the intense need to reserve a site for future school expansion.

Preservation of the Balboa Reservoir, a site directly adjacent to the campus, is particularly crucial. The facilities that CCSF requires, such as a library and an auditorium, are essential to the main structure of the campus. Unlike classrooms, it would be unreasonable to build an auditorium or a library on an off-campus site, since these facilities are integral to the main function of the school.

Associated Student Council of City College
Jack Lee, Vice President of Associated Counsel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Local 2121 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, representing City College faculty, urges a yes vote on Proposition E.

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

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is twice as crowded as any community college in northern California. It needs a much larger library, bookstore and auditorium, and more parking.

The college has always expected to use the empty SOUTH reservoir for educational needs. That land is finally surplus. Neither the college Governing Board nor the Chancellor attended the Mayor's planning sessions for the property and the faculty was not informed. When the 12.3 acre site was offered to a developer for $36,900 for subsidized housing, the Chancellor said, "We are at a crossroad and the correct path is for the Board of Supervisors, with the Mayor's support, to deed this surplus land to City College so that the college may continue to serve the city effectively for the next 50 years as it has for the past half century." The Mayor refused. Now only Board member John Riordan supports the correct path.

The Water Department says it may need the NORTH reservoir now used for student parking. If that crisis occurs, the Chancellor says, "We'll deal with the situation then." How, if the south reservoir is gone?

(continued)
When land is available other community colleges finance large projects through alliances with civic, athletic and cultural organizations, and through property sales. New methods for public funding are being developed. The faculty would like three years of careful study to unravel misunderstandings and poor management, and to find the best way to be a good neighbor.

Ken Crizer  
Lene Johnson  
Madeline Mueller  
Julia Scholand  
Steering Committee,  
City College Faculty for Responsible Development

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College needs land now for desperately needed facilities, one of which is a library. City College has an enrollment of 23,000 students but our library has seating for 450. There are other possible locations for new housing, but City College can't be moved. Give us an opportunity to plan a development for the community and the college.

Annie M. Young  
City College Library Faculty and Staff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty and staff members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Water Department has begun a resource study of water use, due for completion in two or three years. The study may well indicate that one or both reservoirs will be needed. The American Water Works Association states that reservoirs should be used in pairs. This is particularly important because it is the only reservoir at an elevation of 305 feet.

The Mayor twisted the arm of the Water Department to declare one of these reservoirs surplus before the water resource study is completed. Don't let her get away with this kind of political manipulation.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Kurt Common
Ken Crizer
Ed Dierauf
Herb Naylor
CCSF Engineering Professors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The South Balboa Basin has been unused since college leased buildings, including a large auditorium, were torn down on that site thirty years ago. We hope that three years of thorough planning would explore the possibility of returning a part of that property to the college for the development of a multi-purpose medium-sized auditorium which could be shared with community groups.

Robert Bozina
Mack Crooks
Bob Davis
Helen Dilworth
Franz Encejo
Richard Ezerman
Richard Fenmer
Lawrence Ferrara
Ted Fleming
Peggy Gorsham
William Grethkopp
David Hardiman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition E. This moratorium is necessary because there are too many worthy uses for this land to make a hasty and potentially very costly decision. Only through careful planning can the limited land available for development be best used.

Nicolos Alexander
Paul Hewitt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, as Physical Education Instructors, have always been committed to a diversified program for our students and community. The reservoir space is a natural land resource for a Multi Educational and Cultural Center.

Your YES vote on E will allow us the freedom to explore ways that this property could most constructively benefit all.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, full-time faculty of the Computer and Information Science Department of City College, urge a YES vote to postpone the decision until additional planning and surveys can be conducted. The current proposal would negatively impact the College's enrollment.

ARGUMENTS printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

A YES vote on Proposition E helps STOP a scheme to GIVE AWAY $12,300,000 worth of City land for $1,800,000 (or less) to a Redwood City real estate developer.

A YES vote will SAVE taxpayers $550,000 per year. The housing project will produce $240,000 in taxes, but supplying City services will cost $790,000 per year.

The Controller's cost estimate does NOT account for the $12,300,000 land value, since land sale below value is NOT technically a cost of government. The Controller also is NOT permitted to assume that the housing project will be constructed, since construction has NOT yet been ordered by the Board of Supervisors.

The plan does NOT restrict housing sales to moderate-income first-time buyers. The plan only restricts use of tax-subsidized funds. Any person favored by the developer or politicians can buy these dwellings and get the benefits of the public land giveaway.

The houses are made "affordable" by giving away the land far below market value, by City-backed low interest, and by cutting construction corners.

The real beneficiaries of the subsidized housing project are the financiers (NOT the project dwellers). Bondholders receive 9.6% average tax-free interest, which is equivalent to 24.6% taxable interest at 61% maximum tax. The developer and bond establishment receive $5,340,000; this is $26,300 (or 22.40%) for each $117,400 unit.

The City loses $51,700 worth of land GIVEN AWAY for each unit.

Vote YES on Proposition E for good fiscal management.

William Marquardt
Financial Analyst, SNaP
Helen Crizer, Treasurer, SNaP

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

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

Name of College     Number of students     Campus (acres)     Area/1000 students
City College of SF   22,624                 56                  2.47
Laney College, Oakland 9,805               59                  6.02
Chabot College, Hayward 18,000             147                 8.17
Contra Costa College  8,500               83                  9.76
College of San Mateo  13,820              153                 11.07
College of Marin     6,663                77                  11.56

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Given these facts, why does the Governing Board not try to get the old West Campus back? Why don't they support this moratorium to delay the land grab?

The Governing Board is under political pressure from City Hall. They have been threatened with the loss of the north reservoir parking lot and funding for special projects. Forgive them.

Vote Yes on E.

Friends of City College
David Newton
Glen Simpson
Jack Baker
Thomas Velasquez
Tillie McCullough

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The student population at City College is increasing. This semester's enrollment is up 1,265 students over last semester.

The enrollment in the San Francisco public schools has been increasing by 1,218 per year for the last three years. City College draws most of its enrollment from public schools in San Francisco.

Obviously, City College will have a larger enrollment in the future years, and will be in desperate need of space if we do not give it back its old West Campus.

Please reserve this public land for the college.

Please vote YES on E.

Barbara Holman

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON E

In 1981, I launched a six-point program to expand San Francisco’s housing supply and the voters had approved a City policy to add 20,000 new housing units within five years. This Proposition would destroy a major portion of the effort to build affordable, single-family housing in our city.

The Balboa Reservoir Site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now a site for development of 203 new single-family homes, most with three bedrooms and two baths. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed as other homes built under the City’s program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom could not afford homeownership. It is believed that these new homes will sell rapidly.

The Balboa Reservoir site is one of the few sites large enough to accommodate a substantial number of new homes. Please do not let a few people stop a major opportunity for new housing. Vote no on Prop E.

Not only would Proposition E halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site, but the 9.8% fixed-rate, 30-year mortgage money set aside for the housing would also be lost.

Nothing constructive is accomplished by this measure—it does not provide additional land or facilities for City College. As a matter of fact, City College has neither plans nor money to use the property. Further, the Community College Board of Directors, the governing body for City College, has voted overwhelmingly to oppose the initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No on E.”

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the site of the unused Balboa Reservoir and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost.

These homes are desperately needed for San Franciscans who can’t afford to buy in the city where the average house is selling for over $160,000. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

The homes would be built on land that belongs to the City. Over two years ago, it was declared surplus and available for housing. It is not part of City College, and City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

We urge you to vote no on Proposition E if you want more affordable housing for San Franciscans.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

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

The 203 affordable owner occupied single family units slated for the southern portion of Balboa Reservoir are part of the 1988 total. Our progress in addressing the City’s housing shortage will be curtailed if this ill-advised initiative is approved. SUPPORT OWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Housing production is essential to check rising prices and to maintain our social, economic, and ethnic population diversity. AS A SAN FRANCISCO VOTER, YOU CAN BE PART OF OUR HOUSING PROGRESS BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

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

WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT THE CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY HOUSING BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

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

Proposition E would halt construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. We need more housing in San Francisco, not less. Please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.

Doris M. Ward, Member
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

A critical issue facing San Francisco today is the lack of housing middle class San Franciscans can afford.

That is why I have joined these neighborhood associations to support the Balboa Reservoir neighborhood housing proposal. Those participating in the development of the proposal includes: O.M.I. Community Association
Dorado Terrace Association
Outer Mission-Ingleside
Political Action Committee
Greater Ingleside Community
Mount Davidson Manor
Ocean Avenue Merchants Association
Ingleside Terrace Association
The San Francisco Open Space Committee
City College of San Francisco

From early in 1985 I worked closely with these neighborhood groups in the discussions between city government and community leaders concerning the development plans for this desperately needed new housing at the unused Balboa reservoir site.

THESE ARE THE REASONS YOU SHOULD VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

1. The neighborhood housing proposal that this initiative seeks to stop is the result of months of hard work by the largest coalition of neighborhood associations ever to join together to plan a housing development in San Francisco.

2. The housing at the Balboa Reservoir site was designed with the involvement of the coalition of neighborhood associations to enhance the surrounding community.

3. The governing Board of the Community College District has made clear that they have no plans for the site and no ownership rights to it. City College does not oppose the construction of this development and opposes this initiative.

4. Self-proclaimed “Friends” of City College want to stop the proposal in order to preserve the site for future faculty parking. A clique of City College staffers involved in a neighborhood association pose as community opposition to this development even though a representative from this organization, the Sunnydale Neighborhood Association, had helped plan and support the proposal.

5. By masquerading as concerned neighbors these self-appointed “friends” of City College hope to prevent the construction of 204 critically needed units of housing and pull off one of the biggest land grabs in San Francisco’s history.

DON’T BE FooLED. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Residence Element of the Comprehensive Plan of the City and County of San Francisco assesses the City’s housing needs and lays out specific steps to meet those needs. This document was adopted by the City Planning Commission in 1984 after extensive public review at neighborhood meetings and public hearings, and consideration of the detailed Environmental Impact Report.

The first objective of the Housing Element is “to provide new Housing for all income groups” in locations appropriate for residential development. To meet this goal, development of housing is to be aggressively pursued and encouraged on surplus, underused and vacant public land.

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

If you want more affordable housing in San Francisco vote no on Proposition E.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Susan J. Bierman, City Planning Commissioner
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on E.

Proposition E deprives San Franciscans of one of their last real chances to become homeowners at an affordable price. At the South Balboa Reservoir we have City-owned land on which 203 units of three-bedroom, two-bath homes can be built at low prices which average San Franciscans can afford to pay. These homes need to be built now, not in three years. In three years the low interest rates on mortgages and the bond financing will be gone. Two hundred families will have lost the opportunity to become homeowners, and the City will have lost the opportunity to ease the tight market in rental housing.

Nor does this ill-conceived initiative help City College in any way. City College does not need this land. Speculation that the College may at some future date find a use for the land is not founded on fact. The College may never be able to build on the reservoir. Their enrollment has dropped by over 4000 students in the last few years.

This initiative is designed to confuse you. It will make our housing shortage worse for three long years. If you support affordable housing in our City, Vote NO on Proposition E.

Bill Maher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Balboa Reservoir site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now planned for development of 203 new single family homes. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed — other homes built under this program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom would not otherwise be able to afford home ownership.

San Francisco has the most expensive housing in the nation where last year the average home sold for over $160,000. Housing is difficult to produce because the obstacles are great — little land on which to build, high construction costs and uncertain interest rates.

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost. The initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional land or facilities for City College. The Community College Board, the governing body of City College, in fact recently voted to oppose this initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No” on Proposition E.

John L. Molinari

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

In 1980, the voters of the City and County of San Francisco approved a measure making it City policy to add 20,000 new units of housing within five years. In 1984 in an effort to satisfy this objective, the Board of Supervisors adopted a policy encouraging the expansion of the City’s housing supply. Making surplus City-owned land, such as the site at Balboa Reservoir, available for affordable housing was an important part of that policy. A proposal to build 203 homes on the unused Balboa Reservoir site was advanced to help implement the pro-housing policy.

Approval of Proposition E would HALT construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.

The Balboa Reservoir homes would be built on land currently belonging to the City and County of San Francisco. The property IS NOT part of the City College, and City College has neither plans or money to buy the property and convert it for City College use.

The only debatable issue is the future of affordable housing on the Balboa Reservoir site.

As we are all aware, San Francisco has the most expensive homes in the United States. The average cost of a home is $152,000. Not many can afford such prices. However, the housing proposed for the Balboa Reservoir will give many more citizens the opportunity to become homeowners. The homes to be built will be sold to first-time buyers at prices ranging from $83,000 to $145,000.

Other homes built in San Francisco under the direction of similar affordable housing programs have been snapped up quickly by San Franciscans. Without the program, most would not have been able to purchase the home and become homeowners.

Again, if you desire to preserve the construction of more affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site, vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Willie B. Kennedy
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Additional single family housing is undeniably San Francisco's most acute social need. When some vacant surplus City land (12 acres) finally becomes available for 203 additional new private homes there will always be some selfish individuals who are in favor of new housing "just so long as it is not built across the street from me!" This unused, vacant City reservoir land hasn't generated a dime of taxes for over thirty years! Let's add 203 NEW homeowner taxpayers to the City's rolls as quickly as possible.

Stop these self-serving no-growth obstructionists! Please vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Prop E would halt affordable housing construction at the Balboa Reservoir site. Many gay people need affordable housing, too, and we join with other community groups urging you to vote NO on Prop E.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Robert Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E, if approved, would block the construction of 203 badly needed single-family homes on the south portion of the Balboa Reservoir in San Francisco. Sixty percent of these homes would be available for purchase by moderate and middle income families at purchase prices between $80,000 and $120,000. They would be constructed on surplus public land and financed by the sale of mortgage revenue bonds to enable the developer to sell the homes at below market prices.

A neighborhood group headed by two city college faculty members is responsible for placing Proposition E on the ballot. The group contends that the land which is intended to be used for the project should be made available instead to City College for the construction of new teaching facilities even though enrollment at City College is declining and the City College Board has voted 6 to 1 to oppose the initiative.

Like many other areas of the country, San Francisco suffers from a shortage of housing. Purchase prices here are among the highest in the nation. The use of surplus public lands and revenue bond financing provide a means for making single family homes available to a broad spectrum of families at affordable prices.

The Balboa Reservoir project is supported by the leaders of 8 neighborhood groups in the area surrounding the location of the proposed project and by a majority of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and by Mayor Diane Feinstein. We urge you to encourage the construction of this type of housing in San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition E.

San Francisco Board of Realtors
William L. Jansen, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

SAVE OUR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS!

BERNAL HEIGHTS SAYS, "VOTE NO ON PROP E!"

We are residents of Bernal Heights in San Francisco. We've worked hard to build affordable family and senior citizen homes in our neighborhood.

We need more affordable housing in our city to survive. The real issue in Prop E is affordable family housing—a "yes" vote prevents the construction of 203 family homes. That's crazy! Join us in preserving what's best in our City.

Vote "no" on Prop E!

Sylvia M. Yee, Bernal Heights Community Foundation Board of Directors***
Frank Hutchins, BHCF Board*
Mary Lou Bertoletti, BHCF Board*
Lela Havener, BHCF Board*
Elizabeth Egger, BHCF Board*
Sister Janet Simon, BHCF Board*
Stephen Antonaras, BHCF Board*
Lorenzo R. Dill, BHCF Board*
Barbara Bagot, BHCF Board*
Margaret C. Randolph, Northwest Bernal Block Club*
Maurice Lamb, NWBBC*
Tim Molinaro, BHCF Planning & Dev Committee*
Buck Bagot, BHCF P & D Committee*

***Organization for identification purposes only.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco Needs Affordable Housing—
Vote No on Proposition E

Everyone agrees that San Francisco needs affordable housing. The questions are how and where that affordable housing can be built.

The Balboa Reservoir housing development, to be built on the site of a reservoir built thirty years ago and unused since that time, answers those important questions for more than 200 San Francisco first-time homebuying families by providing:

- 203 new affordable three-bedroom, single family homes
- 9.8% fixed-rate financing
- A mix of 30% low-income, 30% moderate-income and 40% market-rate first time buyers
- A convenient site that has been declared “surplus” by the City and “available for development of affordable housing”

The Balboa Reservoir housing development is a small but significant step in the effort to generate affordable housing in our City.

Thousands of San Franciscans from every community, neighborhood group and viewpoint agree that the Balboa Reservoir development is good for San Francisco. Virtually every elected official, including the Governing Board of City College also agree.

All these San Franciscans ask you to say “yes” to affordable housing and “NO” to Proposition E.

San Francisco Coalition for Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar, Executive Director

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The viable plan for affordable single family housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site is being threatened by Proposition E. If Proposition E passes, 203 single family homes will be lost to the citizenry of San Francisco at a time when they are greatly needed.

The facts about the proposed housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site argue strongly against Proposition E. All 203 homes will be for first time home buyers. One-third of the homes will be available to households earning $27,000. Another third of the homes will be available to households earning $36,000. Adequate parking will be provided within the development itself, thus answering any concerns that traffic in the area will be congested.

City College has no need or plan to use South Balboa Reservoir for its facilities. City College’s priority is to develop its existing campus. South Balboa Reservoir should therefore be used for one of the City’s greatest needs: increased and affordable housing which is available to lower and middle income families.

As homeowners who live in the vicinity of South Balboa Reservoir, we welcome its planned use for single family housing and feel it will become an integral and contributing part of the community. We therefore urge you to vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Submitted by:
Stephen Graham, Chairman of the Housing Sub-committee of the Citizen’s Committee for Community Development
Roderick A. McLeod, Vice-Chairman of the Citizen’s Committee on Community Development

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing is a group of neighbors which consists of many of the renters of Westwood Park and Sunnyside neighborhoods as well as owners and renters of Ingleside which are the closest neighbors to the Balboa Reservoir along with some of the students and teachers of City College.

We strongly support the Balboa Reservoir for housing. We believe that the Balboa Reservoir is an ideal spot for housing.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Our neighborhood wants homes in the South Balboa Reservoir.
Vote No On Prop. E.

Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughey
Submitted by Patricia Vaughey

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

As Merchants as well as residents of Ocean Avenue, Greater Ingleside and San Francisco, we support the Development of the Balboa Reservoir as housing.

A Traffic Survey has stated that there will be minimal impact on the existing patterns of traffic by this development.

Additional City College Parking is being considered on another location off I-80 to keep the college congestion away from the neighborhood’s streets.

City College has 44 more acres in which to expand and existing buildings at City College have viable means to expand.
Balboa Reservoir Development Ban

We believe that housing on the Balboa Reservoir is the most viable solution to develop a vacant piece of property that is directly adjacent to our stores on a Transprefferential Street.

Affordable housing is in great need in San Francisco and is as much needed here as anywhere. We want to help provide this need. Vote No on Prop. E.

Ocean Avenue Merchants Assoc.
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughney
Submitted by Patricia Vaughney

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction on much-needed affordable, single-family housing at the long vacant south Balboa Reservoir site. This proposition would also block a major housing development that would bring jobs into an area of the city that has little industry or private business.

Sale prices for these units are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the San Francisco housing market, where the average home is selling for $160,000. Construction of these homes will help all young, first-time home buyers and will require only 5% down, instead of the 20% down payment on houses bought with conventional home mortgages.

This plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by nine nearby neighborhood organizations. If Proposition E is approved and this project is blocked, more young adults will purchase their first home in Valley or some other outlying area, further draining San Francisco of the young families that every growing community needs.

San Francisco residents will gain apprenticeships, jobs, contracts and subcontracts from this development.

This plan calls for 2 and 3 bedroom, family-sized houses, with space for another bedroom which can be finished when needed.

Each house will have 2½ parking spaces in front and would not cause parking problems in the area. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

City College of San Francisco has no plans to buy the property, has no money for institutional expansion, nor any mention of this land in any master plan. Some supporters of this proposition are motivated by racist notions and have said they fear that this development will become another "Geneva Towers." This type of thinking is similar to support for apartheid practiced in South Africa and must be defeated by progressive San Francisco voters. Property values will increase, instead of a decrease as a result of this project.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition E.

Larry Ural Johnson-Reed — President, O.M.I. Pilgrim Community Center Inc.
Maria Campbell-Corley — Program Director, Bay Area Engineering Societies Committee for Manpower Training, Inc.
Clara Mills-Bradford — Program Director, O.M.I. Senior Center
John C. Jackson
Linda Rose-Gipson
Jon Still — Secretary, Young Adult Committee
Kenneth Butler

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote "No" on Proposition E.

Affordable Housing Alliance — Mitchell Omerberg, Director
Bay Area Urban League — Gregory Best, Field Representative
Bernal Heights Community Foundation — Andre Lennell Daye
Community Educational Services — Dorothy Chen, Executive Director
Japanese Community Youth Council St. Francis Square Apartments, Inc. — Sandra Mayor-Jenkins, Secretary
Minority Contractors Association of Northern California — James Hugkey, Secretary, Board of Directors
National Community Congress — Dr. Edie C. Weldon
Parkmerced Residents Organization, Inc. — Ricardo A. Collejo, Esq.
Potrero Hill Neighborhood House — Enola Maxwell
San Francisco Building Trades Council — Stan Smith
San Francisco Housing & Tenants Council — Joseph Lacey
San Francisco Tenants Union — Jim Ray
Rev. Amos C. Brown — Local Pastor & Community Servant
Greg Day — Chairman, Citizens Committee on Community Development
Polly V. Marshall — Commissioner, San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
Regina A. Sneed
Jim Wierbolo — San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Michael E. Wills, AIA — Fleming Corporation

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

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?

YES 296

NO 297

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: With certain exceptions, City officers, including elected officials and commission members, may represent clients before City boards and commissions other than their own, and be paid for their services. State legislators may represent clients before City boards and commissions, and be paid for their services. Any person may contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would prohibit City officers from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay. This proposition would prohibit State legislators from appearing before City boards, commissions and departments on behalf of clients for pay. City officers would be prohibited from discussing with these officers and legislators matters that the City is deciding. Proposition F would also prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit City officers and State legislators from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to allow City officers and State legislators to represent clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to allow any person to contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

Controller's Statement on "F"

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

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 77

How "F" Got on Ballot

On February 26 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for limitations on compensated advocacy and campaign contributions had qualified for the June ballot.

Quentin Kopp, Marth Gillham and Cheryl Arenson, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 9,400 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,986 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The purpose of Proposition F is to cut campaign contributions by large contributors (and thus reduce campaign spending) and eliminate undue influence by officeholders retained as paid lobbyists for projects requiring City approval.

Let's take a minute to analyze the untrue arguments against Proposition F.

- The opponents claim that Proposition F will force half the City's Commissioners to resign. In fact, Proposition F does not force any Commissioners to resign. It simply says they can't be a paid lobbyist and a City Commissioner at the same time. Does a commissioner value making money by lobbying more than public service?

- Some have also alleged that Proposition F will prevent duly-elected union leaders from serving as City Commissioners. No it won't. Proposition F prohibits "compensated advocacy"—that means lobbyists hired by an organization, not members of the organization itself. Proposition F does not apply to salaried employees of labor unions, corporations, or non-profit agencies. Moreover, Section 8.105 of the Charter precludes it specifically from applying to any member serving as a representative of any profession, trade, business, union or association on any board or commission which requires membership of representatives of specific professions, trades, businesses, unions or associations.

- Another untrue argument against Proposition F is that it prohibits City officials only from discussing pending issues with other City officers or State Legislators who are also acting as paid lobbyists in a matter and doesn't stop those officeholding lobbyists from writing City officials about their clients' objectives. That's not so. Proposition F applies to all such lobbying, written or oral. (The dictionary defines "discuss" as "to examine by means of speech or writing.")

End government decision-making by "insiders" and reduce the influence of money on local campaigns. VOTE YES ON F.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
San Franciscans for Good Government

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

In all our years of observing San Francisco City government, we have found one maxim to be true time after time: a good idea gets copied, especially among politicians.

For no sooner did Quentin Kopp promise to bring Proposition F to the voters than did Mayor Feinstein come up with an informal, administrative version of her own. Fine, you say (and the Mayor says), then why vote Yes on Proposition F?

(1) The Mayor's remedy of asking City Commissioners who also act as lobbyists before City agencies to resign is nothing more than a hand slap, and is good only as long as she is mayor.

It's not binding on future mayors and could be changed without any vote of the Board of Supervisors, let alone the people of San Francisco. Proposition F prohibits this kind of conflict-of-interest, and it will be the law, no matter who is mayor.

(2) The Mayor's action did nothing to state legislators who can also act as lobbyists before City Boards and Commissions, nor did her action stop the law or business partners of City Commissioners from picking up the slack in big-money lobbying. Proposition F will stop these practices in their tracks.

(3) What about the other half of Proposition F, which reduced the campaign contribution limit to $500 so that all San Franciscans can enjoy equal access to City officials, not just the ones with the big bucks? The Mayor can't do anything about this, and she hasn't. Only a Yes vote on Proposition F will reduce the weight of big money and ensure our full voice in City elections and City government.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. If it's important enough for the Mayor to copy part of it administratively, it's important enough to do the job right and make it a law.

John J. Barbagelata
Harry Aleo
June Cahn
Dorothy Partridge

Robert Arenson
Rudolph Lohntein
Janet Wentworth

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The worst and most persistent problem in American politics is that politicians and political races can be "bought". Reducing the size of campaign contributions will be a step forward in reducing the role of money in elections. Vote yes for more honest government.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

RESTORE to the people their rightful and equal power as individual voters by reducing the monetary clout and influence of private interests who make the laws and the policies as City officials and Commissioners or State legislators.

TELL the special interests that their money and influence can no longer interfere with representative government.

TELL the special interests that the voters will no longer tolerate the influence-buying which comes with large campaign contributions.

TELL the special interests that this measure will encourage highly talented citizens to serve San Francisco honestly and responsibly.

VOTE YES ON F.

Cheryl Arenson
Anne Renfrew
David Pacheco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

"Government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

These noble words from Abraham Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address, cast in bronze at the entrance to City Hall, seem to have escaped the attention of some City officials who pass by them every day. For in San Francisco City government, Lincoln’s simple formula for representative government would read quite differently: “Government of the powerful, by the lobbyists, and for the wealthy.”

Government of, by, and for the privileged few is bad government. Government of, by, and for all the people is good government. It’s as simple as that—as simple as Lincoln first put it.

Proposition F, the Good Government Initiative, will help San Franciscans maintain control of their government and will prevent undue influence by City officeholders.

To reduce undue influence, Proposition F outlaws the practice of City Commissioners and State Legislators representing special interests for pay before City Commissions and Boards. City Commissions should render their decisions deliberately and impartially, not be swayed by the political clout of the lobbyists appearing before them, or by any political favors those lobbyist/politicians might promise. “I’ll scratch your back if you scratch my back” bargains do not belong in government. And until such backroom bargains are made illegal, City government will not belong to the rest of us either.

Proposition F also reduces the maximum amount that anyone can give to a local candidate from $1,000 to $500. If large contributors and other special interests can’t give as much money, they can’t buy as much influence with elected officials. And the lower the contribution limit, the less campaign spending and the more City government will be responsive to all San Franciscans.

You can “buy back” City government from the privileged and powerful with the most precious of all political commodities: your vote.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Mary Lohnes
Peter Patou
Judith Thorson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F, an initiative of the people, is needed to protect the voters and the integrity of the legislative process from being corrupted by the power of money and influence. It prevents City officials and State Legislators from lobbying the City on behalf of high-powered special interests. It also lowers the campaign contribution limit from $1,000 to $500, thus reducing the influence of those same special interests over our elections and elected officials.

The bogus argument that the Mayor won’t be able to find qualified people to serve on City commissions if Proposition F is adopted ignores the plain fact that there are 700,000 people in San Francisco, a pool of civic-minded citizens more than large enough to accommodate the 250 commission appointments available in our City government. For example, there are plenty of architects to fill the one architectural appointment on the Art Commission, just as there are plenty of non-lobbyist business people and lawyers available to serve on other commissions.

Thousands of San Franciscans, not just the “insiders”, are ready, willing, and able to serve the public.

Proposition F deserves your vote. Restore integrity to City government. Restore the confidence of the citizens of San Francisco in that government. Let’s have no more Wilkes Bashford situations.

VOTE YES ON F.

Oscar Suro
Martha Gillham
Marguerite Warrent

Leonel Monterey
Tony Kilroy
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE "NO" ON F

This proposition disguises itself as "good government" but, in reality, would drive good people out of government. It is so crudely drawn — so sweeping in its implications — that it would bar from government almost anyone with even a remote business or community tie to government.

It would purge from City commissions anyone who "directly or indirectly" receives compensation from any "interests" with an issue before any City agency. Effectively, this could discriminate against employees from community and neighborhood groups, civil rights organizations, non-profit corporations, labor unions, merchant and business groups, as well as architects, lawyers and other professionals.

Actually, there currently are no commissioners who represent any clients before any City agency. All who are appointed in my administration sign a statement saying they will not advocate for any paying client before any official body of the City while they are commissioners. This proposition simply is not necessary.

Proposition F also would lower the limit for any individual campaign contribution from $1000 to $500. Although this sounds good, it would permit a wealthy person with various businesses and numerous family members to contribute many thousands of dollars through different sources. This would encourage "hidden" contributions. We must strive for disclosure of contributions, not a system which drives contributions underground. Candidates must be able to raise funds enough to put their message before the voters. Reducing the contribution limit can be a tactic to discourage persons from challenging incumbents.

Vote no on Proposition F.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition F purports to achieve a noble objective: The removal of "influence peddling" from City Hall. In fact, Proposition F is so poorly-crafted, it may have exactly the opposite effect on City government. It is not a "good government" initiative. It is bad legislation.

Proposition F provides no definitions and no standards for the public to judge whether City officials comply with its restrictions. Its uncertainties will be chaotic and lead to endless, needless lawsuits.

A measure similar to Proposition F was rejected by the Board of Supervisors because no public hearings were ever held on the legislation. If the public had had a chance to comment on this initiative, it might not have the critical shortcomings, deficiencies and uncertainties that now warrant its rejection by responsible San Franciscans.

In the coming months, the Board will review good government measures that are comprehensible, effective and, most important, certain. Proposition F is a misguided disaster.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

This should properly have been titled the "SINK WILLIE BROWN ORDINANCE"! The "meat of the coconut" is in Section 4.

Supervisor Kopp's intentions are good, however this sloppily drafted and incomprehensible measure succeeds in "burning down the barn" to eliminate a couple of rats!

Under this proposal, to avoid any potential INDIRECT conflict of interest, (which is undefined!), one would have to be a destitute, unemployed welfare recipient to qualify for service on any City Board or Commission! The Mayor has already solved this "hired advocacy" problem with the "conflict of interest" affidavits she demands IN ADVANCE from any prospective appointee.

Quentin's proposed $500.00 campaign contribution limit is an "inside joke" and he, of all people, knows it! It merely obliges a heavy contributor to have his wife, children, business associates, or friends send in SEPARATE $500.00 checks if he wants to contribute more than $500.00 to a politician's campaign.

These proposals require additional City employees for enforcement and wind up doing far more harm than good. Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr., President
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Union members and labor officials have legitimate reasons for meeting with City officers. It is unfair and wrong to lump them in the same category as special interest lobbyists, yet that's exactly what Proposition F does. Working people deserve representation on City boards and commissions. VOTE NO!

Walter Johnson
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council
LeRoy King
James Elliot
Keith Eickman
Reva Olson

Jeff Greendorfer
Stan Smith
Larry Griffin
Steve Rabissa
Terrence Ryan
Jack Beggs
Tony Marovich

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

If you want to ban business owners and executives from serving on City boards and commissions, then vote for Proposition F.

If you think board members of non-profit corporations and employees of community agencies have nothing to contribute to City government, then vote for Proposition F.

If you believe union members and labor officials should not have a voice at City Hall, then vote for Proposition F.

But if you share our belief that these individuals have legitimate concerns and expertise that is valuable in running major City departments, then join us in voting NO on Proposition F.

Proposition F is a simplistic, sloppily-drafted, meat axe approach to a problem already resolved by Mayor Feinstein's ban on commissioners lobbying on behalf of private clients.

Proposition F is not good government and it is not reform. Proposition F is bad legislation. VOTE NO.

Hon. Douglas Engmann
Hon. Charlotte Berk

Hon. Eugene Friend
Hon. Phyllis Lyon

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

We're sympathetic to the need for political reform. But it's a complicated problem, and Proposition F just isn't the way to go.

Frankly, we can't tell who is and isn't affected by this measure. While a handful of people sometimes might abuse their positions, that's no reason to question the integrity of so many solid citizens who give tirelessly to public service. Proposition F is simply the wrong approach. Please join us in voting NO.

William E. McDonnell
Frances May McAteer
N. A. Sapanik
Caroline and Michael Figoni

Martin D. Murphy
Eugene C. Payne III
Suzanne B. McCarthy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Concerned about elected officials spending $400,000 to run for supervisor and $1 million on a mayor's race? Then vote NO on Proposition F.

That's right. NO.

Proposition F isn't going to do anything about campaign spending. Prop F simply limits the size of contributions, reducing the current limit from $1,000 to $500. Supervisors can and will continue spending outrageous sums on their re-election campaigns. With Proposition F they'll just spend twice as much time raising money from twice as many sources, and that makes special interests even more powerful. They can always find ways around campaign limits.

We need campaign spending reform, but Proposition F doesn't provide it. Please join us in voting NO on F.

District 8 Democratic Club
Stephen L. Tuber
Ruth Gravanis
Alan Roznick
Miriam Blaustein

Linda Chapman
Dale Carlson
James Firth
Debra Barnes
Lew Serbin
Debra Stein
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

When campaign contributions are limited, political freedom suffers. Your right to free speech includes not only your right to express your views, but also your right to support as much as you want, any candidate who speaks for you.

Minority viewpoints depend heavily on the contribution of a few dedicated supporters to get your message out. To limit your financial support of your beliefs is to silence your political voice.

Only incumbents, who have many opportunities for free media exposure benefit from this assault on free speech. The dangers of a campaign contribution limit far outweigh any possible benefit from this proposition. Defeat Proposition F!

San Francisco Libertarian Party
Michael R. Fowler, Secretary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

You may think Prop F only applies to big-time lawyers and a few legislators who represent developers. Think again!

Prop F would prohibit many community leaders from public service. If it passes, board members and employees of community and charitable organizations could be banned from serving on City boards and commissions.

We appreciate the public need for a government free of "influencing peddling." But restrictions on "compensated advocacy" ought to be clearly and carefully crafted to protect the voices of community leaders who argue on behalf of the public interest, not private special interests.

Vote No.

Hon. Juanita Del Carlo
Mission Hiring Hall

Bob Ross
Publisher, Bay Area Reporter

Hon. Jeffrey Ken Mori
Japanese Community Youth Council, Inc.
Bill O'Callahan
American Red Cross
Hon. George Suncin
Horizons Unlimited
Hon. Jean Rita Alvar
Mission Education Project
Hon. Greg Day
Polk Street Town Hall
Hon. Naomi Gray
Hon. James Foster
Carol Wong
Marlena Marseille
Lee Woods
Jo Daly
Dennis Collins
Hon. H. Welton Flynn
(Organizations listed only for purposes of identification.)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will have no effect on developers' lawyers. None.

It won't make any difference to state legislators either.

Don't kid yourself. This is not "reform" and it isn't "good government." Proposition F will allow the special interests and influence peddlers to continue exercising influence over our elected officials. It has so many loopholes, lobbying will actively continue, untouched, in the back rooms of City Hall.

And developers will always find ways around campaign contribution limits. As Common Cause has noted, Prop F simply makes tracing their dollars more difficult for the public.

Real reform would directly attack the source of huge contributions—the developers and other special interests that employ the lobbyists to peddle their influence.

VOTE NO.

Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
David Looman
Michael Mason

Rich Waller
Susan Klugerman
Rene Cazeneuve
Margie O'Driscoll

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

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

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?

YES 300

NO 301

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has adopted an ordinance prohibiting the City, with certain exceptions, from purchasing goods or services from companies doing business with South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a declaration of policy that says the City must try to avoid doing business with companies that significantly profit from or help maintain the Apartheid system in South Africa. It calls on other public bodies and private groups to adopt similar policies. It directs the Board of Supervisors to identify the companies which have the greatest ties to Apartheid so that the public can also boycott those companies.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to avoid doing business with companies that help maintain Apartheid, and you want a public boycott of those companies.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

“The proposed Declaration of Policy be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “G” Got on Ballot

On November 6, 1985 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for the City to boycott businesses with significant ties to South Africa had qualified for the June ballot.

Arlo Hale Smith, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,546 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on October 11.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,941 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:

It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This measure calls for a public boycott of companies that aid apartheid.

Any claim of “conflict” between Proposition G and existing anti-apartheid legislation is imaginary: It is the legislative intent of supporters of this measure that it can be construed as a directive for making existing law tougher.

Personal attacks have no legitimate place in a ballot measure campaign. As proponent of this measure, I repudiate all such tactics.

Vote NO on apartheid. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Arlo Hale Smith

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Boycotts are grassroots politics. They’ve helped the farmworkers, they’ve helped win integration, and they can help end the legal racism called “Apartheid”.

A Gallup poll found 77% of South Africa’s black majority favoring international economic boycotts to force the Apartheid regime to accept reform peacefully.

After the Boycott Initiative made the ballot, the San Francisco Supervisors unanimously passed a similar city purchasing policy. The issue that remains is whether to call on the general public to join in, boycotting companies identified by the Supervisors as the worst offenders in each industry.

The companies that would be targeted consider profits to be the “bottom line”. Economic pressure is all they understand.

The AFL-CIO, NAACP, and NOW have called a boycott of Shell Oil because of its profiteering from South Africa’s oppressive economic conditions. Proposition G supports that and would put the same pressure on other industries as well.

This proposition is supported by the elected county central committee of the Democratic Party, the Peace-and-Freedom Party and the Humanist Party, and by leading attorneys, such as Terry Francois, Terence Hallinan, Tony Serra, Lewis Hope Lee, Marc Van Der Hout, Abby Ginsberg and Terence Redmond.

If South Africa were a democracy, its majority would long ago have voted to end Apartheid. We need to vote Yes—because they can’t.

Atty. Arlo Hale Smith, Democratic Party County Central Committee
Paul Kangas, Peace and Freedom Party
Lois Salisbury, Public Advocates*
Dr. Kevin Danaher, Food First*
Jesse James, Mission Rebels
Terry Collins, Community Activist
Stony Gebert, Election Action
Robert McCull, Hotel & Restaurant Employees
Executive Board Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Attorneys speak out against Apartheid:

South African police can arrest anyone without charge. They can hold you incommunicado — no contacts with family, lawyers or press.

They regularly censor news, books, music. They have banned Christmas caroling, funerals and other peaceful gatherings. Groups which criticize the government are forbidden to hold meetings.

Blacks are subject to legal segregation; their property and employment rights are greatly restricted; often, they are simply murdered.

As attorneys, we help people who have legal rights that are being violated. But what can we do for those who have no legal rights?

Boycotts and other economic sanctions are the only way to make the Apartheid government accept reform peacefully.

In the Court of World Public Opinion, Apartheid has been convicted of crimes against humanity. By imposing a sentence of economic isolation, we can end Apartheid.

Vote Yes—take a stand for justice.

Terence Hallinan
Arlo Hale Smith
Terry Francois
Karen Anderson Ryer
Robert R. Bryan

Ann Menasche
Ruchel Ginsburg
Leo Paoli
Gabriel Gesmar
Ora Prouchnovick

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is a moderate, responsible but effective proposal to bring economic pressure on the South African government to establish constitutional rights for all of its citizens.

Vote Yes.

Terence Faulkner, Republican
Mike Garza, Republican

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

All decent Americans abhor apartheid. However, boycotting U.S. investment in South Africa is counterproductive; it only penalizes the actual victims of apartheid.

U.S. international firms have acted as progressive agents for change through the Sullivan principles. Their investments have improved the social and economic condition of the labor force.

It is improper to penalize their positive contributions.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

We are individuals and organizations working actively to end the racist system of apartheid in South Africa. And we are voting NO on Proposition G.

Why?

(1) Because Proposition G will weaken San Francisco's present divestment law. This law requires companies doing business with the city to sign affidavits that they will make no new contracts with South Africa.

Proposition G has no such provision.

(2) Proposition G provides no mechanism or funding to carry out its declared purpose of "boycotting" South Africa.

Proposition G will not stop South African products from entering the Port of San Francisco.

Vote against this useless, confusing, and deceptive initiative.

Preserve the stronger divestment law San Francisco already has.

Vote NO on Proposition G!

Yvonne Golden
Geraldine Johnson
Dr. Johanne Matheus
AFT 2121 Anti-Apartheid Committee
Artists Against Apartheid
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition of Black Trade Unions
Coalition of Conscience
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club Executive Committee
ILWU 10 and SEIU 250 Southern Africa Liberation Support Committees
National Conference of Black Lawyers
San Francisco Anti-Apartheid Committee
Southern Africa Freedom Committee/All Peoples Congress

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1983 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!
PROPOSITION H

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Several city and private agencies conduct various programs related to AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a declaration of policy that says San Francisco should support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council, consisting of a Committee on Education and a Fund-Raising Committee. The Research Committee would make recommendations on the most useful AIDS research projects and try to prevent duplication of efforts. The Education Committee would inform the public about the latest research and about ways to prevent AIDS. The Fund-Raising Committee would seek donations and grants for AIDS research and education projects.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

“The proposed Declaration of Policy for an AIDS research and education council and the formation of advisory committees of civic leaders would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, additional expenditure of public funds for AIDS research may result, the amount of which cannot be determined.”

How “H” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for AIDS research had qualified for the June ballot.

Stony Gebert, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 10,540 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on December 6, 1985.

A check of each signature on the petition showed that 7,564 of the signatures were valid. This is more than 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We need a council to expose and address major AIDS issues without the impasse of present medical/political bias.

As taxpayers, we are subsidizing a treadmill of continual AIDS casualties. There are major oversights where AIDS is concerned. Only recently was it learned that CDC statistics suggest 79% of early AIDS cases appear drug-related. We hear AIDS is 100% fatal. Perhaps that is because death may also be drug-related in the way of immuno-suppressive antibiotic and radiation overloads to already compromised immunity systems. Prevailing medicine is both tunnel-visioned and high-profit motivated. Also well-funded. This solution may be part of the problem. Some physicians are beginning to feel where AIDS is concerned many current practices are ethically, medically bankrupt.

Remissions occur. Largely through immunity-enhancing, holistic medicine. Significantly, only 1% of AIDS cases occur among people at risk in the Asian community. Perhaps this is due to less drug abuse or use of an unfunded, ignored resource: herbology as part of diet. More options: homeopathy, acupuncture, etc.

If, as anticipated, upwards of 40% of those testing positive come down with AIDS, we may become overburdened. To ignore all of the above becomes part of the problem. Vote Yes on Proposition H.

Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Rich McKirkeby, Former Orderly, Marketing Associate, Pacific Bell
Joseph P. Clady, AIDS Hospice, Shanti Counselor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There is great need for research and education about AIDS and related conditions.

We need to attack the disease, not its victims.
Knowledge is the only vaccine available today.
Vote Yes.

John Lorenzini, President, People With AIDS Alliance
Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Jan Beck, Steven Russell, Eugene Ewins, ARC/AIDS Vigil

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There are many possible treatments for AIDS and related conditions which are not being examined by the federal government, especially therapies based on natural substances and processes.

Vote Yes for an AIDS Research Council open to all viewpoints.

Scott Gregory, M.D.
Paul Kangas

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

A tape recording (Talking Book) of the San Francisco Voter Information pamphlet is available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

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

Name______________________________________________________________

Address__________________________________________________________ Apt. # ______

Telephone No. (required)__________________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any)_____________________________________

Signature__________________________________________________________
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

**PROPOSITION I**

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?

- **YES** 307
- **NO** 308

---

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the Freeway with a surface roadway.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition I is a policy statement asking whether or not the Embarcadero Freeway should be torn down.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want the City's policy to remain as it is, and you want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you want to change the City's policy, and you do not want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

---

**Controller's Statement on "I"**

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

"The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway demolished, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by at least $10.2 million in local funds. Potential private sector financing and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available and could defray all or part of the cost."

---

**How "I" Got on Ballot**

On March 3 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy placing the question of demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway before the voters had qualified for the June ballot.

Richard Hongisto, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 11,119 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,720 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

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

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land now under the Broadway ramps is put back on the tax rolls, with low-rise buildings limited by restrictive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when united with Proposition J, recognizes these facts:

1) The Embarcadero Freeway is what is left of a never-completed elevated freeway that would have ringed the City through North Beach and Marina neighborhoods to the Golden Gate Bridge.

2) Today this massive freeway, which separates us from our waterfront, would never be built.

3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.

4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman’s Wharf will be preserved.

5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked for this new system.

6) Only that portion of the Embarcadero Freeway east and north of the Main and Beale Street ramps — basically the portion directly on the waterfront — will be removed to make way for the new system. The removal cost, approximately $10 million to be paid for with privately-generated new revenues, is a relatively small part of the overall new system.

As for Proposition J, vote "YES, let’s tear down the Embarcadero Freeway." Then turn to Proposition J and support the plan for a beautiful waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Removing the Embarcadero Freeway will allow San Francisco to:

- Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero.
- Build on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway.
- Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula.
- Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero.
- Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.
- Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won’t benefit San Francisco. Don’t let outsiders determine our future. Vote YES on I.

Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Jack Whiteley
Roger Boyer
A. Lee Knitch
Robert Bradford
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Donald A. Crosby, AIA
Eli Y. Ohana
Robert Meyers
Ralph Hurtado
Hon. Susan Berman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Douglas G. Wright
Anita Sanchez
Chuck Forester
Fritz Arko
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones
Rondell Rossi
Karl Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Browkema
Jon Thichell
Jane Winlow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK — VOTE YES ON I

This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY — VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds — without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city’s fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ABSENT VOTER BALLOT APPLICATION
Application must be received by the registrar of voters no later than 5/27/86.

Election Date: June 3, 1986

MAIL COMPLETED FORM TO:
Registrar of Voters
Room 155 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

PLEASE PRINT REGISTERED NAME:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>MIDDLE NAME</th>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX NUMBER)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

X

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

(AREA CODE) RESIDENCE TELEPHONE

THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT PROPER SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

STREET OR BOX

CITY   STATE   ZIP

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Ballot Type/Party
Affidavit No.
Signature and Registration Verified as Correct:

Date   Deputy Registrar

DATE OF BIRTH

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT—VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to 157 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown, Fisherman's Wharf and the financial district would be reduced.

Travel within the city would be slowed down at all hours. Vote no to the destruction of the freeway.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
• Tearown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
• Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
• If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
—By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
—Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
—MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
—Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Judith Tornese

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Tear it down? The concept is preposterous! There are 70,000 cars a day whizzing by on this high speed downtown elevated waterfront freeway! Where will they all go?

Aside from the outrageous demolition costs involved, (some engineers estimate $40,000,000 of taxpayer money!), eyeball observation, logic, and just plain "common sense" dictates that ground level "total gridlock" will result if this expensive freeway is now destroyed.

Nostalgic individuals must realize that the times have changed! We can't bring the Bay back up to Montgomery Street! On behalf of San Francisco's overburdened taxpayers, we urge a NO vote!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled.
Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

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

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?

YES 310
NO 311

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a policy statement that says that the City would replace the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt a policy statement which says that the Embarcadero Freeway would be torn down if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt a policy statement to replace the Embarcadero Freeway under these conditions.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway replaced with a tree-lined six lane boulevard and other traffic and transit improvements, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by approximately $27.5 million. This includes a one-time freeway demolition cost of $10.2 million plus $17.3 million required to match potential federally-funded transit improvements. Potential financing by the State and private sector and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “J” Got on Ballot

On March 5 a declaration of policy regarding the future of the Embarcadero Freeway was delivered to the Registrar from the Mayor and several supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows the Mayor or four or more supervisors to submit a declaration of policy to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

In addition to Mayor Feinstein, the March 5 document was signed by Supervisors Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker, Molinarri, Kennedy and Nelder.

POLS ARE OPEN
FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans now have a chance to remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with an at-grade, six-lane parkway, which will open our waterfront and restore views blocked for years by this large freeway.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for traffic and transit improvements:

- New, shorter freeway ramps connecting directly with The Embarcadero;
- A tree-lined, at-grade, 6-lane Embarcadero Boulevard, with a new waterfront Muni line, a jogging and bicycle path from Fisherman's Wharf to Mission Bay;
- Extension of Muni Metro south to the Caltrain station at 4th and Townsend;
- New ramps connecting I-280 with The Embarcadero;
- Changes in traffic flow and improvements to existing freeway ramps.

Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf will be preserved and enhanced.

The Board of Supervisors has specified that the Embarcadero Freeway will be torn down only if preliminary engineering during the next two years confirms—as traffic and environmental studies already have—that removal of the freeway will not result in more problems than it solves.

San Francisco became eligible for $88 million in federal highway funds for this new system when the Supervisors approved the plan in 1980. The $10.2 million cost of freeway demolition itself can be paid from revenues from low-rise development of the parcels now under the Broadway ramps and the increased values of nearby properties. Strict waterfront zoning limits the size of any development.

Traffic and environmental studies by the California Department of Transportation since 1980 clearly indicate that the new waterfront transportation system will be vastly superior to the existing situation, and that traffic congestion levels will not be notably different with the elevated structure removed.

Vote YES on J and let's remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with a parkway and transit system—once again let us see our waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J gives the voters a chance to be heard on an important and timely issue. This issue is the replacement of a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway as one element of a comprehensive package of transportation improvements in the Waterfront area.

Last fall, the Board of Supervisors adopted for further study a set of traffic and transit improvements for the Waterfront. These improvements include:

- a new landscaped surface-level boulevard
- replacement of the Clay/Washington and Broadway on and off ramps with new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom
- removal of the unused stub of I-280 and construction of new ramps connecting the new waterfront boulevard to Route I-280
- a new light rail transit line linking Fort Mason with the Caltrain Depot
- extension of the Muni Metro to the train depot, improving the Peninsula Commute Service

A YES vote on Proposition J does not allocate funds for these projects. It does allow for further design and engineering studies, including cost analysis, assessment of impacts on traffic, and other matters. The studies will then be presented to the Supervisors so that they can make an informed decision on the plan. If the studies prove positive, San Francisco will be able to transform its Waterfront for the benefit of all.

Proposition J will insure that the City will not proceed with the removal of any of the Freeway until all the studies are completed and all potential consequences are assessed. This is the responsible approach. Vote YES on J.

SPUR
League of Women Voters
Embarcadero Citizens Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SAN FRANCISCO'S NEIGHBORHOODS ASK YOU TO VOTE YES ON J.

REDUCE TRAFFIC CONGESTION—YES ON J!

Traffic backed up by the Embarcadero Roadway slows travel and creates congestion in North Beach and other nearby neighborhoods. J will speed traffic flow.

IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION—YES ON J!

Proposition J will provide regular streetcar service along the Embarcadero and extend Muni Metro service to the south, ultimately extending to Bayview-Hunters Point.

PROMOTE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY—YES ON J!

If Proposition J does not pass, San Francisco could lose $88 million in federal funds for traffic improvements.

(continued)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

RESTORE THE WATERFRONT—YES ON J!
San Francisco’s waterfront could become a focal point for the city, graced by a grand promenade, instead of the dismal, deteriorating eyesore it is now.
San Francisco’s neighborhoods join together to ask your support for an improved Embarcadero. We guarantee the freeway will not be removed unless it is replaced by facilities that will assure a smoother, more efficient traffic flow. YES ON J!

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Robert Bradford  Ruth Gravitis
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt  Anita Sanchez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SUPPORT PUBLIC TRANSIT—VOTE YES ON J.
SAVE SAN FRANCISCO FROM GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON J.
The revitalization of the Northeastern Waterfront...as included in San Francisco’s Master Plan and transit plans, as overwhelmingly approved by the Board of Supervisors and as urged by Mayor Feinstein...will allow almost $90 million in unused federal highway funds to be used for vital downtown and waterfront transit and street improvements which will be a key to reducing needless auto congestion in San Francisco.

PROPOSITION J SUPPORTS IMPORTANT TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS TO THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT. It will:
- extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific/CalTrain depot
- create a new rail line (possibly using historic streetcars) to connect the entire waterfront from Mission Bay to the Ferry Building to Fishermans Wharf and Fort Mason
- set the stage for a possible streetcar line along Third Street
Since the city of San Francisco adopted the Transit First policy in the early 1970's, transit investments in the Muni Metro, in new electric trolley an articulated bus service, and in BART and Golden Gate Transit, have saved downtown San Francisco from gridlock!

IF you are concerned about the future of transit in San Francisco, IF you are concerned about reducing needless auto congestion, THEN we urge you to join Mayor Feinstein and the majority of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in voting YES ON Proposition J.

Norman Rolfe
San Francisco Muni Coalition
California Transit League
Jack Wholey
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Regina Sned
ton Kiley
Hon. Jack Morrison
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Bay Area Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Hon. Amy Meyer, Recreation and Park Commissioner
Alan Lubliner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A SOUND BUSINESS PROPOSITION—YES ON J!
Common sense and good business demand we make the most of our resources. San Francisco’s waterfront is an economic and civic asset unrivaled anywhere—yet much of it is cut off by an ugly, noisy, elevated roadway. The traffic improvements called for by Proposition J will benefit workers, tourists, property owners, neighborhoods, and business.
- Traffic flow and transit will move quickly on a realigned, reorganized Embarcadero Roadway, allowing easier, more pleasant access to waterfront businesses.
- An improved and beautified Embarcadero will create new commercial opportunities and increase the value of existing property and businesses.
- New jobs and an expanded tax base will generate increased revenue for the city as several lots now covered by freeway ramps return to productive private ownership. Though limited to low rise development (40 to 65 feet), tax revenues from development will more than make up the city’s share of the project.

Robert Meyers
Dennis J. Potts
Kenneth R. Lerch
M. Arthur Gensler, Jr., FAIA
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones

—Other projects in the area, such as upgrading piers 1½, 3, and 5 as well as the Ferry Building and existing facilities like the YMCA will benefit from the proposed improvements.
—Traffic studies show overall access to the downtown will be improved by Proposition J. Federal money has been set aside for this proposal and cannot be used for other projects in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON THIS CAREFULLY PLANNED PROJECT TO REVITALIZE OUR WATERFRONT!
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J OFFERS RESIDENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO A ONCE IN A LIFETIME OPPORTUNITY TO RECAPTURE THEIR WATERFRONT.

Coveting the Embarcadero into a tree-lined boulevard and building a new streetcar line will make the waterfront more pedestrian and transit oriented, that is, more people oriented.

A freeway structure that is a source of objectionable noise and casts a pall over a large part of the waterfront will be removed. The waterfront will be opened up to sunlight and fresh air and made more inviting and cheerful to those who wish to walk on one of the world's outstanding waterfronts. Air pollution that is now retained by the existing elevated structure will be dissipated.

The transit orientation of the new waterfront will encourage energy conservation. Proposition J will:

—Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero
—Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway
—Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula

—Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero
—Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line
—Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won't benefit San Francisco. Don't let outsiders determine our future.

VOTE YES ON J FOR A BETTER SAN FRANCISCO.

Sierra Club
Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage
Williuda McCrea*
Bob Cramer*
Rebecca Evans*
Richard Livingston*
Marilyn Clemens*
Jennie Lew*
Jeffrey Henne*
Jane Winlow*
Roger Boyer

A. Lee Knight
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Patrick S. Hohin
Monica Halloran
Walter K. Morris
Lisa Klarimond
Jeffrey Heller
Bob Insinon
George T. Rockrise, FAIA
Jon Twichell
Marc Kasky

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J GIVES US A CHANCE TO CORRECT A COLOSSAL MISTAKE!

The Embarcadero Freeway should never have been built. The original plan was to build a freeway from bridge to bridge, destroying the Northern Waterfront, Fisherman's Wharf, Fort Mason, and Marina Green in the process. When the people of San Francisco saw what was happening, they stopped it in mid-air — literally.

Walk under it. Hear the noise. Feel the gloom. See how it cuts out light.

It's time to remove this mistake.

The new waterfront plan will give us a tree-lined boulevard, a new streetcar line, and a Muni Metro extension to the Southern Pacific/Caltrain depot. It will give us a transit and pedestrian oriented waterfront that will give us pride and pleasure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J!

San Francisco Tomorrow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, with a membership of 1700 working architects in San Francisco, urges a "YES" vote on Proposition J. In 1968 the citizens of San Francisco stopped highway planners from ringing our waterfront with freeways. Today voters have another opportunity to return the waterfront to our citizens. Removal of the Embarcadero Freeway is one part of a carefully researched transit plan for San Francisco. This proposition supplies an unique opportunity to carry out a broad range of transportation improvements that will have many positive effects on the City of San Francisco.

Removal of the freeway will:

1. Return the waterfront to the people by removing this barrier to access and view.
2. Facilitate needed MUNI improvements.
3. Encourage development of the Embarcadero as a grand civic boulevard unifying the City of San Francisco.

The members of the American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, urge you to vote "YES" on Proposition I and "YES" on Proposition J.

Donald Kennedy, FAIA
President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans love Their City, the ambiance, the Bay, waterfront, the views, the healthy neighborhoods.
Freeway builders did their damnest to destroy the City and di-
vide our neighborhoods.
Now we can remove that damned spot, the concrete dinosaur, the hideous barrier that destroys our scenic views, the fence that keeps us from the Bay, the concealer of the Ferry Building.
Correct a mistake.

VOTE YES ON J.

Miriam Blaustein
Charlene Clark
Marie Creasy
Zack Cowan
Dick Grabbell
Rick Haupan

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

NO ON PROPOSITION J.
"J" is for JOKE—a cruel joke on us. What will J really do?
Add traffic to every street east of Gough. Delay the construction of waterfront streetcar service. Cost millions in local dollars needed to improve MUNI. Create a ground-level freeway on the waterfront as big as Van Ness, with more cars.
I'm a private citizen who's concerned about traffic and what it's doing to our City. If you are too, vote NO on Proposition J.

Steve Colman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
• Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
• Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
• If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
— By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will in-
crease from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersec-
tions—an increase of only 76%.
— Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
— MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
— Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Blair C. Pascoe

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

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:
1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION A

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by boldface type.

3.202 Office of Risk Management

There is established under the chief administrative officer an office of risk management which shall review, analyze and report to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the finance committee of the board of supervisors the practices of the several departments, boards and commissions of the city and county regarding loss prevention and risk management, including the insurance requirements of the city and county. The office shall also establish and assist in the implementation of planning and operational guidelines regarding risk management and loss prevention for each department, board or commission. The chief administrative officer may appoint, at his or her pleasure, or contract with, a qualified individual or organization for the operation of the office. The qualifications of the individual or organization operating the office shall include relevant education, training and experience in insurance and risk management.

3.401 City Attorney

(a) The city attorney shall be an elective officer. He shall furnish an official bond in the sum of ten thousand dollars ($10,000). He shall appoint, and at his pleasure may remove, all assistants and employees of his office. He shall devote his entire time and attention to the duties of his office. He must, at the time of his election, be an elector of the city and county, qualified to practice in all the courts of the state, and he must have been so qualified for at least 10 years next preceding his election.

The city attorney must represent the city and county in all actions and proceedings in which it may be legally interested, or, for or against the city and county, or, any officer of the city and county in any action or proceeding, when directed so to do by the supervisors, except where a cause of action exists in favor of the city and county against said officer. Whenever any cause of action exists in favor of the city and county, the city attorney shall commence the same when within his knowledge or when directed so to do by the supervisors. He shall give his advice or opinion in writing to any officer, board or commission of the city and county when requested. Except as otherwise provided in this charter, he shall not settle or dismiss any litigation for or against the city and county, unless, upon his written recommendation, he is ordered so to do by ordinance.

The city attorney shall prepare, or approve as to form, all ordinances before they are enacted by the supervisors. He shall approve, by endorsement in writing, the form of all official or other bonds required by this charter or by ordinance before the same are submitted to the proper commission, board or office for final approval, and no such bonds shall be finally approved without such approval as to form by the city attorney. Except as otherwise in this charter provided, he shall prepare in writing the draft or form of all contracts before the same are executed on behalf of the city and county. He shall examine and approve the title of all real property to be acquired by the city and county.

He shall keep on file in his office copies of all written communications and opinions, also all papers, briefs and transcripts used in matters wherein he appears; and books of record and registers of all actions or proceedings in his charge in which the city and county or any officer or board thereof, is a party or is interested.

(b) The duties of the city attorney in connection with the bureau of delinquent revenue collection shall be transferred to and performed by the attorney for said bureau who shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

(c) There is established in the office of the city attorney a bureau of claims investigation and administration which shall have the responsibility of investigating, evaluating and processing for the several boards, commissions and departments all claims for money or damages made upon the city and county pursuant to section 7.03 of this charter or the general law of the State of California.

Claim investigation functions of the police department in existence on June 4, 1986, shall continue as an adjunct to the bureau established under this section. Claims functions of the public utilities commission shall remain under that commission unless transferred to the bureau of claims investigation and administration by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the bureau shall also have the power to investigate events and occurrences giving rise to potential civil liability against the city and county and adjust and settle demands, within dollar limits to be established by ordinance, prior to their presentation as claims. There shall be established by ordinance a revolving fund to satisfy such demands adjusted prior to their presentation as claims. The bureau shall be responsible for the investigation of all claims and the analysis of city policies and practices upon which the bureau shall report and advise the several departments.

The city attorney shall appoint a chief of the bureau who shall serve at his or her pleasure. The chief of the bureau may appoint, subject to confirmation by the city attorney, investigators who shall serve at the pleasure of the chief; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status at the position of civil claims investigator or any equivalent classification on the date of approval of this amendment by the electorate shall continue to have civil service status to said position under the civil service provisions of this charter.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by horizontal strikethrough.

7.100 Materials, Supplies and Equipment

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreements for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of an unusual character or to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may be made at the discretion of the department head in charge thereof and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract. All purchases in excess of one thousand dollars ($1,000) shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head the purchase of any emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases and a permanent record of all such quotations shall be kept. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000); fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) for materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000); fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of materials, supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two or more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specification of the article requisitioned and may advertise for
bids is the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends for the purchase the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall direct the rejection of all articles which may be below standards, specifications or samples furnished. He shall not approve any bill or voucher for articles not in conformity with specifications, or which are at variance with any contract.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall also have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for and in use in all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed to be due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.

7.103 Requisition, Contract and Payment

All purchase orders and contracts shall be based on written requisitions, or, for materials, or supplies in common use in the various departments, on the purchaser's records of average use by all departments. Purchase orders and contracts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000); fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) must be approved by the chief administrative officer for amounts in excess of the lowest or best bid, and the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall approve all bids and vouchers for materials, supplies, equipment, and contractual services before the controller shall draw and approve warrants therefor. All contracts for the purchase of materials, supplies and equipment shall be made after inviting sealed bids by publication. All sealed bids received shall be kept on file. When an award of contract is made, notice that the same has been made shall be given by one publication, and any interested person may examine the bids and records at the purchaser's office.

The purchaser of supplies shall by rules and regulations, approved by the chief administrative officer and the controller, designate and authorize appropriate personnel within the purchasing department to exercise the purchaser's signature powers for purchase orders and contracts, as provided in this charter.

7.200 Public Works and Purchasing Contracts

The construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements, and the purchase of supplies, materials and equipment, when the expenditure involved in each case shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000); fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), shall be done by contract, except as otherwise provided by this charter. It shall constitute official misconduct to split or divide any public work or improvement or purchase into two or more units for the purpose of evading the contract provisions of this section. In an emergency, provided an actual emergency be declared by the board of supervisors to exist, and when authorized by resolution of said board, any public work or improvement may be executed in the most expedient manner. Notwithstanding any other provision in this section or this charter contained, upon the approval of the chief administrative officer declaring the work to be emergency in character, there may be expended by the department of public works the sum not to exceed five hundred dollars ($500) for new construction of any type in or upon unimproved or improved land not under the jurisdiction, or the signature of the department head and the approval by resolution of the board or commission concerned for departments not under the chief administrative officer.

The board of supervisors, by ordinance, shall establish a procedure whereby appropriate city and county departments may file sealed bids for the execution of any work to be performed under contract. If such bid is the lowest, the contract shall be awarded to the department. Acceptance of bids shall be kept of all direct and indirect charges incurred by the department under any such contract, which unit costs shall be reported to and audited by the controller monthly and on the completion of the work.

In any case where the lowest or unit cost bid is not accepted, and a contract is entered into with another bidder, written report shall be made to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the controller by the officer authorized to execute the contract, with the reasons for failure to accept such lowest bid.

If any provision of this section is in conflict with any provision of section 7.100 of the charter, the provision contained in section 7.100 shall govern and control.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.

7.201 Public Works Contract Procedure by Ordinance

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter and, in particular, the provisions of section 7.200, the board of supervisors shall by ordinance determine the monetary limits not to exceed $50,000 fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), within which the construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements may be done by contract or by written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county, consistent, save as to monetary limits, with the manner provided for in section 7.200 and section 7.100.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.

POLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D, Continued from page 25

point two commissioners to terms of one year each, one commissioner to a term of two years, one commissioner to a term of three years and one commissioner to a term of four years. Thereafter, the terms of the commissioners shall be for four years from the commencement thereof. Not less than one-fourth of the commissioners shall have prior experience representing labor and one member shall have prior experience representing management.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of one hundred dollars ($100).

—Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of considering and adopting examination questions shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission, after the regular daily working hours of the commission, not later than 5 p.m. Such person or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

In accordance with section 3.50, the commission shall have the power and it shall be its duty to appoint an executive assistant to be the administrative head of the affairs under its control who shall serve at its pleasure; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of assistant secretary to the civil service commission on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to have civil service status in the position of executive assistant under the civil service provisions of this charter.

3.66 General Powers and Duties

The civil service department shall be the employment and personnel department of the city and county and shall determine appointments on the basis of merit and fitness, as shown by appropriate tests.

The commission shall classify, and from time to time may reclassify, in accordance with duties and responsibilities of the employment and training and experience—required, all—places of employment in the departments and offices of the city and county; and shall determine positions of the civil service provisions of this charter, but which, by the provisions of section 8.40, thereof, are subject to classification for salary standardization purposes on the basis of duties and responsibilities of the employment and training and experience—required. The civil service commissioner shall be the judge of such classification.

The commission shall also, in accordance with duties and responsibilities, allocate, and from time to time may re-allocate, the positions to the various classes of the classification. The allocation or re- allocation of a position shall not adversely affect the civil service rights of an occupant regularly holding such position; No person shall hold a position outside of the classification to which he has been appointed; provided that every employee of any department or office shall discharge any of the duties pertaining to such department or office to which his chief may temporarily assign him.

The classification and class names assigned to positions by the commission shall be used in all records, reports, statements and communications, including the compensation schedule, annual budget and salary ordinance, payroll, and appropriation ordinances.

The commission shall adopt rules to carry out the civil service provisions of this charter and, except as otherwise provided in this charter, such rules shall govern applications; examinations; eligibility; duration of eligible lists; certification of eligibles; appointments; promotions; Commission may resignations; lay-offs or reduction in force, both permanent and temporary, due to lack of work or funds, retraining, or completion of work; the filling of positions; temporary, seasonal, and permanent; classification; approval of payroll; and orientation of persons not in conflict with this charter. The commission may, upon one week's notice, make changes in the rules, which change shall thereupon be printed, and be in force provided that no such changes in rules shall affect a person already on the list, and the commission shall upon one week's notice, make changes in the rules, which change shall thereupon be printed, and be in force provided that no such changes in rules shall affect a person already on the list. The secretary may certify eligibles and payrolls and conduct examinations under the rules of the commission.

The commission shall have power to institute and prosecute civil actions for violations of any of the civil service provisions of this charter.

(b) The civil service commission shall establish an inspection service for the purpose of investigating the conduct of and action of appointees in all positions and of securing records of service for promotion and other purposes. All departments shall cooperate with the commission in making its investigations and any person hindering the commission or its agents shall be subject to suspension.

(c) Newthorities shall be added; or other provisions of this Charter; the civil service commission shall by rule establish procedures to review and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of race; religion; sex; origin; ethnic identity; age; physical handicap; political affiliation; sexual orientation; ancestry; marital status; color; medical condition or other non-merit factors. The determination reached under civil service commission procedures shall be final and shall forthwith be enforced by every employee and officer.

3.661 General Powers and Duties

(a) The civil service commission shall have the power to inquire into the operation of the personnel system of the city and county to ensure compliance with the provisions set forth in section 8.310. After such inquiry, the commission may recommend to the personnel director as established pursuant to section 3.653, the mayor or to any other officer of the city and county such action as the commission believes necessary to carry out the civil service provisions of this charter. In any hearing conducted by the civil service commission or by any hearing officer it appoints, the commission or the hearing officer shall have the power to subpoena persons and require the attendance of witnesses and the production of records as provided in section 3.701. 

(b) The civil service commission may require periodic reports from the personnel director in a manner and form which it shall prescribe.

(c) The civil service commission may hear appeals from an action of the personnel director with respect to:

1. Allegations of discrimination. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the civil service commission regarding allegations of discrimination shall forthwith be enforced by every officer and employee;

2. Allegations of fraud;

3. Allegations of conflict of interest, pursuant to section 8.315.

(d) No action by the personnel director which is the subject of any appeal shall be stayed during the appeal process except by the unanimous vote of the civil service commission.

(e) The commission shall be notified of the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal of personnel regulations and may comment on such proposals. The adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing fraud or allegations of discrimination shall be subject to ratification by the commission. In addition, the adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfers, resignations and terminations shall be subject to ratification by the commission.

The commission shall ratify or reject any such regulation within 60 days of receipt. The commission's failure to act shall be deemed approval.

3.662 Department of Personnel Administration

There is hereby established a department of personnel administration which shall consist of a personnel director and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the civil service commission and whose job function is placed under the department of personnel administration shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job function had not, by amendment to this charter, been placed under the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration.

The personnel department of personnel administration shall be the personnel department of the city and county and shall provide a means to recruit, select, certify, appoint, train, evaluate, promote career development, classify positions, administer salaries, administer employee discipline, discharge and other related personnel activities in order to maintain an effective and responsive work force.

3.663 Personnel Director

(a) A personnel director shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the mayor; provided, however, that the personnel director shall be selected from candidates nominated by any civil service commissioner and confirmed by vote of the board of supervisors. The nominee of the mayor may be an acting personnel director pending confirmation. The personnel director shall be appointed, before taking office, make oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointment to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of personnel director in the spirit of this declaration."

(b) The personnel director shall conduct appropriate examinations for employment, establish eligible lists based on their results and provide for certification of eligibles. The action of the personnel director on examination matters including, 73
but not limited to, announcements, minimum qualifications, classes of applicants, components, construction, weighting, content, type, list length, duration and certification shall be final.

(c) The personnel director shall adopt personal regulations which, except as otherwise provided in this charter, shall govern both the administrative matters within the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration and the exercise of the authority granted in this section, including, but not limited to, recruitment; applications; examinations of eligibles; permanent, temporary and provisional appointments; regular performance evaluations; promotions; transfers; resignations; layoffs or reduction in force due to lack of work or lack of funds, reorganization, reassignment, or completion of work; and certification of eligibles. Such personal regulations shall be adopted, amended or repealed without a prior public hearing upon at least two weeks public notice by the personnel director and after meet and confer sessions with recognized employee organizations as required by state law. All civil service commission rules relevant to the foregoing shall govern the personal regulations adopted by the personnel director.

(d) The personnel director shall conduct the salary surveys for the civil service commission as set forth elsewhere in this charter.

(e) The personnel director by personal regulation shall establish procedures to review and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. Notwithstanding other provisions of this charter except as fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the personnel director shall forthwith be enforced by every employee and officer unless the decision is appealed to the civil service commission in accordance with personnel regulations.

(f) The personnel director shall investigate all employee complaints concerning job related conduct of City and County employees and shall promptly report to the source of the complaint.

(g) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall promote effective and efficient management through personnel programs that ensure high productivity and exemplary performance.

(h) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall provide a procedure for resolution of employee disputes which shall be consistent with other provisions of this charter and shall be utilized by all department heads and appointing officers upon the expiration of the existing term of any otherwise binding agreement.

(i) Compliant with the foregoing and other applicable provisions of this charter, the personnel director shall delegate to the various appointing officers appropriate personnel responsibilities, including but not limited to appropriate disciplinary procedures, and consult with appointing officers with respect to personnel regulations affecting their operations.

(j) Personal services contracts shall be reviewed and approved by the personnel director in accordance with the provisions of appropriate personnel regulations. Personal services contracts reasonably expected to involve payment by the city of more than twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000) shall also be reviewed and approved by the Commission. Failure of the Commission to act within thirty days of submission of the contract by the personnel director shall be deemed to constitute approval by the commission.

(b) The personnel director shall establish a system of job classification. The provisions of section 8.220 shall govern whenever new classifications are created or existing positions are reclassified. The personnel director shall be the judge of such classification determinations.

(d) From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the department of personnel administration shall determine whether a position within a classification is, "in character", temporary or permanent. Appointments may be made on a permanent, temporary or, where confirmation is required, a provisional basis.

(e) Except as specifically provided for in section 8.327, the Civil Service Commission shall provide for examinations on an entrance, promotional or combination entrance-promotional basis. Consideration shall be given to permanent employees in separate promotional examinations and in combination entrance-promotional examinations which are compared with entrance-examinations for City and County-service when the passing mark has been attained and may include evaluation of work performance and other credits. When an examination announcement is issued for a class on both a promotional and entrance basis, there shall be listed instead of result listing of eligibles at large, exhaustive examinations on the same terms and conditions as a person holding a permanent appointment to a position in that same classification, subject to a demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the civil service commission.

(f) The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to promotional examinations announced after its effective date.

—8.328—Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave

Employees under permanent civil service appointment who, because of absence on duly authorized military leave after June 27, 1950, did not participate in a promotional examination held after June 27, 1950, and during time of war as defined in section 8.324 of this charter, and in which examination the employee would have been otherwise eligible to compete had the war not intervened; and whose examination, in the discretion of the department which appointed the employee, is hereinafter referred to as the original promotional examination, was not otherwise computed in the identification sheets of eligibles that have been opened; further changes in the rating key shall not be made.

—8.323—Protest of Tentative List of Eligibles—

Following the completion of any examination, a tentative list of eligibles shall be posted for inspection of the public and of participants. The posting period shall be for a minimum of three (3) working days for the entrance-examinations of five (5) working days for promotional or combined entrance and promotional examinations. During this period a fee of $2.00 for the inspection of the paper of each eligible shall be charged by the civil service commission; the amount of such fee shall be established by ordinance of the board of supervisors. The fee shall be paid for eligibles who wish to inspect their own papers. Inpection of papers shall include all documents supporting the eligibles' rank and score except neither the identity of the examiner giving any mark or grade in an oral examination nor the questions and answers on any continuous or standard entrance or examination, or the rank and score of the participants in the examination may be reviewed. The questions used in the examination, if no protests are received during the posting period--the eligible is automatically adopted. If protests are received during the posting period the investigation and action of the general manager; personnel, shall be expedited so that final adoption of the eligible list is not delayed beyond sixty (60) days after the date of posting. Eligibles who, as a result of their ranking, would receive a notice of appointment regardless of the outcome of the protest (s) may be offered employment from adopted lists pending the resolution of any protests and amendment to the adopted eligible list.

—8.326—Promotions in Geographic Areas—

Except as specifically provided for in section 8.327, the Civil Service Commission shall provide for examinations on an entrance, promotional or combination entrance-promotional basis. Consideration shall be given to permanent employees in separate promotional examinations and in combination entrance-promotional examinations which are compared with entrance-examinations for City and County-service when the passing mark has been attained and may include evaluation of work performance and other credits. When an examination announcement is issued for a class on both a promotional and entrance basis, there shall be listed instead of result listing of eligibles at large, exhaustive examinations on the same terms and conditions as a person holding a permanent appointment to a position in that same classification, subject to a demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the civil service commission. The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to promotional examinations announced after its effective date.
more than the minimum passing mark established by
the civil service commission for inclusion on the list of eligibles resulting from the original promotional examination, his name shall thereupon be entered on the eligible list resulting from the original promo-
tional examination in accordance with the relative ex-
cellence obtained by all and in the order of preference on the
original and similar promotional examinations.
Such employees shall be eligible for appointment from such list of eligibles in accordance with civil service rules to any vacancy therein occurring, and subject to satisfactory completion of a probationary period as provided in section 8.340 of this charter for a period of four years from the date on which their names is entered on the eligible list and before eligibles procuring standing through examinations held subse-
quent to the original promotional examination.

If it is determined by the civil service commission that the name of such person would have been reached for permanent appointment from the list of eligibles established as a result of the original promotional exam-
mination during his term of military service, the name of such person appeared thereon, then such em-
ployee, upon appointment to a permanent position as herein provided, shall be granted seniority in such appointment from the date his name would have been reached had his name appeared thereon, but such seniority shall be used only for the purpose of deter-
miming salary, increments and calculating city and county service credits in other promotional examina-
tions held subsequent to the similar promotional exam-
ination, subject to the seniority list of such employee and all other provisions relating to seniority of service shall date from the date of ap-
pointment as a result of qualifying in the similar promotional examination as herein authorized.

Such employees who qualify for appointment as a result of a similar promotional examination as herein provided, and who are appointed to permanent positions, as herein provided, shall be permitted to partici-
pate in other promotional examinations for which they are otherwise eligible, while serving under probationary appointment in the position to which they were appointed as a result of the similar promotional examina-
tion, provided that certification from lists of eligibles established from such other examinations shall not be made until the employee has satisfactorily completed the aforesaid probationary appointment.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules to govern the administration of similar promotional examina-
tions herein authorized, and appointments and other proceedings therefore.

8.329 Certification of Eligibles; Rule of Three

When a position is controlled by the civil service provisions of this charter is to be filled, the appoint-
in officer shall make a requisition to the civil service commission for a person to fill it. Thereupon, the commission shall certify to the appointing officer the names and addresses of the three persons standing highest on the list of eligibles for such position. In case the position is promotive, the commission shall certify the names of the three persons standing highest on such list. If there are fewer than three names on the list from which certification is to be made, there shall be certified the number thereon. The appointing officer shall fill the position by the appointment of one of the persons certified. The provisions of this section as herein amended at the election of November 2, 1976, shall be applicable only to lists of eligibles finally adopted by the civil service commission pursuant to the provisions of section 8.328. The provisions of this section shall not affect the efficacy of or be amendable by this amendment. In making such certification, sex shall be disregarded except when a statute, a rule of the commission or the appointing officer specifies sex.

From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the commission shall determine whether the position is of character, temporary, seasonal or permanent; and shall notify the candidate in accordance therewith to the end that the candidate may have knowledge of the probable duration of employment. The commission shall provide for such waiver of temporary or seasonal employment as it may deem just to candidates.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this or any other provision of this charter, an employee who has been certified from a regularly adopted eligible list to a non-permanent position in a civil service classification shall be entitled to appointment to a permanent position within that same classification before the expiration of the probationary period, the names and addresses of persons standing higher on the list of eligibles who are not then current employees, subject to a demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the com-
mision. The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to requisitions for permanent positions filled from and after January 1, 1980.

8.330 Duration of Lists of Eligibles

The civil service commission may remove all names from the list of eligibles after they have remained thereon for more than two years and all names from the list of eligibles after the expiration of four years. The commission may, however, provide, in the examination announcement that the list of eligibles secured thereby shall automatically expire at a date not less than two or more than four years after the adoption of such list.

8.331 Limited Tenure Appointments

When in time of war declared by the Congress of the United States eligibles are not available for ap-
pointments from regular lists established through the regular examination procedure as provided in sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof, the civil service commission may qualify applicants for wartime appointments to positions through informal and non-competitive tests. Such tests and appoint-
ments resulting therefrom shall be governed solely by the provisions of this section and by rule of the civil service commission adopted pursuant hereto and the tests shall be adequate in the judgment of the civil ser-
vice commission to determine the capacity of appli-
cants to perform the duties of the positions to be filled, including eligibility through the regular examination procedure as provided in sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof. Eligibles made under the provisions of this section shall be designated limited tenure appointments and may continue only until registers of eligibles are established through the regular examination procedure as provided in sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof. Appointments made under the provisions of this section shall be designated limited tenure appointments and may continue only until registers of eligibles are established through the regular examination procedure as provided in sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof but in no event to exceed six months beyond the cessation of hostilities. Limited tenure appoint-
ments may be terminated by the appointing officer at any time for lack of work or funds. Limited tenure appoint-
ments may be terminated by the appointing officer for good cause at any time with the approval of the civil service commission without reference to the procedures governing removals set forth in section 8.342 hereof. Persons serving under limited tenure appointments in this section provided shall by reason of such service acquire no right or preference to permanent civil service status as defined elsewhere in this charter or by rule of the civil service commission which is conferred on persons completing probationary appointments made from lists of eligibles established through the regular examination procedure as provided in sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 of this charter. Service after January 1, 1951 under lim-
ited tenure appointment; by platform employees of the municipal railway, shall not be included in the cal-
culation of service of such employees for the purpose of determining assignments of runs when such ass-
eignments are made on the basis of seniority of service.

Non-civil service appointments in the absence of civil service eligibles as provided in sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 of this charter shall not be authorized if applicants qualified for limited tenure appointments made under the provisions of this section shall make every effort consistent with current conditions to maintain adequate registers of eligibles established through the regular examination procedure provided in sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules to carry out the provisions of this section and to govern the administration of limited tenure appointments.

In time of national emergency declared by the President of the United States or by the Congress or by any act authorizing compulsory military service, in effect, the provisions of this sec-
tion may also be made operative upon recommendation of the civil service commission and approval of the board of supervisors by ordinance enacted by a two-thirds vote of the board. Authority for limited tenure appointments, if established pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph, shall cease six months after expiration of the period of time authorized by the ordinance which authorized such appointments.

8.332 Temporary and Emergency Appointments

When no list of eligibles exists or no eligible is available on an existing list for a position in the class re-
quisitioned by the appointing officer, and immedi-
ate service in the position is required by the appoint-
ing officer and another list exists which is deemed by the civil service commission to be suitable to provide temporarily the service desired, the commission shall certify for civil service temporary appointment an eligible from such list; if no such other list deemed by the commission to be suitable exists, the commis-
sion in its discretion may authorize the appoint-
ning officer to make a non-civil service or permanent appointment thereto for a period not exceeding one hundred and thirty working days. Non-civil service or emergency appointments extended beyond ninety days must be approved by the civil service commis-
sion. Such non-civil service or emergency appoint-
ment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such one hundred and thirty working days at the time a civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in section 8.329 of this charter.

If a list of eligibles exists for the position requisitioned, a non-immediate need for service is deemed necessary by the appointing officer pending the time a civil service eligible from such list is certified and reports for duty as provided in section 8.329 of the charter, the commis-
sion may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or permanent appointment thereto for a period not exceeding thirty working days. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, how-
ever, shall cease prior to the expiration of such thirty-
working days-at the time a civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in section 8.329 of this charter.

Person shall be compensated under any non-
civil service or emergency appointment appoint-
ments as authorized under the provisions of the fore-
gowing paragraphs of this section for a period exceeding one hundred and thirty working days in any fiscal or calendar year, and no claim or warrant there-
for shall be approved, allowed or paid for any com-
pany in excess of the equal amount of thirty-
working days in any fiscal or calendar year.

No eligibles are available for appointment to a permanent position in the class requested by the ap-
pointing officer-the commission shall immediately hold an examination and establish an eligible list for such class. If its staff is not sufficient to meet the cost of said examination, it shall report to the mayor the estimated cost thereof, and the
8.340 Dismissal During Probation Period

Any person appointed to a permanent position shall serve a probationary period. The civil service commission personnel director shall by rule establish a probationary period of not less than six months' service and may establish a maximum of twelve months' service for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed rank of the police department, fire department, sheriff's department and San Francisco International Airport police force shall be for twelve months except that, with respect to members of the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve months' service from the day following completion of the prescribed department field training officer program, but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment; provided further that probationary members of the uniformed ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in section 8.343 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four months may be established for executive and management classifications. At any time during the probationary period the appointing officer may terminate the appointment of the individual having written notice of such termination to the employee, and to the civil-service commission specifying the reasons for such termination. Except in the case of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments the civil service commission shall review the termination. The civil service commission shall by rule establish the procedure for terminations. If the termination resulted from an entrance examination the commission may declare such person dismissed or may return the name to the list of eligibles under such conditions for further appointment as the commission may deem just; if the appointment resulted from a promotional examination the employee shall have the right of appeal and hearing before the civil service commission. The commission shall render a decision within thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person dismissed; or (b) order such person reinstated to the position without prejudice; and the commission may in its discretion order that the employee be paid salary from time of entrance examination or appointment or reappointment return of such person to a position in the classification from which that person was promoted and may reestablish the employee's eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same promotion classification under such conditions as the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall be final. Immediately prior to the expiration of the probationary period the probationary appointment officer shall report to the civil service commission as to the competence of the probationer for the position; and if competent, shall recommend permanent appointment. Nothing in this section shall preclude the civil service commission from reviewing terminations for the purpose of future employability including terminations in the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments.

8.407 Definition of Generally Prevailing Rates of Wages

Notwithstanding any provision of section 8.401 or any provision of any other section of this charter to the contrary, generally prevailing rates of salaries and wages shall be determined by section 8.401 of the charter shall be determined by the civil service commission as set forth below.

The civil service commission personnel director shall conduct a comprehensive investigation and survey of basic pay rates and wages and salaries in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment for like work and like service, based upon job classifications as provided in section 3.661 and 3.662 of this charter and shall make its findings, based on facts and data collected, as to what are the generally prevailing basic pay rates for each benchmark class of employment solely in the manner hereinafter provided. A benchmark class is defined as a "key class" within an occupational grouping selected as the class for which a representative sample of data will be collected.

Basic pay rate data for public and private employment shall be collected solely from the Bay Area counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, San Francisco and Santa Clara; provided, however, that for any benchmark class of employment for which the civil service commission personnel director determines there is insufficient data from Bay Area public jurisdictions the commission personnel director shall survey major public agencies in the state employing such class, major public agencies to be defined as employing more than 3,000 persons.

The commission personnel director shall collect basic pay rate data for like work and like service from Bay Area public jurisdictions as follows:

(a) The counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara.

(b) The ten most populous cities in these five Bay Area counties based on the latest federal decennial census.

(c) Agencies of the state and federal governments and from school districts and other special districts in the six Bay Area counties as determined by the civil service commission personnel director.

The commission personnel director shall collect private basic pay rate data from recognized governmental Bay Area salary and wage surveys of private employers in the city and county of San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. The data collected shall be limited to basic rates of pay and salaries actually being paid by public and private employers for like work and like service.

The term "prevailing rates of wages" for employers governed by charter section 8.401 and this section shall be defined as the rate ranges developed from the weighted average of the midpoint of the basic pay rate ranges covered by surveyed public employment and the median of the pay rates for private employment to be determined as follows:

1. Multiply the medians from the public and the midpoints from public employment data base by the number of employees in the given classification from each data base;
2. Add the products of (1);
3. Divide the sums in (2) by the total number of employees surveyed for that classification; and
4. Extend this figure by 10% to establish the maximum of the range and reduce this figure by 10% to establish the minimum.

When fixing rates of compensation the board of supervisors shall fix basic pay rates as close as reasonably possible to prevailing rates, provided, however, that the board of supervisors shall not set the maximum rate of pay for any class in excess of the maximum prevailing rate for that class; provided further, however, that no employee shall have his basic pay rate reduced to conform to prevailing rates except as provided for in section 8.406. For those classifications of employment in which the practice is customary, the schedules of compensation shall provide for minima, not less than three intermediate, and maximum salary steps and for a method of advancing the salaries of employees to intermediate to maximum with due regard for seniority of service.

The term "basic pay rate" as used in this section is hereby defined as applying only to the basic rate of wages, with included range scales, and does not include any other benefits of employment or working condition benefits.

It is the declared intent of the qualified electors of the city and county that neither the board of supervisors nor the mayor have the authority to provide any benefits of employment except those enumerated already provided for in the charter and any addition, deletion or modification of benefits of employment enumerated in the charter shall be submitted, as a charter amendment, to the qualified electors of the city and county. The qualified electors of the city and county shall have the power to grant or deny such benefits except in those conditions of employment commonly referred to as "working conditions". Any reference to "working conditions" shall mean those compensations which must necessarily be provided in order for the employee to perform his job description duties efficiently and safely, and shall include but not be limited to such working conditions and benefits as are typically included in the administrative provisions of the salary standardization ordinance and the salary ordinance.

Executive compensation paid at the discretion of the mayor or, at his or her discretion, may provide working condition benefits for employees covered under this section and section 8.401 of this charter only in accordance with the following provisions:

(a) The civil service commission personnel director must determine, certify and recommend to the board of supervisors whether or not the working condition benefit is equitable or necessary for the efficient and safe performance of the employee's duties as enumerated in his job description.

(b) The working condition benefit, as recommended by the civil service commission personnel director, is substantially comparable for like work and like service to that provided for the job classification and is provided to not less than 50 percent of the employees of the class in the jurisdiction covered by the salary survey.

9.108 Initiative, Referendum, and Recall

(a) The registered voters shall have power to propose by petition, and to adopt or to reject at the polls, any ordinance, act or other measure which is within the power conferred upon the board of supervisors to legislate in any legislative manner, or which is within the power conferred upon any other board, commission or officer to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinance, act, charter amendment or other measure may be so proposed by filing with the registrar a petition setting forth said measure in full, signed by registered voters of the city and county as many in number as the percentages hereinafter required of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor cast at the last preceding regular municipal election.

Any declaration of policy may be submitted to the electors in the manner provided for the submission of ordinances; and when approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting on said declaration, it shall become the duty of the city council to enact an ordinance or ordinances to carry such policies or principles into effect, subject to the referendum provisions of this charter.

Any ordinance which the supervisors are empowered to pass may be submitted to the electors by a majority of the board at a general election or at a special election called for the purpose, said election to be held not less than thirty days from the date of the call. Any such ordinance may be proposed by one-third of the supervisors, or by the mayor, and when so proposed shall be submitted to the electors at the next succeeding general election. No ordinance passed by the supervisors granting any public utility franchise
or privilege, shall go into effect until the expiration of sixty days from the date it becomes final. At the end of such sixty days such ordinance shall be in force and effect, unless within such period there shall be filed with the registrar a petition signed by registered voters equal in number to five percent of the entire vote cast for mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election, requesting that such ordinance be submitted to the electors. In case such petition is filed, such ordinance shall not go into effect until approved by a majority of the voters voting thereon at a general or special election.

If, before the time any other ordinance involving legislative matters becomes effective, there shall be filed with the board of supervisors a petition signed by qualified electors of the city and county equal in number to at least ten per centum of the entire vote cast for all candidates for mayor at the last preceding general municipal election at which a mayor was elected, protesting against the passage of such ordinance the same shall be suspended from going into effect, and it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to reconsider such ordinance, and if the same be not entirely repealed, said board shall submit the ordinance to the vote of said electors either at the next general municipal election or at a special election to be held for that purpose, and such ordinance shall not go into effect or become operative unless and until a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon vote in favor thereof. The provisions of section 9,109 and 9,110 of the charter shall apply to and govern the verification and certification of such petition.

Annual budget and appropriation ordinances, supplemental appropriation ordinances, the annual salary ordinance, or ordinances amending the same, the ordnance levying taxes, any ordinance appropriating money from the emergency reserve fund, ordinances authorizing the city attorney to compromise litigation, and ordinances necessary to enable the mayor to carry out any of the powers vested in him in the case of public emergency as defined in section 3,100 of the charter, ordinances enacted pursuant to section 8,410 of the charter, as well as ordinances relative to purely administrative matters, shall not be subject to referendum.

Any elective official, the chief administrative officer, the controller or any member of the board of education or public utilities commission may be recalled by the electors. The procedure to effect such recall shall be as follows: A petition demanding the recall from office of the person sought to be recalled shall be filed with the registrar. Said petition shall contain a statement of the grounds on which the recall is sought. Any insufficiency of form or substance in such statement shall in no way affect the validity of the election and proceedings held thereunder. No recall petition shall be filed against any officer until he has held his office for at least six months.

(b) In the event the representative of the board of supervisors, mayor and the representatives of recognized employee organizations do not reach an agreement through the meet-and-confer process on matters contained in the annual salary standardization ordinance by March 15 of any year, the mayor shall recommend and the board shall either approve or reject a schedule of compensation which reflects current prevailing rates for the classifications covered by Section 4,01 of this Charter the last good faith offer presented by the mayor or his or her representative.

In any year when an agreement on matters contained in the salary standardization ordinance has not been achieved, the elected membership of the personnel director, upon receipt of a written demand from a recognized employee organization made upon the mayor and the personnel director shall prepare, prior to April 1, a schedule of compensation and administrative provisions which reflect additional rates that would be payable, and working conditions, based upon the last demand made by the recognized employee organization(s) which participated in the meet-and-confer process.

Said schedule shall be transmitted to the registrar of voters for submission to the electors of the city and county at a general election or a special election called for that purpose, and said special election shall be held no less than sixty (60) days from the date of the call. No such schedule shall be withdrawn after it has been received by the registrar of voters. At said election, the ballot shall contain the following two alternatives:

(1) Approval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

(2) Disapproval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

If a majority of the valid votes cast in the election favor paying the additional rates set forth in the schedule of compensation based upon the last demands of the recognized employee organizations which engaged in the meet-and-confer process, it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to amend the salary standardization ordinance to reflect said increased continued on page 78
rates and the same shall be in lieu of said annual compensa-
tion, and notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, said rates shall become effective and be payable as if adopted prior to April 1, of any year.

The provisions of sections 3.100 and 3.100-1, relating to the emergency powers of the mayor, shall not be applicable to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

11.05 Effective Date of Amendments
The effective date of the amendments, additions

and deletions to the civil service provisions of the charter shall be ninety (90) days after the acceptance and filing thereof with the Secretary of State.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION G

We the people of San Francisco declare this to be our

pointing to the company's complicity with Apartheid, according to the following criteria:

1) IT IS IMPROPER TO PROFIT FROM OR PROVIDE SUPPORT TO THE RACIST POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SYSTEM IN SOUTH AFRICA, KNOWN AS APARTHEID.

Therefore it is necessary to sever commercial ties to South Africa, until people of all races obtain equal rights in that country, including equal voting rights.

2) COMPANIES HAVING SUBSTANTIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH APARTHEID MUST BE CONSIDERED IRRESPONSIBLE.

(a) The Board of Supervisors must determine which companies doing or seeking business with the City have the greatest ties to Apartheid. Companies that have a significant involvement in profiting from or maintaining the Apartheid system, may, on that basis, be deemed "irresponsible bidders."

In purchasing goods and services and awarding other contracts, the city must give priority to avoiding such companies; the degree of the preference must be

in proportion to the company's complicity with Apartheid, according to the following criteria:

— how much the company profits from that business;

— how much support the company provides the Apartheid government in taxes, loans, payments or other funding;

— the nature of the company's South Africa business;

— the degree of the company's cooperation with South African political censorship or secrecy agreements;

— the degree to which the company supports the South African government with the technology, materials and other means to maintain and enforce Apartheid.

(b) City funds must not be deposited or invested with any bank or other company which does business in or with, or makes loans to, South Africa.

(c) If any exception to the above policies is found to be necessary or appropriate, the responsible official must promptly and publicly report it to the Board of Supervisors, clearly describing the exception and the reasons for it.

The term "city" includes all agencies, departments, officials, employees, units and subunits of the city and county of San Francisco, and all funds administered by or on behalf of the city or county.

3) WE CALL ON ALL OTHER PUBLIC BODIES AND PRIVATE OR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS TO ADOPT SIMILAR POLICIES.

4) WE CALL A GENERAL PUBLIC BOYCOTT, FOCUSING ON THOSE COMPANIES HAVING THE GREATEST TIES TO APARTHEID.

The Board of Supervisors must determine and announce which company or companies are the worst offenders within each major industry, so that the public can focus its boycott on those companies.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION H

SUMMARY: THIS INITIATIVE STATES THAT THE AIDS EPIDEMIC IS MAJOR PUBLIC HEALTH PROBLEM OF CONCERN TO EVERYONE, REQUIRING INCREASED SUPPORT FOR RELATED MEDICAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION. IT CALLS FOR A COUNCIL FOR AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION OR SIMILAR UNITED EFFORT TO STOP AIDS.

We the people of San Francisco hereby adopt the following policy:

The AIDS epidemic has rapidly become a major public health problem, costly both in human lives and in general community resources;

— the first steps in dealing with such a crisis are:

— the scientific research needed to discover and understand the nature, causes, co-factors, prevention, diagnosis and treatment of the disease, and

— the education of the public about the lessons of that research;

A proper program of research and education pays for itself in the long run;

PROMPT action is urgent, because of the rapidly growing number of persons affected, increasing not only the suffering but also the difficulty of eradicating the disease;

The leadership and support of such an effort is everyone's responsibility;

While San Francisco's role in the overall effort against AIDS has been viewed as a positive example to other areas, the continued rapid increase in the spread of the disease means that we cannot afford to rest on our laurels or leave further responsibility to others.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

We call on all appropriate government bodies as well as medical, professional, charitable and community organizations and concerned individuals to join together in an all-out effort to stop AIDS;

We call for support to an organized united effort along the lines of an AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION COUNCIL, including, in some form:

— A COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, to provide informed evaluations as to priorities among research projects and proposals, recommending those which are most cost-effective and most likely to produce early results useful in the prevention or treatment of the disease, to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts or neglect of promising approaches, and to provide the council with complete and up-to-date information regarding comparative results of experimental treatments, prevention programs and other existing research;

— A COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, to inform the public regarding prevention and other research findings, and to inform relevant government officials and the general public, concerning the factual basis for a re-ordering of current public funding priorities toward an increased war against disease, including research and education against AIDS and related conditions;

— A FUND-RAISING COMMITTEE, to solicit donations, lobby for grants, organize benefits and other fund-raising projects spreading the financial burden by appealing to many sources;

We ask the council and committees to be responsive and accessible to public input, to include representation of all interested groups, to consider all viewpoints and to be capable of prompt action;

We ask appropriate city officials to determine whether a suitable form of such a council already exists; if it does, we wish the city to support it actively; if not, we wish the city to seek to encourage its formation by such means as may appear proper.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION I

SUMMARY: This initiative asks "Shall we tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?" The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated portion of Route 480 known as the Embarcadero Freeway. This initiative declaration of policy will give the voters the opportunity to establish the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco regarding the proposed teardown of the Embarcadero Freeway.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION J

Shall the City replace a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if such replacement would open up the Waterfront to its citizens, improve the tax base, and create a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic?
Candidates

FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER
JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco
My age is 42

My qualifications for office are: The Bill of Rights guarantees that every person accused of a crime shall have the effective assistance of counsel. Whether an individual is rich or poor, that person is entitled to a competent and dedicated attorney.

In San Francisco it is the duty of the Public Defender to uphold this sacred right. In every case, we provide the client with the best defense under the law.

In the last 7 years, my outstanding staff has done this work with the highest degree of professionalism. In the next 4 years, that same strong, professional, independent and ethical representation will continue.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John D. Bardin, 150i Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Yang Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative In Congress, 5th District
Manuel Caballito, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
George Christopher, 170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Diane Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Clerk
Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Artist/Community Organizer
Brian Gert, 55 22nd Ave., Attorney
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Thomas E. Horn, 550 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Mattie M. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., International Vice President, ILGWU
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for Children & Youth
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070 26th Ave., Executive Assistant to Sala Burton M.C.
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Community Health Director
Linda Ann Post, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative
Jim Rivaldo, 430 Steiner St., Political Consultant
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Member, SF Community College District
Governing Board
Yuri Wadi, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel W. Walker, 562 Campbell Ave., President — Local 250-A Transport Workers Union of America
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilkurt Ave., Minister
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor
C. R. Zanis, 1966 Pacific Ave., Auto Repair Proprietor

FOR ASSESSOR
SAM DUCa

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor

My qualifications for office are: I was elected your Assessor in 1978 and re-elected in 1982. My years in the Assessor’s Office were spent in a professional appraisal capacity personnel and administration. I have two university degrees, the coveted MAI designation, and am the recipient of a special Congressional Advisory Board award from the United States Congress. I have served in an advisory capacity, both nationally and internationally, in property tax administration and will continue to serve the taxpayers of the City and County of San Francisco in dealing with Article XIII-A of the State Constitution. My community involvement includes participation in cultural, civic business organizations.

Sam Ducca

The sponsors for Sam Ducca are:
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
Eugene L. Friend, 2900 Lake St., Investor
Nancy Pelosi, 40 Presidio Ter., Housewife and volunteer in politics
Walter H. Shorenten, 740 El Camino del Mar., Chairman, Milton Meyer & Co.
Stanley Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Emma W. Louie, 1257 Jackson St., Housewife
Alfred S. Wilsey, 2590 Jackson St., Jr. of Exec. Comm. of Diversified Holding Co.
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arthur H. Coleman, II Hinckley Walk, Physician
Gerson Bakar, 2330 Hyde St., Investor
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired
Joseph C. Orenne, Sr., 865 Faxon Ave., Publicity Dept. — S.F. Giants
James A. Scatena, 911 St. Elmo Way, Chairman of the Board, Scatena York Co.
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher
Frances May McCauley, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Recreation & Park Commissioner
Frederick F. Campagnoli, 2609 Larkin St., Attorney
Betty Brooks, 1738 26th St., Field Representative
Jess Teruel Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Businessman
Cyril J. Maguin, 994 California St., Merchant
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John H. Swanson, 145 Lake Merced Hill South, Bowling Alley Owner
Frances G. Goldman, 745 El Camino Del Mar, Child Guidance
Irina M. Bernardo, 2182 34th Ave., Housewife
Leo R. Murphy, 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Charles M. Cunningham, 475 Connecticut St., Self Employed
Lawrence V. Eppstein, 815 Fell St., Conf. Secretary
Mary M. O'Connell, 72 Mendocino Ave., Volunteer & Homemaker
Elizabeth R. Ducca, 16 Wawona St., Homemaker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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BALLOT TYPE
D401

DEMOCRATIC
17th Assembly District
3rd Senate District
5th Congressional District

PRECINCTS APPLICABLE:
4400's, 4500's,
4800's, 5700's,
5900's.

Application for Absentee Ballot
is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

Name ____________________________
Residence Address ____________________________
Mailing Address ____________________________
Signature ____________________________

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

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

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

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:
The “yes” or “no” on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.
This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter en route to the polls have not been considered.
June 3, 1986
Primary Election
Eleccion Primaria

Vote for One
請選1人
赞成 反對
Yes No
SI NO
Vote par Uno

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Voter Information Pamphlet
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PROPOSITION A
Would centralize the City’s risk management and claims investigation functions.
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PROPOSITION B
Would make technical changes in the role of the Purchaser regarding contracts.
Analysis ................................................................. 22
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Proposition C was removed from the ballot by the Board of Supervisors on April 22.

PROPOSITION D
Would re-write the civil service provisions of the City Charter.
Analysis ................................................................. 24, 25
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PROPOSITION E
Would ban development of the Balboa Reservoir site (near Ocean & Phelan Avenues) for three years.
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PROPOSITION F
Would ban “compensated advocacy” by City officials and legislators and would place a lower limit on campaign contributions.
Analysis ................................................................. 51
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Legal Text .............................................................. 77

PROPOSITION G
Would declare it to be City policy that businesses with ties to South Africa be boycotted.
Analysis ................................................................. 57
Arguments ............................................................. 58, 59

PROPOSITION H
Would declare it to be City policy that an AIDS research council be established.
Analysis ................................................................. 60
Arguments ............................................................. 61

PROPOSITION I
Would declare it to be City policy that the Embarcadero Freeway be torn down.
Analysis ................................................................. 63
Arguments ............................................................. 64, 65

PROPOSITION J
Would declare it to be City policy that a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway be torn down, subject to certain conditions.
Analysis ................................................................. 66
Arguments ............................................................. 67-70

CREDITS

The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The active members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Suzanne Guyette, Mary Ann Aronson, Mary Martin and Tom Owen.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER  
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?  
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 5, 1986.

Q—Who can register to vote?  
A—You can register to vote if you:  
• are a U.S. Citizen,  
• are at least 18 years of age on election day,  
• are a resident of California, and  
• are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?  
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?  
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?  
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, such as this one, you can only choose among the candidates of your party.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?  
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?  
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?  
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Senator, State Assemblymember, County Central Committee, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q—Where do I go to vote?  
A—Your polling place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?  
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?  
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 3, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?  
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?  
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?  
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in”. If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?  
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

Q—Can a worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?  
A—No.

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?  
A—Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?  
A—Yes. You can vote early by:  
• Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or  
• mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see enclosed card).

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

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?  
A—You must write:  
• your home address,  
• the address where you want the ballot mailed,  
• then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail by absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?  
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 3, 1986.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS CONCERNING VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:

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

Note: Si hace algun error, devuelva su tarjeta de voto y obtenga otra.

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de voto completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

A 第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 1

STEP 2

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

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

B 第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

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

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

C 第三步
請把命鐘之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入，打孔投票。

STEP 4

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

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

D 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate’s name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person’s name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the “YES” or after the word “NO”.

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO UNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfore la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfore la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfore la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra “SI” o después de la palabra “NO”.

Todas las marcas o borradoras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

選民須知:

投票卡印有您的任何您所選之候選人之姓名，或者在候選人姓名之右邊打孔。如果有兩位或以上候選人生於同一職位，請在候選人姓名之後之所有候選人中，選擇你要投票的候選人打孔，但不要超過票選之規定人數。

投票合格的非候選人，請在非候選人選票信封所提供的預定空間上寫下數候選人所屬選區及候選人之姓名。

投票任何提案，請在選票上所指之“YES”或“NO”字樣打孔。

選票上若有顯著污損或辨識不清之現象，選票作廢。

如果您在選票上打孔過了，撕破或弄破了，或損壞了，弄壞了非候選人選票信封，應把該選票立即退還選務專員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

請在下頁開始投票

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>HUGH G. BAGLEY</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRANK L. THOMAS</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EILEEN ANDERSON</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHARLES &quot;CHUCK&quot; PINEDA, JR.</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOM BRADLEY</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>LEO T. McCARTHY</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>MARCH FONG EU</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>JOHN GARAMENDI</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Senator, Businessman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senator Estatal, Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>ALISTER McALISTER</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assemblyman, 18th District, California Legislature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asambleista, Distrito 18, Legislatura de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>GRAY DAVIS</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Legislatura de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[WRITE-IN] For a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California State Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tesorero del Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[WRITE-IN] For a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney General, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procurador General, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Member, State Board of Equalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BERT DE LOTTO</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraiser/Broker/Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxador/Intermediario/Agricultor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLIS</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization, Second District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*

### United States Senator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Scientist-Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profesor-Especialista en Ciencias Politicas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES GREENE</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Senior Legislature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro, Legislatura Superior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIAN LANTZ</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultor de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN CRANSTON</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senador de Estados Unidos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT J. BANUELOS</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Technician</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Técnico de Comunicación</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*

---

**DEMOCRATIC PARTY**

**ELECCION PRIMARIA 3 DE JUNIO DE 1986**

**UNITED STATES SENATOR**
(REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國眾議員
United States Representative

ANDREW KLEIN
Consultant
Consultor

MICHAEL MOBERG
Certified Public Accountant
Contador Público Certificado

SALA BURTON
Representative in Congress 5th District
Diputada en el Congreso 井波員

(WRITE-IN): To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

ELECCIÓN PRIMARIA
3 DE JUNIO DE 1996

(SENADOR ESTATAL) 州參議員
State Senator

LOUIS J. PAPAN
Member of the Legislature
Miembro de la Legislatura

JIM GONZALEZ
Mayor's Special Assistant
Asistente Especial del Alcalde

(WRITE-IN): To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY

(PRIMARIA) 州議員
Primary Election

MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY

WILLIE L. BROWN, JR.
Legislator/Lawyer
Legislador/Abogado

(WRITE-IN): To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

Vote por Uno
Vote for One

158 →
160 →
162 →
164 →
169 →
171 →
173 →
178 →
180 →
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CATHERINE DODD</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posición del cargo 立委</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posición del cargo 立委</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNE BELISLE DALEY</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posición del cargo 立委</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RON HUBERMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posición del cargo 立委</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERENCE HALLINAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney-at-Law 律师</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESSE J. IVY</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Deputy Sherriff 警察署長</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSAN J. BIERMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posición del cargo 立委</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAR JAICKS</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posición del cargo 立委</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNETH JOHN AZBILL</td>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian Lawyer 美国印第安律师</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Service—Attorney 社区服务律师</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WADE &quot;SPEEDY&quot; WOODS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultant  导师</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONY KILROY</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhood Environmentalist 环保专家</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES LEGARE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Motor Truck Operator 司机</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLE MIGDEN</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posición del cargo 立委</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent 擴展竞选者</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LULU M. CARTER</td>
<td>Educator  教师</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>Daniel Nusbaum</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Project Advisor</td>
<td>Jeanne Baird</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>Bill Honig</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessors</td>
<td>Sam Duca</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>Jeff Brown</td>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

### 42 - VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1986
- This act provides for a bond issue of $850,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.
- **YES 236**
- **NO 237**

### 43 - COMMUNITY PARKLANDS ACT OF 1986
- This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for acquiring, developing, improving, rehabilitating, or restoring urgently needed local and regional parks, beaches, recreational areas and facilities, and historical resources.
- **YES 239**
- **NO 240**

### 44 - WATER CONSERVATION AND WATER QUALITY BOND LAW OF 1986
- This act provides for a bond issue of $150,000,000 to provide funds for water conservation, groundwater recharge and drainage water management, and clarifies language in the Clean Water Bond Law of 1984.
- **YES 242**
- **NO 243**

### 45 - DEPOSIT OF PUBLIC MONEYS IN CREDIT UNIONS
- Authorizes Legislature to provide for deposit of public moneys in any credit union. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect. Legislation already approved implementing measure could result in greater interest income to state and local governments.
- **YES 246**
- **NO 247**

### 46 - PROPERTY TAXATION
- Provides exception to property tax limit when acquisition or improvement of real property approved by two-thirds of voters. Fiscal Impact: By itself, measure has no fiscal effect. No increase can occur in local property tax rate unless bond issue is approved by two-thirds vote. State costs for tax relief programs could increase. State income tax revenues could decline as taxpayers deduct greater amounts for property tax payments.
- **YES 249**
- **NO 250**

### 47 - ALLOCATION OF VEHICLE LICENSE FEE TAXES TO COUNTIES AND CITIES
- Requires allocation of Vehicle License Fee taxes to local governments. Fiscal Impact: Measure would have no direct fiscal effect. Prevents Legislature from changing the law to take vehicle license fees away from counties and cities. Measure would not prevent state reducing other forms of aid to local governments or changing existing formula for dividing vehicle license fee revenues between counties and cities.
- **YES 254**
- **NO 255**

### 48 - LEGISLATORS' AND JUDGES' RETIREMENT SYSTEMS
- **YES 258**
- **NO 259**
**DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES**

236 SI 寿成
237 NO 反對

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1988.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $950,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en la compra de granjas y casas para los veteranos de California.

**ACTA DE TERRENO DE PARQUES DE LA COMUNIDAD DE 1986.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición, desarrollo, mejora y mantenimiento de parques, playas, áreas e instalaciones de recreación, y los recursos históricos locales y regionales.

239 SI 寿成
240 NO 反對

242 SI 賣成
243 NO 反對

**LEY DE BONOS PARA LA CONSERVACIÓN DE AGUA Y CONTROL DE LA CALIDAD DEL AGUA DE 1986.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $150,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la conservación del agua, restauración de agua subterránea, manejo apropiado del agua de drenaje, y clarificación del lenguaje en Ley de Bonos para Agua Limpia de 1984.

246 SI 賣成
247 NO 反對

**DEPÓSITO DE FONDOS PÚBLICOS EN COOPERATIVAS DE CREDITO.** Autoriza a la Legislatura para que disponga el depósito de fondos públicos en cualquier cooperativa de crédito. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. La legislación ya es efectiva, podrá medicida podría resultar en mayor ingreso de intereses para los gobiernos locales y estatal.

249 SI 賣成
250 NO 反對

**FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD.** Diseña excepciones a los límites de impuestos a la propiedad en el caso de adquisición o mejoramiento de la propiedad inmueble. Cabe asignar hasta un $1,000,000 de la propiedad un impuesto fiscal. Ningún aumento en la base de los impuestos locales a la propiedad puede superar el 5% del valor del impuesto fiscal. En el caso de las bajas de las partes de los bienes, los impuestos aplicados por programas de desgravación de impuestos podrían aumentar. Los rendimientos de los impuestos estatales a la renta podrían disminuir a medida que los contribuyentes de impuestos sobre renta se desvisten de sus ingresos.

254 SI 賣成
255 NO 反對

**ASIGNACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS POR PAGOS DE LICENCIA DE VEHICULOS A LOS CONDADOS Y CIUDADES.** Requiere la asignación a los gobiernos locales de los impuestos recaudados en pagos por licencia de vehículos. Impacto Fiscal: La medida no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo. Impide que la Legislatura pueda cambiar la ley para tomar los fondos provenientes de licencias de vehículos de las ciudades y condados. La medida no evitará que el estado pueda reducir otras formas de asistencia a los gobiernos locales o que pueda cambiar la fórmula actual de dividir los rendimientos provenientes del pago por licencia de vehículos entre los condados y ciudades.

258 SI 賣成
259 NO 反對

**SISTEMAS DE JUBILACION DE LOS LEGISLADORES Y JUECES.** Limita las pensiones de jubilación para aquellas personas que se afilian al Sistema de Jubilación de los Legisladores y Jueces después del 1 de enero de 1997. Impacto Fiscal: Ahorro menor para el estado en años futuros si la tasa de inflación excede el aumento en los salarios que se pagan a los que actualmente ocupan cargos.
# MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

## STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>NONPARTISAN OFFICES. Prohibits a political party or party central committee from endorsing, supporting, or opposing a candidate for nonpartisan office. Fiscal Impact: No direct state or local government fiscal impact.</td>
<td>YES 262</td>
<td>NO 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. DISASTERS. Base-year value of property damaged or destroyed by disaster transferable to comparable replacement property in same county. Fiscal Impact: Local property tax revenues would decrease by an unknown amount. County assessor and tax collectors would have nonsignificant higher administrative costs. State would replace revenues lost by school and community college districts. State income tax revenues could increase due to lower property tax deductions on replacement properties. These state costs and revenues cannot be estimated.</td>
<td>YES 266</td>
<td>NO 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>MULTIPLE DEFENDANTS TORT DAMAGE LIABILITY. Plaintiff's non-economic damage recovery limited to defendant's liability based on defendant's percentage of fault. Fiscal Impact: Substantial savings to state and local governments. Savings could be several millions of dollars in a year, varying significantly from year to year.</td>
<td>YES 270</td>
<td>NO 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>COUNTY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county correctional facilities and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of four hundred ninety-five million dollars ($495,000,000).</td>
<td>YES 273</td>
<td>NO 274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgments against the City?</td>
<td>YES 278</td>
<td>NO 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?</td>
<td>YES 281</td>
<td>NO 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>PROPOSITION C HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THE BALLOT BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Núm.</th>
<th>Cargos no Partidarios</th>
<th>Impuestos a la Propiedad Inmueble</th>
<th>Responsabilidad Civil de Multiples Partes Demarcadas</th>
<th>Acta de Bonos para Desembolso de Capital para Instalaciones Correctivas de Condados de 1956</th>
<th>Proposiciones de la Ciudad &amp; Contado</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Acuerdo</td>
<td>Acuerdo</td>
<td>Acuerdo</td>
<td>Acuerdo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Acuerdo</td>
<td>Acuerdo</td>
<td>Acuerdo</td>
<td>Acuerdo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Acuerdo</td>
<td>Acuerdo</td>
<td>Acuerdo</td>
<td>Acuerdo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Acuerdo</td>
<td>Acuerdo</td>
<td>Acuerdo</td>
<td>Acuerdo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CARGOS NO PARTIDARIOS.** Prohibe a un partido político o a un comité central de un partido político patrocinador, apoyar o sostenese a un candidato a un cargo no partidario. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo a los gobiernos estatal o locales.

**IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE DESASTRES.** El valor en el año base de propiedad inmueble dañada o destruida por un desastre puede ser transferible a propiedad inmueble de reemplazo comparable en el mismo condado. Impacto Fiscal: Los ingresos provenientes de impuestos locales a la propiedad disminuirán en una cantidad desconocida. Las tasaciones y revaluaciones de impuestos del condado tendrán un impacto en los costos administrativos más altos. El estado refundirá los ingresos que los distritos escolares y de colegios de educación superior dejen de percibir. Los ingresos del impuesto adicional a la renta podrían aumentar debido a menores deducciones en el impuesto a la propiedad en las propiedades de reemplazo. Estos costos y recaudaciones no pueden ser calculados.

**RESPONSABILIDAD CIVIL DE MULTIPLES PARTES DEMARCADAS EN JUICIOS DIVERSOS INDEMNIZABLES.** Limita la indemnización que puede recibir el demandado por daños no económicos e indemnización de la responsabilidad del demandado basándose en el porcentaje de la culpa del demandado. Impacto Fiscal: Ahorros asignados para los gobiernos estatal y locales. Los ahorros podrían ser algunos millones de dólares al año, que variarían significativamente de año en año.

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA INSTALACIONES CORRECCIONALES DE CONDADOS DE 1956.** Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelación, y reemplazo de instalaciones correccionales de los condados y la ejecución del mantenimiento diferido en las mismas en conformidad con una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos noventa y cinco millones de dólares ($495,000,000).

**PROPÓSITOS DE LA CIUDAD & CONTADO**

**A**

- "¿Debe la Ciudad establecer un oficial de administración del riesgo y un despacho de investigación y administración de demandas, para estudiar y reducir el riesgo de pleitos y sentencias contra la Ciudad?" — Municipalidad ha establecido un departamento de administración del riesgo y un despacho de investigación y administración de demandas, para estudiar y reducir el riesgo de pleitos y sentencias contra la Municipalidad.

**B**

- "¿Debe autorizarse al Comprador a firmar contratos por menos de $50,000 sin la aprobación del Jefe Administrativo y a permitir que sus agentes firmen contratos en su lugar?" — Se autoriza al Comprador a firmar contratos por menos de $50,000 sin la aprobación del Jefe Administrativo y a permitir que sus agentes firmen contratos en su lugar.

**C**

- "Oficialmente Eliminada"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VOTER SELECTION CARD

PRIMARY ELECTION
JUNE 3, 1986

POLLs ARE OPEN FROM
7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR CANDIDATE SELECTION

Fill out this card and take it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.
VOTER SELECTION CARD

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governor</strong></td>
<td>County Central Committee*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lt. Governor</strong></td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secretary of State</strong></td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controller</strong></td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treasurer</strong></td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attorney General</strong></td>
<td>5.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bd. of Equalization</strong></td>
<td>6.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Senate</strong> (if any)</td>
<td>7.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Representative</strong></td>
<td>8.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Senate</strong></td>
<td>9.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St. Assembly</strong></td>
<td>10.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supt. Public Inst.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Defender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to your sample ballot for the number of County Central Committee members to be elected. The number varies with each district.

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR PROPOSITIONS.
PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

288 SI 贏成
289 NO 反对

"¿Deberá la Ciudad transferir la administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil a un departamento de administración de personal que tenga poder para cambiar las normas del servicio civil que el presente constan en la Corte Constitucional?"

292 SI 贏成
293 NO 反对

"¿Deberá la Ciudad negar o revocar cualquier permiso de construcción para edificar en la Regresión Belbo en las Avenidas Ocean y Pacific en los próximos tres años?"

296 SI 贏成
297 NO 反对

"¿Deberá la Ciudad prohibir la defensa remunerada efectuada por oficiales de la Ciudad y legisladores estatales ante cualquier cuestion de la Ciudad, y limitar la cantidad con la que una persona pueda contribuir para un candidato o una oficina municipal en $500?"

300 SI 贏成
301 NO 反对

"¿Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el boicotear las empresas que tienen mayor vinculación con la segregación racial sudáfrica?"

303 SI 贏成
304 NO 反对

"¿Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco exponer a todas las organizaciones apropiadas, públicas y privadas, para establecer y mantener un Consejo para la Investigación y Educación sobre SI.O.A. (A.I.O.S)?"

307 SI 贏成
308 NO 反对

"¿Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el demolir la autopista Embarcadero?"

310 SI 贏成
311 NO 反对

"¿Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el regenerar parte de la autopista Embarcadero, el esto aumentará el acceso del público a la zona de los muelles y mejorará el tráfico?"
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

**BALLOT** — An official list of candidates and propositions.

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

**VOTE BY MAIL** — See Absentee Ballot, above.

**POLLING PLACE** — The place where you go to vote.

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

**MEASURE** — Another name for proposition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**PERMIT (noun)** — A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building. Proposition E concerns the issuance of a permit.

**COMPENSATED ADVOCACY** — Compensated means being paid for doing something; Advocacy means speaking or writing on behalf of someone else. Proposition F concerns the issue of compensated advocacy.

**RISK MANAGEMENT** — This field covers two areas: (1) deciding on when it is better to buy insurance and when it is better to be self insured or uninsured, then shopping for the insurance; (2) identifying hazardous conditions on one's property and seeing that they are corrected so that liability and damage claims will be avoided. Proposition A concerns risk management.

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

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

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

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

**PROPOSITION A**

Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgments against the City?

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** Consultants hired by the Chief Administrative Officer are available to City departments that have questions about "risk management", such as how to keep damage claims to a minimum and how to find the best insurance rates. In some cases, the departments use these consultants. In other cases, the departments make their own decisions. When damage claims are filed, some are handled by the City Attorney's Office and some are handled by City departments.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition A would amend the City Charter to create an Office of Risk Management, under the Chief Administrative Officer. The office would set risk management guidelines for all City departments, boards and commissions. Proposition A would also establish a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration in the City Attorney's Office. The bureau would be responsible for investigating, evaluating and processing all damage claims made against the City, except those claims made against the Public Utilities Commission and the Police Department. The bureau would also have the power to investigate potential suits against the City and to make settlements within dollar limits to be set by ordinance.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer and a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you want damage claims and risk management decisions to continue to be handled the way they are now.

---

**Controller’s Statement on “A”**

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not affect the cost of government. However as a result of its potential future application and the exemption of certain employees from the civil service provisions of the Charter, costs may be affected in an amount presently indeterminate."

---

**How Supervisors Voted on “A”**

On March 10 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

**YES:** Supervisors Richard Hongisto, Willie Kennedy, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

**NO:** None of the Supervisors voted "No."

---

**THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 71**
VOTE YES ON A

Last fiscal year, over 6,400 claims and law suits were filed against the City, costing us more than $10 million in settlements. I believe that it is time to change the way we handle our claims, secure insurance, prevent risks and settle legitimate claims against the City.

Last summer, we appointed a task force of citizens, under San Francisco Bar President Jerry Fall, to make recommendations on how to streamline our procedures and save money at the same time. The present system is very slow, costly, and inefficient.

Currently, all claims are investigated by the department involved. The City Attorney cannot act on any claim until the department is ready. This results in delay and duplication of effort and increased costs. A centralized and accountable Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney would be more efficient, cost-effective, and professional. It would enable the City to settle many claims quickly, before litigation is begun, saving the City the costs of defending itself in court and lowering the average cost of settling a case.

This can be accomplished without creating new jobs by simply moving into one office the city positions presently scattered throughout the government.

VOTE YES ON A. Reduce the cost of City government.

Adoption of this measure would also formally establish responsibility for Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer, where it has been unofficially since 1978. With this strengthened authority, the Risk Management Office would be responsible for the gathering of claims data on a City-wide basis, the creation of incentives for both reducing the possibility for injuries and damage and the number of claims for each department, the coordination of insurance purchasing and specific suggestions to avoid and reduce risk.

This amendment is presented with the recommendation of the Mayor's Task Force on Claims and Judgments, the Chief Administrative Officer, City Attorney, the President of the San Francisco Bar Association, and the President of the Lawyers' Club of San Francisco.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Each year the City spends almost $10 million to settle damage claims. It is estimated that the overall costs to the City for all risk-related activities exceeds $125 million a year. It is time for action to be taken to reduce these huge expenditures. This charter amendment is designed to do just that.

Claims Investigation and Adjustment

Right now, the City claims investigation process is decentralized and largely unorganized. Each department investigates its own claims. Investigators may or may not be specially trained for their duties. There is no uniformity of investigation procedure or claims reporting. In only a few departments do investigators contact injured parties within days of an accident in order to settle the claim quickly and economically.

This amendment will create a claims investigation and adjustment bureau in the Office of the City Attorney. Claims investigation and adjustment activities will be centralized, economized and made much more efficient. The new bureau will be able to respond immediately to accidents and claims, providing quick compensation to deserving persons while at the same time producing a prompt, professional investigation. This reform is greatly needed.

RISK MANAGEMENT

Presently, there is no overall plan for the management of the City’s risk exposure: insurance purchasing, avoidance of industrial accidents, gathering data on accident patterns, etc. Again, risk management as a function is fragmented among the various City departments. As a consequence, departments cannot develop the necessary expertise to manage themselves to reduce risk-related costs.

This measure will establish a risk manager under the Chief Administrative Officer. For the first time, overall City planning will be possible in order to control risk. Departments will be told what activities are producing injuries or damage and advised on corrective measures. Private industry has been utilizing risk managers of this type for years. It is time that the City did the same.

This amendment will reduce the cost of government and insure a more efficient delivery of City services to all San Franciscans. We urge you to give it your unqualified support.

Board of Supervisors

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

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This charter amendment was proposed by a citizens' task force appointed by Mayor Feinstein. Its mission was to propose ways of reducing the number and financial costs of claims and lawsuits against the City.

The amendment has two principal features. The first is to centralize within the City Attorney’s office the investigation of claims filed against city departments. This will allow for improved training and supervision of the investigators, who presently are scattered throughout city government. The result will be more efficient, cost-effective and professional investigation of claims. By improving the quality of claims investigation, the City can identify those claims which have merit and attempt to reach early — and less costly — settlements. Meritless claims will be denied with greater confidence that if suit is filed it can be defended successfully.

The second major feature of the amendment will establish a Risk Management office under the Chief Administrative Officer. Risk management is a concept widely used in private business. Risk managers are professionals skilled in reducing the overall cost of claims. The Risk Manager would be responsible for coordinating the City’s insurance program, data collection, and correcting problems within the City which lead to claims. The Risk Manager would review those claims which have been filed against the City. Where it appears that an unsafe condition or practice has led to a claim, the Risk Manager would suggest to the affected department that corrective measures be taken. Reports to the Mayor and to the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors of the recommended corrections and the actions taken would ensure that the various departments will be responsive.

The City cannot eliminate claims and lawsuits against it. But it can limit its exposure by managing the claims process more effectively. This measure will reduce injuries and reduce claims, and that is good for everyone.

Jerome B. Falk, Jr.
Chair, Mayor's Task Force on Claims and Judgments Against the City

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN
KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, May 31, 1986

12 Noon State Senate, Assembly, Congress and State Propositions
1:00 Proposition A—Risk Management & Claims
1:15 Proposition B—Purchaser & Contracts
1:30 Proposition D—Civil Service
2:15 Proposition E—Balboa Reservoir
2:30 Proposition F—Compensated Advocacy
3:00 Proposition G—Apartheid
3:20 Proposition H—AIDS
3:30 Propositions I, J—Embarcadero Freeway
3:50 Statewide Candidates
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Purchaser & Contracts

PROPOSITION B

Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchaser must get the approval of the Chief Administrative Officer before signing certain contracts for more than $15,000. Only the voters may change that dollar limit. The Purchaser must personally sign every contract that comes through his office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would raise the limit on contracts requiring the Chief Administrative Officer's approval to $50,000. It would also allow the Board of Supervisors to change that limit by ordinance. Proposition B would also permit the Purchaser to name certain people in his office to sign contracts on his behalf.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer's approval only on contracts for more than $50,000. You also want the Purchaser to be able to name certain people in his office to be able to sign contracts on his behalf.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to require the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer's approval on contracts for more than $15,000. You also want him to sign all contracts himself.

Controller's Statement on "B"

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On March 3 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON B!

The City's Charter requires that a permanent, non-elected City official, the Chief Administrative Officer, review all purchases and contracts above $15,000. Of course, CAO approval of major contracts is very important. But, due to inflation, the number of contracts that have to go to the CAO for approval is always increasing. Today there are too many documents requiring CAO approval. This slows down the purchasing process, occupies staff time — and ultimately costs the City money. Proposition B will raise the CAO approval level to $50,000, and help the City to improve the efficiency of its purchasing operations.

The City's budget includes more than $250 million for purchases on tens of thousands of contracts. At the current $15,000 review limit, the CAO must approve thousands of documents every year — a costly, time-consuming process. In the long run the City loses money because of the inordinate length of time required to complete all the paperwork.

An adjustment must be made to remove the smaller contracts from this cumbersome process. Review and approval of contracts under $50,000 should be under the responsibility of the City Purchaser, a highly trained and experienced professional, who reports directly to the CAO. By changing the present $15,000 to $50,000, it will be possible for the CAO to give each document that comes to him the attention it requires. And, by placing its orders and paying its bills faster, both the City and businesses will benefit — especially small business and those owned by minorities and women.

Proposition B will allow future adjustments to the limit to be made by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility will ensure the City's ability to adjust to inflation and changes in the market.

This amendment comes to you with the recommendation of auditors, controllers, bankers, and others who exercise top fiduciary responsibility within their own organizations.

VOTE YES ON B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will make essential changes to update the purchasing and payment procedures under the Chief Administrative Officer. These measures are necessary and desirable because they will save the City money by significantly increasing our management efficiency.

Right now, the City loses because it takes too long for contracts to be reviewed and payments okayed, which means that early payment incentives go unutilized. The CAO has to approve every contract greater than $15,000 — and with City purchases last year over $250 million, the paperwork logjam is vast and overwhelming.

An increase in the review limit from $15,000 to $50,000 will make an adequate adjustment for inflation — $50,000 now is only about $15,000 in 1967 dollars. Proposition B will also enable the City Purchaser, who reports to the CAO, to maximize potential savings through early payments by designating appro-

 priate personnel to approve contracts up to $50,000. These "Good Business" amendments are consistent with private sector practices and should be incorporated by the CAO in the City's best interests.

Finally, Proposition B will give the City the ability to respond quickly to changes in the market place by allowing changes in the CAO review limit by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility is necessary to ensure that in the future we will not lose money because of institutional rigidity. Control is maintained with the necessity of Board action and Mayoral approval to adjust the review limit, and this same feature will allow for change when desired.

Vote yes on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

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

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the civil service system of the City of San Francisco. The structure of the civil service system and certain rules governing its operation are written into the Charter and can only be changed by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would make major changes. A Department of Personnel Administration would run the Civil Service system and would be able to change rules with Commission approval. Major features of Proposition D are described below. The complete charter amendment is printed in this voters' handbook.

Department of Personnel Administration

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Certain civil service rules governing the general operation of the system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs, are written into the Charter and carried out by the Civil Service Commission. Only the voters can change these rules.

THE PROPOSAL: A department of Personnel Administration would be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. A Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor would run the Department. Certain rules governing examination, selection and appointment would be taken out of the Charter. The Personnel Director would be able to change these rules with the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

Civil Service Commission

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the general operation of the civil service system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs. The Commission also hears and decides appeals on civil service matters.

THE PROPOSAL: The Civil Service Commission would no longer be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. The Commission could investigate the operation of the system, approve rule changes proposed by the Personnel Director, and hear and decide appeals only on claims of job discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest.

Employee Relations

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors appoints an Employee Relations Director to negotiate contracts with City employees; the Board approves all contracts.

THE PROPOSAL: The Mayor or his or her agent would negotiate with City employees; the Board of Supervisors would still approve all contracts.

What your vote means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing civil service system.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE
Controller's Statement on "D"

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not directly affect the cost of government, as it removes many civil service policy setting functions from the Charter and an independent Civil Service Commission and transfers responsibility for personnel matters, including labor negotiations, to the Mayor.

"As a product of its inherent flexibility and possible future application, costs could be affected or savings realized in amounts presently indeterminate but probably substantial."

Civil Service

How "D" Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative Charter amendment rewriting the civil service provisions of the Charter had qualified for the June ballot.

Robert Bradford, Jonathan Bulkeley, Lee Munsen and Mary Hilton, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 36,049 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 25,027 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

POLS CLOSE AT 8:00 p.m.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. Consistent with the City's and County's affirmative action goals, no applicant or employee shall be selected, appointed, reduced in rank, removed or in any way favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, union activities, political affiliation or sexual orientation.

(b) The purpose of the civil service system is to obtain for the city and county the best qualified persons to fill city and county positions in a timely and economical manner, using professional, fair and equitable personnel selection and personnel management practices with consideration of the following merit principles:

1. Recruiting, selecting and advancing employees on the basis of their ability, knowledge, skills and performance relative to the work to be performed.

2. Establishing equitable and adequate compensation, as provided elsewhere in this charter.

3. Training employees, as needed, to promote productivity and high quality performance and to facilitate career development.

4. Retaining employees during good service and separating employees for good cause.

5. Assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees from all aspects of personnel administration, with proper regard for their privacy and constitutional rights; and assuring equal employment opportunity, based on the person's ability to do the job.

6. Assuring that employees are protected against coercion for political purposes and are prohibited from using their official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the outcome of an election or a nomination for office.

(c) This charter does not limit the power of departments, agencies, or other subdivisions of

... and other subdivisions of the city and county in their exercise of management prerogatives including but not limited to:

1. Directing employees in the performance of their duties;

2. Hiring, promoting, transferring and assigning employees from those qualified;

3. Classifying positions in accordance with Section 3.663 (b);

4. Disciplining employees;

5. Laying off employees because of lack of work, lack of funds or other reasonable cause; and

6. Determining the mission of its departments and divisions, and its budget, organization, the number of its employees, and the numbers, types, classifications and grades of positions or employees assigned to an organization unit, work project, shift or tour of duty, and the methods and technology of performing its work.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. No person shall in any way be favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, age, religion, national origin or other non-merit factors.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in subsection (a) or any other provisions of this charter, it shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, consistent with a policy of acquiring qualified personnel for the service of the city and county, to encourage the hiring of blind persons. It shall further be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that no otherwise qualified blind person shall be discriminated against in employment, re-employment, appointment, re-appointment, waiver of eligibility for appointment or re-appointment, promotion or demotion in any class, subclass or position in the civil service unless eyesight is indispensable for the performance of the duties and responsibilities of the class, subclass or position. It shall be the duty of the Personnel Commissioner to classify and from time to time make any revisions in the civil service duties of which may be efficiently performed by qualified blind persons and to conduct appropriate examinations which will fairly test the capacity of blind persons as well as sighted persons to perform such duties.

2.302 Employee Relations Director

- Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 3.510 of this charter, the employee relations director shall be appointed by the board of supervisors and shall hold office at the pleasure of said board.

3.02 Employee Relations

It shall be the duty of the mayor to meet and confer with employee representatives on behalf of the city and county and all its constituent boards, commissions, departments and agencies as required by applicable law. These duties may be performed by a designee of the mayor who shall serve at the pleasure of the mayor. Nothing herein shall limit the mayor from contracting for the performance of these duties.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the mayor shall submit all memoranda of understanding or ordinances to be enacted pursuant to Article VIII of this charter herein to the Board of Supervisors for its approval or rejection.

3.660 Commission; Composition; Meetings

There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county shall have the general powers and duties set forth in Section 3.661.

The civil service commission shall consist of five members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and this charter section as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by this amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981 and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed.

The respective terms of the commissioners who shall hold office on the effective date of this section as amended shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date. Thereupon, the mayor shall appoint..."
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Vote YES and join 34,000 San Franciscans who signed petitions to get this crucial reform on the ballot. "D" clears the way to modernize Civil Service so that it is fair and efficient. The present system is a 50-year conglomeration of rules that tie the City’s hands—

- A protest by one applicant can hold up hiring for an entire job classification for months—even years.
- Often tests cannot be given frequently enough to maintain current tests of qualified employees. This leads to delays and temporary appointments that make hiring top candidates all but impossible.
- Appointments to jobs are restricted to the top three names on a list even though more than three people have the same score!
- Many provisions are out of date. Some deal with hiring during the Korean War. Others limit our ability to carry out affirmative action.

"D" would remove archaic rules from the Charter so they could be changed as the times require—subject to meet and confer and public hearings. Job tests could be expedited; hiring and promotions speeded up; opportunities opened to women and minorities.

Specifically, Proposition D:

1) Creates a Department of Personnel Administration at no additional cost. Like other U.S. cities, day-to-day administration would be the responsibility of a director, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Supervisors.

2) Makes the Civil Service Commission the oversight body to set policy and hear appeals. Rulings would have to be within 60 days, eliminating endless delays.

3) Moves the office of labor relations from the Supervisors to the Mayor, who must make the tough-minded decisions to balance the budget. Never again could the Board give labor $27 million for "comparable worth."

This reform is the product of years of work with SPUR, League of Women Voters, Chamber of Commerce. Members of the Board of Supervisors could have put the reform on the ballot last year but bowed to some labor leaders, and 34,000 San Franciscans had to do the job for them.

Proposition D will enable City government to work better for you. Vote YES.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON ‘D’

Proposition D is a complex proposition with a simple goal: remove the archaic restrictions on the hiring, promotion, or firing of city employees and bring San Francisco’s personnel system into the modern age.

Archaic is the only way to describe a system that keeps equally qualified people from competing for a job, and that takes months—sometimes years—to fill vacancies.

For example, if 50 people score equally high on a competitive examination, shouldn’t they all have a chance for any job for which they are eligible? Not under the current system, which requires complicated tie-breaking rules not at all related to a person’s qualifications or abilities.

Or what about being able to hire the best person available for a given job? Currently, eligibility lists are frozen for two years and every person on each list, including the lowest-scoring, must be offered a job before the highest-scoring person on a more recent list. Private businesses couldn’t function saddled with such absurdities.

Proposition D cuts through the red tape. It creates a modern personnel department, with a director responsible for carrying out rules to ensure fairness and efficiency. Accountable to the Mayor, the director would be selected from a list provided by the Civil Service Commission, and subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.

The Civil Service Commission remains an independent body, with the right to approve new personnel rules and hold hearings on abuses. Also under ‘D’, negotiations with employee unions would be under the Mayor, subject to approval by the Supervisors, providing checks and balances in balancing our budget.

With greater accountability and continued checks and balances, Proposition D will open the way to more efficient government in our City.

Bill Maher, Supervisor
Louise Renne, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON ‘D’

Proposition D is a necessary reform to the City’s Civil System. As the City’s Chief Administrative Officer for almost ten years, I have found that quality employee hiring is difficult and the process causes long delays.

The current system is:

- inflexible. The City cannot hire and promote the most qualified persons.
- inefficiently administered by a commission. Other large (continued)
cities do not have such a bureaucratic process.

- antiquated. Civil service rules represent practices of the 1950s rather than the 1980s.

The new system:
- allows the Mayor to appoint an effective personnel director, who controls administration and procedures.
- allows efficient procedures to be developed with review of the Civil Service Commission.
- eliminates cumbersome and dated rules and practices.
- expedites City hiring and promotion procedures.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

It's 1986 and we're still trying to manage City business as if it were 1932. As heads of City departments, charged with the daily responsibility of putting out fires, fighting crime, maintaining hospitals, parks, libraries and providing other essential services, we know from bitter experience about shortcomings of the existing Civil Service System.

Enacted with the City Charter in 1932, the system is foundering in red tape. Outdated rules are the subject of endless challenges. Tests are put off; vacancies go unfilled; promotions delayed; any appeal, however groundless, stops the process in its tracks.

Proposition D would take old procedures out of the Charter so they could be changed in an orderly process by the Civil Service Commission, which also would hear appeals.

Day-to-day administration of the tests—the content, scoring, all the myriad details of managing a complex system, would be put into a modern, highly professional personnel office. Tests would be speeded up. Hiring would keep pace with need. Promotions would be on the basis of competence. High performance would be the standard. Discipline could be imposed with working rights fully protected, and women and minorities would be assured equal opportunity.

Proposition D will help improve management and the quality of City services. Vote Yes on D.

Frank Jordan, Chief of Police
Emmet Condon, Fire Chief
Don Bierer, Director, Public Works
Mary Burns, General Manager, Recreation & Park
John Franz, City Librarian
Eugene Gardland, Director, Port
Marvin Getzinger, Purchaser
Wilbur Hamilton, Executive Director, Redevelopment Agency
Claire Isaac, Director, Arts Commission
Ray King, Director, Parking Authority
Dean Macris, Director, City Planning
Grant Mickins, Director, Human Rights Commission
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, PUC
Joyce Ream, Director, Aging
Ed Sarsfield, General Manager, Social Services
Thelma Shelley, Managing Director, War Memorial
Moira So, Executive Director, Community Development
Louis Turpen, Director of Airport
Dr. David Wenzlau, Director, Health Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The hiring practices outlined in San Francisco City Charter have been virtually unchanged since 1931, a severe handicap in running a modern city. Proposition D is designed to streamline the charter and ensure that the rights of present city employees and candidates for city jobs are protected, while improving the hiring process itself. The initiative also builds management accountability in the city system.

Proposition D Is More Fair, More Efficient, More Economical

The day-to-day personnel functions, including hiring, will be consolidated under a Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. Decisions of the Director of Personnel on examination content and administration are final, unless a decision is stayed during the appeal process by a unanimous vote of the Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D will make it easier to modernize the many archaic Civil Service rules and procedures now included in the Charter, while maintaining a strong and independent Civil Service Commission to safeguard the merit system and protect the rights of city employees. Many detailed rules will come out of the Charter and will become personnel regulations. These regulations can then be modernized, but only through a process which includes public hearings and meet and confer sessions with the union involved. In addition, the Civil Service Commission must approve any changes or new regulations governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfer, resignation and terminations.

Proposition D Will Improve Performance And Public Confidence

The openness and fairness of the proposition will benefit everyone. Well-qualified job candidates will have a better chance of being hired, and well-qualified job holders will have a better chance of being promoted. This means generally better job performance in all departments, resulting in higher employee morale and more public confidence in city government.

Submitted by
Louis Hop Lee, President
Civil Service Commission
Lee Munson, Member Civil Service Commission and Treasurer, San Franciscans for Fair and Efficient Government
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Cities can survive only with strong management. The greatest budgetary restraint must be exercised to assure that full value is received for each tax dollar spent.

With firm limits on what it can spend and faced with a possible loss of Federal funds next year, the City must be managed with the greatest possible efficiency.

Essential to greater efficiency is the need for Civil Service reform. As members of City Commissions, we constantly confront the torturous delays and confused rules that gridlock the present system. The present system simply can’t respond to the City’s personnel needs.

Qualified applicants become frustrated and seek employment elsewhere. Promotions are blocked. Morale suffers. Temporaries fill in; overtime mounts. The ability to plan is crippled; management is weakened.

Proposition D would put the system on a business-like basis. A personnel department would handle day-to-day administration. The Civil Service Commission would be the watchdog to assure the integrity of the merit system.

This streamlined system would replace what is now inflexible and cumbersome. Testing could be accelerated; hiring made more efficient and promotions made on time. The result would be greater efficiency and elimination of costly waste.

Vote Yes on D.

Jerry E. Berg, President, Board of Permit Appeals
Henry Berman, President, Fire Commission
Mo Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
John Blumenfield, Health Commission
Hector Chinchilla, Rent Board
Rev. Harry Chuck, Housing Authority
Dr. Arthur Coleman, President, Port Commission
Owen Davis, Police Commission
J. Edward Fleishhfeld, Airports Commission
H. Nelson Flynn, President, Public Utilities Commission
James Foster, Health Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation & Park Commission
James Fussell, President, Housing Authority
Anne Halsted, Port Commission
Tommy Harris, Recreation & Park Commission
Tom Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Walter Jabe, Public Library Commission
Jeffrey Lee, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Philip Lee, President, Health Commission
Bruce W. Lilenenthal, Small Business Advisory Commission
Jacqueline Nemirovski, President, Arts Commission
Toby Rosenblatt, President, Planning Commission
Dr. David Sanchez, President, Police Commission
Joan San Jule, Housing Authority
John Patrick Short, President, Parking Authority
Marjorie G. Stern, President, Public Library Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D contains civil service reform measures urged by the League of Women Voters since 1969.

Proposition D will:
— Modernize the City’s outdated personnel system by creating a Director of Personnel, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors
— Preserve the principles of merit through policies set by the Civil Service Commission
— Create a more responsive Civil Service system at no additional cost to the taxpayer

EFFICIENCY AND FLEXIBILITY
Proposition D transfers authority for day-to-day management of the City’s personnel system from the Civil Service Commission to the Director of Personnel. This will:
— Prevent hiring delays
— Ensure only the most qualified individuals are hired and promoted
— Provide City managers with more administrative flexibility

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

FAIRNESS FOR EMPLOYEES
Proposition D will:
— Safeguard the rights of City workers
— Protect gains made in hiring women and minorities
— Retain the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit appeals board
— Retain the ability of the City’s unions to negotiate working conditions
— Create a system that can respond quickly and fairly to the needs of City workers

Proposition D will bring the Civil Service system into the 20th century by making the Mayor accountable for the management of a system employing more than 25,000 people. Hiring by merit is still guaranteed by the Charter. Please join us in voting for this Reform!

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
Esther Marks, Past President

Vote Yes on Proposition D the Civil Service Modernization Initiative.

Prevent abuse of a system that was intended to serve the public and protect against favoritism. Prevent situations like this: an employee failed to report to work for a week without explanation; he was telephoned, notified by certified mail and a message left under his door; he was terminated 13 days later; he did not appeal the termination and the civil service commission up-
Civil Service

Two months later, the employee petitioned the commission for reinstatement. The employee got his job back, not because the process of termination was wrong but because the commission had a long standing objection to using “absent without leave” as a reason for firing.

The quality of public services is dependent upon the effectiveness of the staff who deliver them. The primary role of the civil service commission should be to facilitate recruitment and retention of the best available personnel. It must protect against favoritism and must assure that everyone has an equal and fair chance at employment.

The present system does not do that. We feel this initiative will make the system work better, for the managers, for the employees and for the public.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco government is huge, with a budget of more than $1 billion per year and 25,000 employees. It is expected to solve serious problems. This requires that the City have the ability to hire and promote talented people to do the job.

The present civil service system is so tied up in red tape that jobs remain vacant for six months to a year, and all too often someone who is not capable of doing a good job is hired. Your tax dollars are being wasted, and you are not receiving the quality of services you need and deserve.

Proposition D will modernize San Francisco's civil service system. It separates the personnel department from the Civil Service Commission, and puts the department under the Mayor where it belongs. The Mayor is responsible for balancing the budget and delivering city services as efficiently as possible. She cannot do this unless she can find capable people to do the job. That is the task of the personnel department in any organization.

Proposition D will also insure that the independent Civil Service Commission has sufficient authority to require the personnel system to be fair in its treatment of City employees. The Commission will be able to issue subpoenas and require testimony of witnesses on investigations it conducts. Should it find that discrimination has occurred, it can issue orders that must be obeyed.

Most major American cities, and virtually all cities and counties in California, have the kind of civil service system that will be established by Proposition D. San Francisco's present system is still mired in the past. It hobbles the ability of the City to deliver services and spend your tax dollars as efficiently as possible.

SPUR has not placed a statement in the Voter's Handbook for any other issue over the past 15 years. We feel that Proposition D is so vital for San Francisco's future that we are making this appeal for your support.

Vote “YES” on Proposition D.

SPUR—The San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Reform Initiative, will give San Francisco citizens the HIGH PERFORMANCE GOVERNMENT necessary to meet the many challenges of the future. Proposition D corrects the outdated and inflexible requirements originally written in San Francisco's City Charter in 1931. It will eliminate the problems which prevent San Francisco's personnel system from operating with efficiency the City's voters and taxpayers deserve:

- Proposition D insures City jobs will be filled from current lists of the most qualified employees.
- Proposition D prevents ungrounded appeals from delaying for years the appointment or promotion of qualified employees.
- Proposition D eliminates the repetitive tasks currently monopolizing the Civil Service Commission meetings and directs the Commission to serve as an appellate body to protect the City's good employees.
- Proposition D centralizes the day-to-day operation of the civil service system and makes the Director of Personnel responsible to the Mayor.
- Proposition D simplifies the budgetary process by making the Mayor the City's chief labor negotiator, responsible for setting working conditions within the City's financial capacity.

Proposition D is the result of years of painstaking review by the most experienced, able and respected management experts in San Francisco. It is a plan intended to move City government out of the 1930s and equip San Francisco to enter the twenty-first century without being burdened by the red tape of the past.

After ten years of commitment to improving our City, the Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee is convinced adoption of Proposition D is one of the most important issues facing the voters. CHANGE IS LONG OVERDUE. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by,
The Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee

David Anachter
Jerome Anderson
Richard Blum
Charles Chapman
Arthur Cooke, Jr.
Benton Dial
James Edgar
Ruben Garcia
Robert Hayden
Walter Hoadley
John Jacobs
Michael McGill
Ellen Newman
Roy Nordman
Frank Tatum

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PERSONNEL MANAGERS SAY YES ON PROPOSITION D

As the personnel managers for City Departments, we are charged with the responsibility of managing the City's personnel system. The activities include examinations, hiring, training, discipline, union-management relations, affirmative action and compensation. No one knows better than we the frustrations experienced in attempting to monitor an unbelievable sequence of overlapping bureaucratic activities in attempting to get the job done.

Proposition D will bring our personnel system into line with most other public personnel systems. The improved system will create the potential for being more responsive to the needs of operating departments. It will improve labor relations by transferring this function to the executive branch of government where it belongs.

Proposition D will streamline certain routine procedures resulting in a reduction of cost and time. Under the current system delays are experienced due to lengthy appeals during which time the departments' objectives are delayed.

Proposition D will create an atmosphere of increased accountability for department managers in the areas of affirmative action, discipline and job performance.

Proposition D has been endorsed by the San Francisco Council of Human Resource Managers, the association of over one hundred personnel managers in City government.

Proposition D strengthens merit system principles. Civil Service commissioners will have more time to enforce and protect these principles rather than being bogged down in the day-to-day activities of administration.

Proposition D will help bring about improved methods and practices in personnel administration and should result in a more competent and effective workforce which the citizens of San Francisco have a right to expect.

Alvin W. Schaaf
Personnel Director
Recreation and Park Department

Marsha Ramirez
Personnel Officer
San Francisco Port

Edward M. Gazzaro
Personnel Director
Department of Health

James Horan
Senior Personnel Officer
Department of Social Services

James Ilincic
Personnel Director
San Francisco International Airport

Andrea R. Goudine
Manager, Bureau of Personnel & Training
Public Utilities Commission

Mori Naguchi
Senior Department Personnel Officer

Mary Smith
Senior Personnel Officer
Laguna Honda Hospital

Thelma Potet
Senior Personnel Officer
San Francisco General Hospital

John Burke
Personnel Director
Controller's Office

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will assist the Department of Public Works by streamlining the civil service process.

- Under the current system, the duration of eligible lists from 2 to 4 years hampers the Department from hiring graduates of colleges and universities on an annual basis. Consequently, many excellent candidates are not entered into the Civil Service System. Passage of the proposition will improve the quality of the pool of applicants and thereby the quality of public service given by the Department.

- The establishment of a Personnel Director to administer the day-to-day tasks of the system will speed up the decision making process to the advantage of employees and management alike.

- The proposition still calls for checks and balances in that the Commission will continue to hear appeals on discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest. The Commission will act as a watchdog while leaving the general administration to the Personnel Director.

The initiative will make for an improved system for employees, management and the citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Donald Birrer
Director of Public Works

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Passage of this amendment will update our civil service system. These changes will make it comparable to other merit system agencies. Some of these changes are

(A) removal of administrative details from the charter which inhibit timely and effective personnel actions.

The following subjects will be placed in personnel regulations:

- Protests of written questions and answers
- Protests of tentative employment lists
- Promotional examinations

- Examinations for employees on military leave
- Certification of eligibles—Rule of three
- Duration of employment lists
- Temporary employee appointments
(B) allows continuous updating of employment lists.
(C) allows equitable treatment of job candidates with same test score.
(D) realigns responsibilities: The Civil Service Commission dealing primarily with compliance and adjudication activities (continued)
Civil Service

while the Personnel Department administers the day-to-day operation of the merit system.

Equally important the amendment retains important merit system provisions dealing with:

- Employee salary setting procedures
- Positions subject to merit system examinations
- Public hearing and meet and confer requirements
- Penalties for examination fraud
- Seniority, meritorious service and applicable educational credits for promotional examinations in the Police/Fire De-

partment

- Termination of unsatisfactory employees
- Disciplinary suspensions
- Conflict of interest
- Creation of positions

Proposition "D" merits a 'YES' vote.

John J. Walsh
General Manager Personnel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Initiative, is a long-overdue reform to streamline antiquated hiring practices in San Francisco's fifty-year-old charter. Proposition D will ensure that the best and brightest job candidates are chosen to serve our city, thus promoting excellence in job performance and helping to eliminate incompetence. This initiative builds management accountability in the city system, while giving the Civil Service Commission the independence to protect the rights of women and minorities.

A Better, More Efficient System at Less Cost

Proposition D consolidates personnel functions, including hiring, under a new Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. The Director has final authority over content of examinations given city job applicants, so more flexibility is possible in finding truly qualified candidates.

Proposition D redefines the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit systems appeals board and policy-setting body. The merit principles are spelled out in the Proposition. This allows the Commission to protect the rights of women and minorities at no cost to the public.

More Fair to Everyone

Proposition D greatly improves the city charter. Well-qualified job candidates have a better chance to be hired and well-qualified job holders have a better chance to be promoted. The public is rewarded with the better job performance, efficiency and friendliness one expects from good government employees. All of these improvements are at no additional cost to the taxpayer.

Submitted by
James W. Haas

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service System, as presently constituted, (vintage 1932!), is uncivil, and there is nothing "systematic" about it! It's pure, unadulterated municipal lunacy and chaos! Remarkably, BOTH Management and Labor despise it. It certainly is NOT producing the best qualified persons to fill City jobs!

Let's follow Mayor Feinstein's recommendations. If this operation doesn't dramatically improve, there are always FUTURE ELECTIONS where additional, more Draconian changes can be considered by the voters.

As matters now stand, it is far better to light a candle than just sit and curse the darkness! Any changes will be an improvement! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

For more than a half-century, San Francisco Mayors have abided by the employee examination, hiring and promotion policies administered by a strong and independent Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D is a deceptive and dangerous scheme that would give future Mayors and top-level bureaucrats the power to ignore competence and reward political loyalty.

Proposition D would take key Civil Service employment rules out of the City Charter and make them subject to wheeling and dealing by City Hall politicians.

There's an old saying — "if it ain't broke, don't fix it." Civil Service has worked well for more than 50 years. Proposition D is unnecessary, ineffective and even counter-productive.

It's not just deceptive, it's dangerous.

Joseph L. Alioto
Former Mayor of San Francisco

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

Time and time again, different groups have put various propositions on the ballot to weaken our Civil Service System and reintroduce political patronage into City employment practices. And every time the voters have wisely rejected these schemes, no matter how cleverly they have been disguised. Proposition D is just another power grab by bureaucrats at the top in City Hall.

We've said NO! loud and clear in the past. Let's say NO one more time.

Submitted by:
TAXPAYERS FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT
Thomas Scanlon
City Treasurer, Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "D"!!!!

During the eight years while a member of the Board of Supervisors, I fought hard to reform the Civil Service Commission and to bring working conditions and city workers' pay equitable to both workers and taxpayers. I fought to insure an independent Civil Service Commission that would remain just that— independent and free from political influence and political patronage of particularly the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

I am truly saddened by the Mayor's insistence in bringing this disastrous Proposition "D" before the voters. Some of the Supervisors rejected this misguided measure for what it is; an unwise consolidation of authority to hire, fire and promote city workers by the Mayor and newly created personnel officer.

My efforts to bring pay equity to both taxpayers and city workers were continually squashed by then Supervisor Feinstein and Supervisor Molinari. Finally, in 1975, shortly after a disastrous city strike, I was able to place on the ballot, for voter approval, a measure that almost eliminates the power of the Mayor and Supervisors to manipulate the pay of city workers. This measure was overwhelmingly passed by the voters that year and we have not had any labor unrest since that date.

Vote No on "D"!
"D" stands for disaster. It will undo many of these reforms. Also, right now, the City is almost broke, thanks to the manipulation of Mayor Feinstein and her chief ally Supervisor Molinari.

If "D" passes the cost of operating our city government will increase in the next 24 months by not less than $80,000,000. Contrary to the provisions of Proposition 13, property taxes would be increased, thus forcing up rents.

Vote No on "D".
Don't weaken our Civil Service Commission, whereby least deserving city employees could be promoted because of connection or clout.

Vote No on "D".
We now almost have more problems than we can handle. We don't want our city turned into another Chicago, wherefor for nearly half a century a corrupt political system flourished under Mayor Richard Daley.

John Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We join San Franciscans for Fair Employment in opposing the Civil Service Initiative, Proposition D.

This measure will severely hamper the well-being of the San Francisco Fire and Police Departments. These departments are two of the finest in the Country and have consistently protected life and property in a professional manner. They must continue that tradition with a civil service system based on MERIT and not political patronage.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.
Andrew C. Casper
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired
Keith P. Calden
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired
William F. Murray
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Thomas J. Cahill
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired
Donald M. Scott
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Our present Civil Service system was designed to keep corruption out of government. It has generally served that purpose well. This proposition would dismantle that system and in my opinion open the doors to nepotism, favoritism, patronage and corruption. Better a city government that is bureaucratic than one that is corrupt. Vote NO on D.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

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

Proposition D is an attack on the merit system and an attempt to return patronage to the Mayor's office by eliminating the authority of the Civil Service Commission and its built-in checks and balances.

The present Civil Service system is not perfect, but corrections can be made within the Charter without destroying a system that has worked for over 50 years and has been free from fraud and corruption.

This proposition will do nothing to improve the caliber of police performance and could have the opposite effect. I urge you to vote NO on PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by
The San Francisco Police Supervisors and Investigators Association
Don Goad, Captain SFPD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D could be a dangerous first step toward weakening the independent, impartial administration of our City government.

Proposition D would transfer power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor. The Director's decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline and certification would be final. The Commission would have no right to hear examinations or disciplinary appeals.

With the transfer of duties and responsibilities from the Commission to the Mayor's appointed Personnel Director, the Mayor would have control over personnel functions. Currently, commissioners have independent status and can be dismissed for cause. The Personnel Director could be dismissed at will.

The Merit System could be replaced by a patronage system. Proposition D could open the door to rules permitting the Personnel Director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his or her position on the list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Proposition D is NOT a reform package. The checks and balances for efficient City government would be lopsided, with too much power in the hands of unknown future Mayors.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
John L. Molinari, President
Harry G. Britt
Richard Hongisto
Willie B. Kennedy
Wendy Nelder
Nancy Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Beware of PROPOSITION D!

Powerful special interest groups are attempting to remove key City employees from the independent and impartial Civil Service system in the name of "reform".

They want instead to make these employees answerable directly to future Mayors and politically-appointed Personnel Directors and department heads.

PROPOSITION D got on the ballot because the Chamber of Commerce and such companies as Pacific Bell and PG&E paid a professional southern California campaign firm, $70,000 to collect signatures.

They're trying to destroy the merit system and replace it with an old-fashioned patronage system.

Department heads will be able to ignore examination scores and reward loyalty rather than competence in promotions and hiring.

Don't let the Chamber of Commerce, big business and their allies in the City bureaucracy dictate who's hired, fired and promoted among public employees.

PROPOSITION D is not just deceptive, it's dangerous! Vote NO on PROPOSITION D!

Libby Dennebaum
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Tim Wofford
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Ron Huberman
Vice-Chairman, Democratic Central Committee
Jim Wicent
Democratic Central Committee
Roberto Estes
President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Rick Pachur
President, Harvey Milk Lesbian Gay Democratic Club
Walter L. Johnson
Exec. Sec'y., S. F. Labor Council
Michael Bernick Linda Post
Sal Roselli Deborah Stein
John Mehring Pat Norman
Nancy Walker Gwen Craig
Harry Britte Louise Miremick
Carole Migden Agar Jacob
Jack Morrison

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

Proposition D places too much power in the hands of ONE. Proposition D will provide for a personnel director to be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. The Mayor now appoints five members of the Civil Service Commission who also serve at her pleasure.

You work for years to climb the civil service ladder and then somebody comes along with an idea to cut you off at the pockets.

Proposition D will lock in all the employees employed in the Mayor’s office and will control the appointments of any new staff by the next Mayor, elect in 1987 and years thereafter.

Like controlling your estate from the grave.

Vote NO on D.

Marguerite Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service Merit System has served our City well, giving San Franciscans an equal opportunity. It has helped us obtain employment and earn promotions based on objective examinations.

The Civil Service Merit system replaced the old patronage system that rewarded political loyalty more than competence.

Now the supporters of PROPOSITION D want to create a new Personnel Director, accountable only to the Mayor, and give department heads the absolute power to decide who works for the City and who gets promoted.

If PROPOSITION D passes, equal opportunity would give way to opportunity based on membership in the bureaucratic "establishment".

Keep our Civil Service Merit System strong and free from the political abuses of the past.

Vote NO on D!

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly
Ben Tan
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Joanne Miller
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
A. Richard Cerbates
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Soliday Wilson
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, President
S. F. Community College Governing Board
Julie Tang
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Alan S. Wong
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Henry Der
Albert Chang
Rudy Meraz
Robert "Bob" Morales
Yori Wada

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Can you imagine studying for a civil service examination, being rated at the top of the eligible list and never receiving the promotion? That’s exactly what Proposition “D” will do should the electorate adopt this amendment.

The civil service merit system has defects, but to totally eliminate the system and replace it with a patronage system where promotions are based on who you know, rather than what you know is scandalous.

Civil service was put into place to prevent scandal and the “favor seeking” individual from getting a paid position because he/she happened to support the right elected official.

Proposition “D” will allow one person, chosen by the Mayor, to decide who will be promoted, hired and fired. This is awesome power for one single individual to have at any level of government.

Our current Mayor may choose a fair person for this position, but will future Mayors be as careful? As each new Mayor assumes office, the civil service system will again change. The potential to favor one individual or group over others is great.

Proposition “D” has a great potential to diminish the quality of services we now provide to our citizens, as the future of how people are hired and promoted in the San Francisco Police Department is completely unknown.

It’s true our promotional system is fraught with delays and delays frustrate us all, but Proposition “D” is not the answer. Proposition “D” will only add to our existing problems. Several years ago, our citizens elected a Charter Commission to streamline city government and make civil service work more efficiently. The voters eventually rejected those proposals. The checks and balances that make our government stable were no longer present. It simply went too far.

Proposition “D” goes even further. It brings about a system of patronage and should be defeated lest we want to engage in “free-wheeling and dealing” of civil service jobs and promotions.

We urge a strong No vote against Proposition “D”!

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS’ ASSOCIATION

Bob Barry, President
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The purpose of the Civil Service Commission is to ensure that the merit system would be the only criteria in any examination process.

If Proposition D passes, all authority concerning examinations would be taken from the Civil Service Commission and given to a Personnel Director, who is appointed by the Mayor. This Personnel Director would have the authority to hire and fire at his discretion, with no appeal available. This proposition is contrary to everything the Fire Department and all City employees have strived for over the years.

The Civil Service Commission in its present form was instituted to prevent any possibility of a patronage system, where one person has complete control.

This proposition would do nothing to improve your Fire Department. If you are satisfied with the work and make up of the San Francisco Fire Department in its present form, "Vote No On Proposition D". You will be doing a service for the San Francisco Fire Department, and the people of San Francisco.

Submitted by the San Francisco Fire Chiefs' Association
John Flaherty, Battalion Chief SFFD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is bad government and bad politics, changing our independent civil service system into a system dominated by the Mayor:

...By shortening the six year terms of Civil Service Commission to conform to the Mayor's four year term of office.

...By transferring most of the Commission's powers to a Personnel Director who serves solely at the Mayor's pleasure.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D fails to offer enough new and improved procedures to cure the current defects in the civil service system. Charter sections and civil service rules are repealed without specific known replacements.

Proposition D transfers power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created personnel director appointed by, and to serve at the pleasure of, the Mayor. The director's decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline, and certification would be final. The commission would have no right to hear examination or disciplinary appeals.

There are hidden costs with Proposition D because the new Personnel Administration Department will employ a personnel director, and other employees "as may be necessary to carry out (its) functions and duties."

The Merit System could be replaced by an old style Patronage System. Proposition D could open the door to rules which permit the personnel director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his/her position on the civil service testing list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Police and Fire Commissions would lose functions as a result of the personnel director's new power. The director's unlawful employment discrimination policy would be binding upon department administrators. The director's procedure for employee dispute resolution must be used by all department heads and appointing officers.

Proposition D is not the answer. The checks and balances for efficient city government would be lopsided.

I urge a no vote on Proposition D.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, 17th Assembly District
Sala Burton
Congresswoman
Art Agnos
16th Assembly District
Milton Marks
State Senator

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

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

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission declared Balboa Reservoir South (located across Phelan Avenue from San Francisco City College) surplus in 1984 and made the site available for low, moderate and market rate housing. In July 1985, a City-community advisory committee chose a developer to build 203 single-family homes on the 13 acre site. Construction has not yet begun.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would prohibit granting new building permits and would revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site (Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1) between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit granting any new building permits and you want to revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to allow building permits to be granted for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

Controller's Statement on "E"

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

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

How "E" Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for a three-year ban on development of the Balboa Reservoir site had qualified for the June ballot.

Sidney Kass and Jesse David Wall, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 12,430 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1983.

A random check of the petition showed that 10,012 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 77
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Having been responsible for providing leadership at City College from 1947 to 1977, we cannot stand by and see this site converted to housing. We must speak out. Such a move would preclude forever the logical and much needed campus expansion to what was once our West Campus. We left that site reluctantly to make way for water storage. If it is no longer required for that purpose, let us return it to City College.

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

Its 56 acre campus originally housed 3,000 students. Now it serves over 23,000. This campus, compared to other community colleges, can be best described as cramped, inadequate, and second rate. The condition of the campus is to be contrasted with the excellence of its programs—which are recognized as among the best in the nation.

Lou Batmale
Chancellor 1970-1977
Louis G. Conlan
President 1947-1970

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION ‘E’

We question:
1. Why no EIR was required when the proposed development could have a substantial impact.
2. Whether the future needs of City College for classrooms, housing, and parking have been considered.
3. What the impact on taxpayers is with below market land sale and construction financing by bonds.
This moratorium will permit adequate study of these issues.
Vote YES on Proposition ‘E’.

Bruce Bonacker, President
Board of Directors, Glen Park Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let a developer make a mint on land across from the most overcrowded college in the Bay Area! Parking is already an impossibility for residents near City College...adding 200 homes to this land would make the situation much worse.

It's simple: a college which can't find room for more students at a time when more people are returning to education doesn't serve the community.

This land is being sold at much less than its true value. The development wouldn't do much to ease the City's housing crunch, but it would undercut the future of City College and the peace of mind of the neighborhood.

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

You'd probably be upset. We certainly are. Please help us protect our neighborhood. Please vote YES on proposition E.

Westwood Park Residents:
Edna Tooker
Minnie Dorwin
Eugene Eden
Donna Nicoletti
Robert Armstrong
Pauline Armstrong
Joel Martinez
Richard & Lisa Patterson
David Bean
H. Bozzone
William Burke
Richard Robel
Clyde Theriot
Danae Manus
Enza Manuz

Sunnyside Residents:
Ellen Wall
Melissa Voluntad
David Wall
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don’t let the greedy developers take this potentially picturesque open space. A yes vote means you want more time to consider its future use. All we ask is time to think and plan.

John Barbagelata
Former member, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Suppose there was a publicly owned open space across the street from the main U.C. Berkeley Campus. Can you imagine for one moment that it would be passed into private ownership? Vote Yes on E for Equality and Excellence in Education

City College Students:
William Lew, Student
Tim McGuire, Student Council Member
Joseph Goldstein, Student Council Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

In 1952, the “Experts” said we needed reservoirs. They felt so strongly that they condemned the City College West Campus, destroyed the buildings, and constructed the reservoirs—all at taxpayer’s expense.

Now, in 1986 with more demand for water, the “Experts” say the reservoir is no longer needed. What is the concerned taxpayer to believe?

When in doubt, the city should hold on to the expensive things already paid for.

Stop the reservoir giveaway. Vote YES on E.

Taxpayers for Preserving the Reservoir.
Richard Patterson
Dorice Murphy
Lucille Carson
Daniel Gutierrez
Franz Wiese
Bernhard Scholand
Ruth Hansen

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This is a Planning issue

We have been accused of trying to stop housing for poor people. Not true. In the first place, the price levels are certainly middle income and above, but our main objection is that this badly done plan is damaging to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as to the over-crowded community college across the street.

WHAT WE WANT

Even our critics point out that we originally SUGGESTED housing for that site, but they don’t talk about what else we suggested. We want two levels of parking under a City College Library, Bookstore, and Auditorium, with housing on top. Furthermore, let the housing be TRULY affordable—for students and seniors. We are trying to stop the bureaucrats’ subsidized middle income housing project because it makes our dream impossible.

We ask for three years to give the neighborhood and the college a chance to produce a better plan.

SNaP (Sensible Neighborhood Planning Committee)

Helen Critzer, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council, representing 17 neighborhood associations in the area of the surplus reservoir property in question has voted to endorse the three-year stop of private construction on the old West Campus of City College. Dr. Louis Batsmae, Chancellor of City College from 1970-1977, has persuaded us that City College needs the lands.

Juanita Raven, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Be a sport.
Give City College a vote of support.
City has 23,000 students and badly needs a library. The only
place to put it is in the reservoir site. City College has walked
closely with San Francisco for five decades. The reservoir site
has always been understood to be reserved for City College.

Until now when someone wants it for housing. Housing is
important, but it can be anywhere in town. But a City College
library can only be located at the College.

Vote yes to support a book— and a reader.
Reading, studying, writing and research make up our town
also.

It is hard to understand criticism of City for wanting to keep
this area for a library. Sure, housing sites are at a premium—but
even more so a library site for City which is one of the largest
schools in the Nation.
Some people blast City for wanting a library because of the
need for housing. Housing is needed. But some of those very
same people want a big battleship stationed here that will bring
in 15,000 new family members.

The Educational and cultural growth of San Francisco man-
dates living space for the City College library.

If this measure gets a no vote, it means there will be no site for
a Library. This is the last chance. Vote YES to help out a
book— and a reader.

State financing, when approved, will construct this building.
It is the top building priority at City College.

A YES vote here means there will be time to think about the
use of the site. During that three year period, cooler heads may
realize this is the only site for a Library. If the housing goes in
there will be no library there.

Vote yes for a book, for a good school and a better City.

John Riordan, Board of Governors
San Francisco Community College District.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Sunnyside Neighborhood Association is not against hous-
ing, but we are trying to stop a hasty and short-sighted plan. We
are asking for this moratorium to get time for a better plan that
will answer a variety of needs and benefit the entire city as well
as our community.

This is a planning issue.
The release of the reservoir property as surplus by the water
department came as a surprise to our neighborhood. The June
1984 “Residence Element” of the city’s Master Plan did not even
list the land as surplus. By 1985 major decisions were being
made for use of the land without adequate neighborhood input.

There were some meetings attended by a few people carefully
selected for their zealous pro-housing views or potential finan-
cial gain. The resulting plan has gone out of control. Now it
benefits only the developer and the lucky few who will get
houses on free land.

Proposition E is not an attack on housing.
Please help us save our neighborhood against poor planning
by voting YES on Proposition E.

Joe Mahoney, President
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Miraloma Improvement Club urges a YES vote on Propo-
sition E.

Frank Mastro, President
Arnell Rodrigues

Maggie Kroil
Dorothy Evers

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION E

All the talk in the world can’t change the fact that City College
has fewer acres of land relative to its student population than any
college in the Bay Area.

Enrollment at City College is INCREASING, as is the enroll-
ment of the San Francisco public schools from which City Col-
lege draws most of its students. It is obvious that City College
needs and deserves the reservoir land. The three year morato-
rion will gave time to produce a better plan which will have in-

put by faculty, students and alumni who know the college’s needs
and want to support it.

Sid Kass
Susie Langdon Kass
Phil Kass
City College Student

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The homeowners of Westwood Park, a neighborhood adjacent to the Balboa Reservoir, support the ballot initiative calling for a 3 year development moratorium. We believe that the City and City College should take additional time to determine their needs and how they might be met by using the Reservoir. In the event that City College does not need this property, we support its development as open space or as single family detached housing.

Westwood Park Association
Don C. Swander
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Let’s not aggravate the traffic problem around City College before we first develop solutions for the existing problems.

A three-year moratorium only buys our neighborhood and elected officials time to find solutions; it doesn’t say no to housing. A YES vote is a vote for prudent development. A YES vote helps to preserve the family character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ken Hoegger
Realtor and community Activist

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As representatives of the students of City College, we understand first-hand, the intense need to reserve a site for future school expansion.

Preservation of the Balboa Reservoir, a site directly adjacent to the campus, is particularly crucial. The facilities that CCSF requires, such as a library and an auditorium, are essential to the main structure of the campus. Unlike classrooms, it would be unreasonable to build an auditorium or a library on an off-campus site, since these facilities are integral to the main function of the school.

Associated Student Council of City College
Jack Lee, Vice President of Associated Counsel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Local 2121 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, representing City College faculty, urges a yes vote on Proposition E.

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

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is twice as crowded as any community college in northern California. It needs a much larger library, bookstore and auditorium, and more parking.

The college has always expected to use the empty SOUTH reservoir for educational needs. That land is finally surplus. Neither the college Governing Board nor the Chancellor attended the Mayor’s planning sessions for the property and the faculty was not informed. When the 12.3 acre site was offered to a developer for $36,900 for subsidized housing, the Chancellor said, “We are at a crossroad and the correct path is for the Board of Supervisors, with the Mayor’s support, to deed this surplus land to City College so that the college may continue to serve the city effectively for the next 50 years as it has for the past half century.” The Mayor refused. Now only Board member John Riordan supports the correct path.

The Water Department says it may need the NORTH reservoir now used for student parking. If that crisis occurs, the Chancellor says, “We’ll deal with the situation then.” How, if the south reservoir is gone?

(continued)
When land is available other college communities finance large projects through alliances with civic, athletic and cultural organizations, and through property sales. New methods for public funding are being developed.

The faculty would like three years of careful study to unravel misunderstandings and poor management, and to find the best way to be a good neighbor.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College needs land now for desperately needed facilities, one of which is a library. City College has an enrollment of 23,000 students but our library has seating for 450. There are other possible locations for new housing, but City College can’t be moved. Give us an opportunity to plan a development for the community and the college.

Annie M. Young
City College Library Faculty and Staff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty and staff members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco’s community college for our students’ needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Virgie Applin
Bill Carpenter

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco’s community college for our students’ needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Darlene Allato
Mary Allen
Mary Anstler
Tom Angelloff
Robert Balestreri
Don Bateni
Diana Bernstein
Joe Berry
Anna Bratton
Thomas Brendel
James Bristol
Richard Brongel
Lauren Broussard
Philip Brown
Barbara Cabral
John Callen
John Caris
Frank Cerrato
Rosemary Clark
Perry Close
Kurt Common
Walter Cripps
Patrick Davis
Gay DePrimo
Edward Diueraff
Sharman Edwards
Larry Ernst
Mary Ewning
Kaye Fong
William Funke
Terry Greenfield
Robert Griffin
Michael Guthrie
Mary Hamra
Yen-Kuang Ho
Peter Hoeh
Ronald Hochshe
Myrna Holden
Katherine Hondi
Michael Hubert
Edward Hunt
Frank Ingersoll
Elaine Johnson
Wendy Kaufman
Jo Kennedy
Mercedes Kow
Rosalind Kwok
Don Lafferty
James Lallias
Steve Levinson

Sue Light
Gary Ling
Anelia Lippi
Dave Ludhert
Leon Lucas
Damarre Macalou
Marion McManus
Patricia Madigan
Michael Malachowski
Mary Mari
Maria Mariati
Sylvia Marshall
Valerie Meelho
Jose Mejia
Margit Michelmyou
Deanne Milan
Cindy Moody

Thomas Munro
David Myhre
Deborah Nagle
Glenn Nance
Herbert Nayler
William Nett
Denis Pienkowski
Francine Podenski
Theresa Poydeless
Solomon Raju
Mary Randon
Barb Barbour
Barbara Thomas
Clare Thompson
Willie Thompson
Mary Thraller
Robert Triscato
James Trimmer
Joanne Timminia
George VanBuzay
Cherie Wetzl
Austen White
Jaan Wilson
Rosalie Wolf
Christina Yee

Robert Struckman
McShuet Tam
Edward Taylor
Pierre Thiry
Barbara Thomas
Clare Thompson
Willie Thompson
Mary Thraller
Robert Triscato
James Trimmer
Joanne Timminia
George VanBuzay
Cherie Wetzl
Austen White
Jaan Wilson
Rosalie Wolf
Christina Yee
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Water Department has begun a resource study of water use, due for completion in two or three years. The study may well indicate that one or both reservoirs will be needed. The American Water Works Association states that reservoirs should be used in pairs. This is particularly important because it is the only reservoir at an elevation of 305 feet.

The Mayor twisted the arm of the Water Department to declare one of these reservoirs surplus before the water resource study is completed. Don’t let her get away with this kind of political manipulation.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Kurt Common
Ken Crizer
Ed Dierauf
Herb Naylor
CCSF Engineering Professors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The South Balboa Basin has been unused since college leased buildings, including a large auditorium, were torn down on that site thirty years ago. We hope that three years of thorough planning would explore the possibility of returning a part of that property to the college for the development of a multi-purpose medium-sized auditorium which could be shared with community groups.

Joseph Alessi
Mary Argenti

Robert Bezina
Mack Crooks
Bob Davis
Helen Didsworth
Franz Enciso
Richard Esterman
Richard Fenner
Lawrence Ferrara
Ted Fleming
 Pegny Gorham
William Grothkopp
David Hardiman

Judy Hubbell
Charles Hudspeh
Sieglinde Isham
Baruch Klein
John Korgismark
Joshua Law
Steven Lopez
Jerry Mueller
Madeline Mueller
Marvin Tartak
Frank Townsell
City College Music Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition E. This moratorium is necessary because there are too many worthy uses for this land to make a hasty and potentially very costly decision. Only through careful planning can the limited land available for development be best used.

Nicolas Alexander
Paul Hewitt

Robert Kaar
James Kurck
Dack Lee
Chelcie Liu
William Maynez
Annette Rappeleya
Oleg Reout
David Wall
City College Physics Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, as Physical Education Instructors, have always been committed to a diversified program for our students and community. The reservoir space is a natural land resource for a Multi Educational and Cultural Center.

Your YES vote on E will allow us the freedom to explore ways that this property could most constructively benefit all.

Gail Barton
Curtis Decker
Brud Duggan
Tanaka Hagiwara
JoAnn Hahn
Daniel Hayes

Lene Johnson
Grover Klemmer
Paula McCullum
Art Octavio
Louise Scourkes

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, full-time faculty of the Computer and Information Science Department of City College, urge a YES vote to postpone the decision until additional planning and surveys can be conducted. The current proposal would negatively impact the College’s enrollment.

William Beaver
Ronald Cerruti, Chairman
Kirk Gibson
Howard Gruner
Frank Holden
Michael Kelly

George Lanyi
Norbert Ludkey
Charles Metzler
Charles Miller
Marilyn Schnake
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AROUNDMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

A YES vote on Proposition E helps STOP a scheme to GIVE AWAY $12,300,000 worth of City land for $1,800,000 (or less) to a Redwood City real estate developer.

A YES vote will SAVE taxpayers $550,000 per year. The housing project will produce $240,000 in taxes, but supplying City services will cost $790,000 per year.

The Controller's cost estimate does NOT account for the $12,300,000 land value, since land sale below value is NOT technically a cost of government. The Controller also is NOT permitted to assume that the housing project will be constructed, since construction has NOT yet been ordered by the Board of Supervisors.

The plan does NOT restrict housing sales to moderate-income first-time buyers. The plan only restricts use of tax-subsidized funds. Any person favored by the developer or politicians can buy these dwellings and get the benefits of the public land giveaway.

The houses are made “affordable” by giving away the land far below market value, by City-backed low interest, and by cutting construction corners.

The real beneficiaries of the subsidized housing project are the financiers (NOT the project dwellers). Bondholders receive 9.6% average tax-free interest, which is equivalent to 24.6% taxable interest at 61% maximum tax. The developer and bond establishment receive $5,340,000; this is $26,300 (or 22.40%) for each $117,400 unit.

The City loses $51,700 worth of land GIVEN AWAY for each unit.

Vote YES on Proposition E for good fiscal management.

William Marquardt
Financial Analyst, SNaP
Helen Crizer, Treasurer, SNaP

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of College</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Campus (acres)</th>
<th>Area/1000 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City College of SF</td>
<td>22,624</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laney College, Oakland</td>
<td>9,805</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot College, Hayward</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa College</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of San Mateo</td>
<td>13,820</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>11.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Marin</td>
<td>6,663</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given these facts, why does the Governing Board not try to get the old West Campus back? Why don't they support this moratorium to delay the land grab?

The Governing Board is under political pressure from City Hall. They have been threatened with the loss of the north reservoir parking lot and funding for special projects. Forgive them. Vote Yes on E.

Friends of City College
David Newton
Glen Simpson
Jack Baker
Thomas Velasquez
Tillie McCullough

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The student population at City College is increasing. This semester's enrollment is up 1,265 students over last semester.

The enrollment in the San Francisco public schools has been increasing by 1,218 per year for the last three years. City College draws most of its enrollment from public schools in San Francisco.

Obviously, City College will have a larger enrollment in the future years, and will be in desperate need of space if we do not give it back its old West Campus.

Please reserve this public land for the college.
Please vote YES on E.

Barbara Holman

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON E

In 1981, I launched a six-point program to expand San Francisco's housing supply and the voters had approved a City policy to add 20,000 new housing units within five years. This Proposition would destroy a major portion of the effort to build affordable, single-family housing in our city.

The Balboa Reservoir Site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now a site for development of 203 new single-family homes, most with three bedrooms and two baths. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed as other homes built under the City's program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom could not afford homeownership. It is believed that these new homes will sell rapidly.

The Balboa Reservoir site is one of the few sites large enough to accommodate a substantial number of new homes. Please do not let a few people stop a major opportunity for new housing. Vote no on Prop E.

Not only would Proposition E halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site, but the 9.8% fixed-rate, 30-year mortgage money set aside for the housing would also be lost.

Nothing constructive is accomplished by this measure—it does not provide additional land or facilities for City College. As a matter of fact, City College has neither plans nor money to use the property. Further, the Community College Board of Directors, the governing body for City College, has voted overwhelmingly to oppose the initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No on E.”

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the site of the unused Balboa Reservoir and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost.

These homes are desperately needed for San Franciscans who can't afford to buy in the city where the average house is selling for over $160,000. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

The homes would be built on land that belongs to the City. Over two years ago, it was declared surplus and available for housing. It is not part of City College, and City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and the money for institutional expansion. We urge you to vote no on Proposition E if you want more affordable housing for San Franciscans.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

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

The 203 affordable owner occupied single family units slated for the southern portion of Balboa Reservoir are part of the 1988 total. Our progress in addressing the City's housing shortage will be curtailed if this ill-advised initiative is approved. SUPPORT OWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Housing production is essential to check rising prices and to maintain our social, economic, and ethnic population diversity. AS A SAN FRANCISCO VOTER, YOU CAN BE PART OF OUR HOUSING PROGRESS BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

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

WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT THE CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY HOUSING BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

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

Doris M. Ward, Member
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

A critical issue facing San Francisco today is the lack of housing middle class San Franciscans can afford.

That is why I have joined these neighborhood associations to support the Balboa Reservoir neighborhood housing proposal. Those participating in the development of the proposal includes:

O.M.I. Community Association
Dorado Terrace Association
Outer Mission-Ingleside
Political Action Committee
Greater Ingleside Community
Mount Davidson Manor
Ocean Avenue Merchants Association
Ingleside Terrace Association
The San Francisco Open Space Committee
City College of San Francisco

From early in 1985 I worked closely with these neighborhood groups in the discussions between city government and community leaders concerning the development plans for this desperately needed new housing at the unused Balboa reservoir site.

THESE ARE THE REASONS YOU SHOULD VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

1. The neighborhood housing proposal that this initiative seeks to stop is the result of months of hard work by the largest coalition of neighborhood associations ever to join together to plan a housing development in San Francisco.

2. The housing at the Balboa Reservoir site was designed with the involvement of the coalition of neighborhood associations to enhance the surrounding community.

3. The governing Board of the Community College District has made clear that they have no plans for the site and no ownership rights to it. City College does not oppose the construction of this development and opposes this initiative.

4. Self-proclaimed “Friends” of City College want to stop the proposal in order to preserve the site for future faculty parking. A clique of City College staffers involved in a neighborhood association pose as community opposition to this development even though a representative from this organization, the Sunny- side Neighborhood Association, had helped plan and support the proposal.

5. By masquerading as concerned neighbors these self-appointed “friends” of City College hope to prevent the construction of 204 critically needed units of housing and pull off one of the biggest land grabs in San Francisco's history.

DON'T BE FOOLLED. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Residence Element of the Comprehensive Plan of the City and County of San Francisco assesses the City's housing needs and lays out specific steps to meet those needs. This document was adopted by the City Planning Commission in 1984 after extensive public review at neighborhood meetings and public hearings, and consideration of the detailed Environmental Impact Report.

The first objective of the Housing Element is “to provide new Housing for all income groups” in locations appropriate for residential development. To meet this goal, development of housing is to be aggressively pursued and encouraged on surplus, underused and vacant public land.

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

If you want more affordable housing in San Francisco vote no on Proposition E.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Susan J. Bierman, City Planning Commissioner
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on E.

Proposition E deprives San Franciscans of one of their last real chances to become homeowners at an affordable price. At the South Balboa Reservoir we have City-owned land on which 203 units of three-bedroom, two-bath homes can be built at low prices which average San Franciscans can afford to pay. These homes need to be built now, not in three years. In three years the low interest rates on mortgages and the bond financing will be gone. Two hundred families will have lost the opportunity to become homeowners, and the City will have lost the opportunity to ease the tight market in rental housing.

Nor does this ill-conceived initiative help City College in any way. City College does not need this land. Speculation that the College may at some future date find a use for the land is not founded on fact. The College may never be able to build on the reservoir. Their enrollment has dropped by over 4000 students in the last few years.

This initiative is designed to confuse you. It will make our housing shortage worse for three long years. If you support affordable housing in our City, Vote NO on Proposition E.

Bill Maher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Balboa Reservoir site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now planned for development of 203 new single family homes. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed — other homes built under this program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom would not otherwise be able to afford home ownership.

San Francisco has the most expensive housing in the nation where last year the average home sold for over $160,000. Housing is difficult to produce because the obstacles are great — little land on which to build, high construction costs and uncertain interest rates.

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost. The initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional land or facilities for City College. The Community College Board, the governing body of City College, in fact recently voted to oppose this initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No” on Proposition E.

John L. Molinari

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

In 1980, the voters of the City and County of San Francisco approved a measure making it City policy to add 20,000 new units of housing within five years. In 1984 in an effort to satisfy this objective, the Board of Supervisors adopted a policy encouraging the expansion of the City’s housing supply. Making surplus City-owned land, such as the site at Balboa Reservoir, available for affordable housing was an important part of that policy. A proposal to build 203 homes on the unused Balboa Reservoir site was advanced to help implement the pro-housing policy.

Approval of Proposition E would HALT construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.

The Balboa Reservoir homes would be built on land currently belonging to the City and County of San Francisco. The property IS NOT part of the City College, and City College has neither plans or money to buy the property and convert it for City College use.

The only debatable issue is the future of affordable housing on the Balboa Reservoir site.

As we are all aware, San Francisco has the most expensive homes in the United States. The average cost of a home is $152,000. Not many can afford such prices. However, the housing proposed for the Balboa Reservoir will give many more citizens the opportunity to become homeowners. The homes to be built will be sold to first-time buyers at prices ranging from $83,000 to $145,000.

Other homes built in San Francisco under the direction of similar affordable housing programs have been snapped up quickly by San Franciscans. Without the program, most would not have been able to purchase the home and become homeowners.

Again, if you desire to preserve the construction of more affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site, vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Willie B. Kennedy
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Additional single family housing is undeniably San Francisco’s most acute social need. When some vacant surplus City land (12 acres) finally becomes available for 203 additional new private homes there will always be some selfish individuals who are in favor of new housing “just so long as it is not built across the street from me!” This unused, vacant City reservoir land hasn’t generated a dime of taxes for over thirty years! Let’s add 203 NEW home-owner taxpayers to the City’s rolls as quickly as possible.

Stop these self-serving no-growth obstructionists! Please vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Prop E would halt affordable housing construction at the Balboa Reservoir site. Many gay people need affordable housing, too, and we join with other community groups urging you to vote NO on Prop E.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Robert Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E, if approved, would block the construction of 203 badly needed single-family homes on the south portion of the Balboa Reservoir in San Francisco. Sixty percent of these homes would be available for purchase by moderate and middle income families at purchase prices between $80,000 and $120,000. They would be constructed on surplus public land and financed by the sale of mortgage revenue bonds to enable the developer to sell the homes at below market prices.

A neighborhood group headed by two city college faculty members is responsible for placing Proposition E on the ballot. The group contends that the land which is intended to be used for the project should be made available instead to City College for the construction of new teaching facilities even though enrollment at City College is declining and the City College Board has voted 6 to 1 to oppose the initiative.

Like many other areas of the country, San Francisco suffers from a shortage of housing. Purchase prices here are among the highest in the nation. The use of surplus public lands and revenue bond financing provide a means for making single family homes available to a broad spectrum of families at affordable prices.

The Balboa Reservoir project is supported by the leaders of 8 neighborhood groups in the area surrounding the location of the proposed project and by a majority of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, as well as by Mayor Dianne Feinstein. We urge you to encourage the construction of this type of housing in San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition E.

San Francisco Board of Realtors
William L. Jansen, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

SAVE OUR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS!
BERNAL HEIGHTS SAYS, “VOTE NO ON PROP E!”

We are residents of Bernal Heights in San Francisco. We’ve worked hard to build affordable family and senior citizen homes in our neighborhood.

We need more affordable housing in our City to survive. The real issue in Prop E is affordable family housing—a “yes” vote prevents the construction of 203 family homes. That’s crazy! Join us in preserving what’s best in our City.

Vote “no” on Prop E!

Sylvia M. Yee, Bernal Heights Community Foundation Board of Directors***
Frank Hutchins, BHCF Board*
Mary Lou Bertolotti, BHCF Board*
Lela Havener, BHCF Board*
Elizabeth Egger, BHCF Board*
Sister Janet Simons, BHCF Board*
Stephen Antonaras, BHCF Board*
Lorenzo R. Dill, BHCF Board*
Barbara Bagot, BHCF Board*
Margaret C. Randolph, Northwest Bernal Block Club*
Maureen Lamb, NWBBC*
Tim Molinaro, BHCF Planning & Dev’t Committee*
Buck Bagot, BHCF P & D Committee*
***Organization for identification purposes only.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco Needs Affordable Housing—
Vote No on Proposition E

Everyone agrees that San Francisco needs affordable housing. The questions are how and where that affordable housing can be built.

The Balboa Reservoir housing development, to be built on the site of a reservoir built thirty years ago and unused since that time, answers those important questions for more than 200 San Francisco first-time homebuying families by providing:

— 203 new affordable three-bedroom, single family homes
— 98% fixed-rate financing
— A mix of 30% low-income, 30% moderate-income and 40% market-rate first time buyers
— A convenient site that has been declared “surplus” by the City and “available for development of affordable housing”

The Balboa Reservoir housing development is a small but significant step in the effort to generate affordable housing in our City.

Thousands of San Franciscans from every community, neighborhood group and viewpoint agree that the Balboa Reservoir development is good for San Francisco. Virtually every elected official, including the Governing Board of City College also agree.

All these San Franciscans ask you to say “yes” to affordable housing and “NO” to Proposition E.

San Francisco Coalition for Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar, Executive Director

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The viable plan for affordable single family housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site is being threatened by Proposition E. If Proposition E passes, 203 single family homes will be lost to the citizenry of San Francisco at a time when they are greatly needed.

The facts about the proposed housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site argue strongly against Proposition E. All 203 homes will be for first time home buyers. One-third of the homes will be available to households earning $27,000. Another third of the homes will be available to households earning $36,000. Adequate parking will be provided within the development itself, thus answering any concerns that traffic in the area will be congested.

City College has no need or plan to use South Balboa Reservoir for its facilities. City College’s priority is to develop its existing campus. South Balboa Reservoir should therefore be used for one of the City’s greatest needs: increased and affordable housing which is available to lower and middle income families.

As homeowners who live in the vicinity of South Balboa Reservoir, we welcome its planned use for single family housing and feel it will become an integral and contributing part of the community. We therefore urge you to vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Submitted by:
Stephen Graham, Chairman of the Housing Sub-committee of the Citizen’s Committee for Community Development
Roderick A. McLeod, Vice-Chairman of the Citizen’s Committee on Community Development

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing is a group of neighbors which consists of many of the renters of Westwood Park and Sunnyside neighborhoods as well as owners and renters of Ingleside which are the closest neighbors to the Balboa Reservoir along with some of the students and teachers of City College.

We strongly support the Balboa Reservoir for housing. We believe that the Balboa Reservoir is an ideal spot for housing.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

As Merchants as well as residents of Ocean Avenue, Greater Ingleside and San Francisco, we support the Development of the Balboa Reservoir as housing.

A Traffic Survey has stated that there will be minimal impact on the existing patterns of traffic by this development.

Additional City College Parking is being considered on another location off 1-280 to keep the college congestion away from the neighborhood’s streets.

City College has 44 more acres in which to expand and existing buildings at City College have viable means to expand.
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We believe that housing on the Balboa Reservoir is the most viable solution to develop a vacant piece of property that is directly adjacent to our stores on a Transpreferential Street.

Affordable housing is in great need in San Francisco and is as much needed here as anywhere. We want to help provide this need. Vote No on Prop. E.

Ocean Avenue Merchants Assoc.
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughy
Submitted by Patricia Vaughy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposal E would stop construction on much-needed affordable, single-family housing at the long vacant south Balboa Reservoir site. This proposition would also block a major housing development that would bring jobs into an area of the city that has little industry or private business.

Sale prices for these units are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the San Francisco housing market, where the average home is selling for $160,000. Construction of these homes will help all young, first-time home buyers and will require only 5% down, instead of the 20% down payment on houses bought with conventional home mortgages.

This plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by nine nearby neighborhood organizations. If Proposition E is approved and this project is blocked, more young adults will purchase their first home in Vallejo or some other outlying area, further draining San Francisco of the young families that every growing community needs.

San Francisco residents will gain apprenticeships, jobs, contracts and subcontracts from this development.

This plan calls for 2 and 3 bedroom, family-sized houses, with space for another bedroom which can be finished when needed.

Each house will have 2½ parking spaces in front and would not cause parking problems in the area. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

City College of San Francisco has no plans to buy the property, has no money for institutional expansion, nor any mention of this land in any master plan. Some supporters of this proposition are motivated by racist notions and have said they fear that this development will become another "Geneva Towers." This type of thinking is similar to support for apartheid practiced in South Africa and must be defeated by progressive San Francisco voters. Property values will increase, instead of a decrease as a result of this project.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition E.

Larry Udlai Johnson-Redd — President, O.M.I. Pilgrim Community Center Inc.
Maria Campbell-Casey — Program Director, Bay Area Engineering Societies Committee for Manpower Training, Inc.
Clara Mills-Bradford — Program Director, O.M.I. Senior Center
John C. Jackson
Linda Rose-Gipson
Jon Still — Secretary, Young Adult Committee
Kenneth Butler

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided — 2 ½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote "No" on Proposition E.

Affordable Housing Alliance — Mitchell Omerberg, Director
Bay Area Urban League — Gregory Best, Field Representative
Bernal Heights Community Foundation — Andre Lennell Daye
Community Educational Services — Dorothy Chen, Executive Director
Japanese Community Youth Council St. Francis Square Apartments, Inc. — Sandra Mabey-Jenkins, Secretary
Minority Contractors Association of Northern California — James Haggabeck, Secretary, Board of Directors
National Community Congress — Dr. Eddie C. Welbon
Parkmerced Residents Organization, Inc. — Ricardo A. Callejo, Esq.
Paterno Hill Neighborhood House — Ecola Maxwell
San Francisco Building Trades Council — Stan Smith
San Francisco Housing & Tenants Council — Joseph Lacey
San Francisco Tenants Union — Jim Raye
Rev. Anna C. Brown — Local Pastor & Community Servant
Greg Day — Chairman, Citizens Committee on Community Development
Polly V. Marshall — Commissioner, San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
Regina A. Steudle
Jim Wachholz — San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Michael E. Willis, AIA — Fleming Corporation
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Greater Ingleside Political Club—Frank Noto, Treasurer
Housing Conservation and Development Corporation—Lennie Lawson, Board of Directors

Members of the Ocean Avenue Merchants Association
James Hayes
John Jung
B. C. Han
Jamalah Kanika

Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing
Rev. Roland Gordon
Dr. S. Bergman
Patricia Vaughn, principal officer
Robert Muelbauer
Lillian Jackson
Monica Urbanske
Davy Tate
Ali Homran
Ah Aogoa
Inez Pride
Bey Fohman
Shirley A. Keith
J. Hamilton
I. Robinson
Thomas Lee
Bung Xi An
Low Dunaitz
Wu Ti

S.N.I.G.
Will H. Reno
Larry Daniels
Ted Mckethan

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Buyview Baptist Minister Fellowship—Rev. N. B. Mills, President
Bread of Life Missionary Baptist Church—Rev. S. A. Bailey
Cosmopolitan Baptist Church—Rev. A. Ray Gentile
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Raymond M. Howard Sr.
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Carele Nelson
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Cornelius P. O’Reilly
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Paul G. Thesier
Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee—Charles Gale, Chairman
St. Peters Housing Committee—Tessa Rouverol

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON’T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
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Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?

YES 296

NO 297

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: With certain exceptions, City officers, including elected officials and commission members, may represent clients before City boards and commissions other than their own, and be paid for their services. State legislators may represent clients before City boards and commissions, and be paid for their services. Any person may contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would prohibit City officers from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay. This proposition would prohibit State legislators from appearing before City boards, commissions and departments on behalf of clients for pay. City officers would be prohibited from discussing with these officers and legislators matters that the City is deciding. Proposition F would also prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit City officers and State legislators from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to allow City officers and State legislators to represent clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to allow any person to contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

How “F” Got on Ballot

On February 26 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for limitations on compensated advocacy and campaign contributions had qualified for the June ballot.

Quentin Kopp, Marth Gillham and Cheryl Arenson, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 9,400 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,986 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The purpose of Proposition F is to cut campaign contributions by large contributors (and thus reduce campaign spending) and eliminate undue influence by officeholders retained as paid lobbyists for projects requiring City approval.

Let's take a minute to analyze the untrue arguments against Proposition F.

- The opponents claim that Proposition F will force half the City's Commissioners to resign. In fact, Proposition F does not force any Commissioners to resign. It simply says they can't be a paid lobbyist and a City Commissioner at the same time. Does a commissioner value making money by lobbying more than public service?

- Some have also alleged that Proposition F will prevent duly-elected union leaders from serving as City Commissioners. No it won't. Proposition F prohibits "compensated advocacy"—that means lobbyists hired by an organization, not members of the organization itself. Proposition F does not apply to salaried employees of labor unions, corporations, or non-profit agencies. Moreover, Section 8.105 of the Charter precludes it specifically from applying to any member serving as a representative of any profession, trade, business, union or association on any board or commission which requires membership of representatives of specific professions, trades, businesses, unions or associations.

- Another untrue argument against Proposition F is that it prohibits City officials only from discussing pending issues with other City officers or State Legislators who are also acting as paid lobbyists in a matter and doesn't stop those officeholding lobbyists from writing City officials about their clients' objectives. That's not so. Proposition F applies to all such lobbying, written or oral. (The dictionary defines "discuss" as "to examine by means of speech or writing.")

End government decision-making by "insiders" and reduce the influence of money on local campaigns.

VOTE YES ON F.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
San Franciscans for Good Government

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

In all our years of observing San Francisco City government, we have found one maxim to be true time after time: a good idea gets copied, especially among politicians.

For no sooner did Quentin Kopp promise to bring Proposition F to the voters than did Mayor Feinstein come up with an informal, administrative version of her own. Fine, you say (and the Mayor says), then why vote Yes on Proposition F?

(1) The Mayor's remedy of asking City Commissioners who also act as lobbyists before City agencies to resign is nothing more than a hand slap, and is good only as long as she is mayor. It's not binding on future mayors and could be changed without any vote of the Board of Supervisors, let alone the people of San Francisco. Proposition F prohibits this kind of conflict-of-interest, and it will be the law, no matter who is mayor.

(2) The Mayor's action did nothing to state legislators who can also act as lobbyists before City Boards and Commissions, nor did her action stop the law or business partners of City Commissioners from picking up the slack in big-money lobbying. Proposition F will stop these practices in their tracks.

(3) What about the other half of Proposition F, which reduced the campaign contribution limit to $500 so that all San Franciscans can enjoy equal access to City officials, not just the ones with the big bucks? The Mayor can't do anything about this, and she hasn't. Only a Yes vote on Proposition F will reduce the weight of big money and ensure our full voice in City elections and City government.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. If it's important enough for the Mayor to copy part of it administratively, it's important enough to do the job right and make it a law.

John J. Barbagelata
Harry ALeo
June Cahn
Dorothy Partridge

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The worst and most persistent problem in American politics is that politicians and political races can be "bought." Reducing the size of campaign contributions will be a step forward in reducing the role of money in elections. Vote yes for more honest government.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

RESTORE to the people their rightful and equal power as individual voters by reducing the monetary clout and influence of private interests who make the laws and the policies as City officials and Commissioners or State legislators.

TELL the special interests that their money and influence can no longer interfere with representative government.

TELL the special interests that the voters will no longer tolerate the influence-buying which comes with large campaign contributions.

TELL the special interests that this measure will encourage highly talented citizens to serve San Francisco honestly and responsibly.

VOTE YES ON F.

Cheryl Arenson
Anne Renfrew
David Pacheco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

"Government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

These noble words from Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, cast in bronze at the entrance to City Hall, seem to have escaped the attention of some City officials who pass by them every day. For in San Francisco City government, Lincoln's simple formula for representative government would read quite differently: "Government of the powerful, by the lobbyists, and for the wealthy."

Government of, by, and for the privileged few is bad government. Government of, by, and for all the people is good government. It's as simple as that—as simple as Lincoln first put it.

Proposition F, the Good Government Initiative, will help San Franciscans maintain control of their government and will prevent undue influence by City officeholders.

To reduce undue influence, Proposition F outlaws the practice of City Commissioners and State Legislators representing special interests for pay before City Commissions and Boards. City Commissions should render their decisions deliberately and impartially, not be swayed by the political clout of the lobbyists appearing before them, or by any political favors those lobbyist/politicians might promise. "I'll scratch your back if you scratch my back" bargains do not belong in government. And until such backroom bargains are made illegal, City government will not belong to the rest of us either.

Proposition F also reduces the maximum amount that anyone can give to a local candidate from $1,000 to $500. If large contributors and other special interests can't give as much money, they can't buy as much influence with elected officials. And the lower the contribution limit, the less campaign spending and the more City government will be responsive to all San Franciscans.

You can "buy back" City government from the privileged and powerful with the most precious of all political commodities: your vote.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Mary Lohneis
Peter Fatooh
Judith Thorson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F, an initiative of the people, is needed to protect the voters and the integrity of the legislative process from being corrupted by the power of money and influence. It prevents City officials and State Legislators from lobbying the City on behalf of high-powered special interests. It also lowers the campaign contribution limit from $1,000 to $500, thus reducing the influence of those same special interests over our elections and elected officials.

The bogus argument that the Mayor won't be able to find qualified people to serve on City commissions if Proposition F is adopted ignores the plain fact that there are 700,000 people in San Francisco, a pool of civic-minded citizens more than large enough to accommodate the 250 commission appointments available in our City government. For example, there are plenty of architects to fill the one architectural appointment on the Art Commission, just as there are plenty of non-lobbyist business people and lawyers available to serve on other commissions.

Thousands of San Franciscans, not just the "insiders", are ready, willing, and able to serve the public.

Proposition F deserves your vote. Restore integrity to City government. Restore the confidence of the citizens of San Francisco in that government. Let's have no more Wilkes Bashford situations.

VOTE YES ON F.

Oscar Sutro
Martha Gillham
Marguerite Harrent

Leonel Monterey
Tony Kilroy
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE "NO" ON F

This proposition disguises itself as "good government" but, in reality, would drive good people out of government. It is so crudely drawn—so sweeping in its implications—that it would bar from government almost anyone with even a remote business or community tie to government.

It would purge from City commissions anyone who "directly or indirectly" receives compensation from any "interests" with an issue before any City agency. Effectively, this could discriminate against employees from community and neighborhood groups, civil rights organizations, non-profit corporations, labor unions, merchant and business groups, as well as architects, lawyers and other professionals.

Actually, there currently are no commissioners who represent any clients before any City agency. All who are appointed in my administration sign a statement saying they will not advocate for any paying client before any official body of the City while they are commissioners. This proposition simply is not necessary.

Proposition F also would lower the limit for any individual campaign contribution from $1000 to $500. Although this sounds good, it would permit a wealthy person with various businesses and numerous family members to contribute many thousands of dollars through different sources. This would encourage "hidden" contributions. We must strive for disclosure of contributions, not a system which drives contributions underground. Candidates must be able to raise funds enough to put their message before the voters. Reducing the contribution limit can be a tactic to discourage persons from challenging incumbents.

Vote no on Proposition F.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition F purports to achieve a noble objective: The removal of "influence peddling" from City Hall. In fact, Proposition F is so poorly-crafted, it may have exactly the opposite effect on City government. It is not a "good government" initiative. It is bad legislation.

Proposition F provides no definitions and no standards for the public to judge whether City officials comply with its restrictions. Its uncertainties will be chaotic and lead to endless, needless lawsuits.

A measure similar to Proposition F was rejected by the Board of Supervisors because no public hearings were ever held on the legislation. If the public had had a chance to comment on this initiative, it might not have the critical shortcomings, deficiencies and uncertainties that now warrant its rejection by responsible San Franciscans.

In the coming months, the Board will review good government measures that are comprehensible, effective and, most important, certain. Proposition F is a misguided disaster.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

This should properly have been titled the "SINK WILLIE BROWN ORDINANCE"! The "meat of the cocoanut" is in Section 4.

Supervisor Kopp's intentions are good, however this sloppily drafted and incomprehensible measure succeeds in "burning down the barn" to eliminate a couple of rats!

Under this proposal, to avoid any potential INDIRECT conflict of interest, (which is undefined!), one would have to be a destitute, unemployed welfare recipient to qualify for service on any City Board or Commission! The Mayor has already solved this "hired advocacy" problem with the "conflict of interest" affidavits she demands IN ADVANCE from any prospective appointee.

Quentin's proposed $500.00 campaign contribution limit is an "inside joke" and he, of all people, knows it! It merely obliges a heavy contributor to have his wife, children, business associates, or friends send in SEPARATE $500.00 checks if he wants to contribute more than $500.00 to a politician's campaign.

These proposals require additional City employees for enforcement and wind up doing far more harm than good. Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Union members and labor officials have legitimate reasons for meeting with City officers. It is unfair and wrong to lump them in the same category as special interest lobbyists, yet that’s exactly what Proposition F does. Working people deserve representation on City boards and commissions. VOTE NO!

Hon. Walter Johnson
Hon. Jeff Greendendorfer
Secretary-Treasurer
Stan Smith
San Francisco Labor Council
Larry Griffin
LeRoy King
Steve Rabissa
James Elliot
Terrence Ryan
Keith Eickman
Jack Beggs
Reeva Olson
Tony Marovich

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

If you want to ban business owners and executives from serving on City boards and commissions, then vote for Proposition F.

If you think board members of non-profit corporations and employees of community agencies have nothing to contribute to City government, then vote for Proposition F.

If you believe union members and labor officials should not have a voice at City Hall, then vote for Proposition F.

But if you share our belief that these individuals have legitimate concerns and expertise that is valuable in running major City departments, then join us in voting NO on Proposition F.

Proposition F is a simplistic, sloppily-drafted, meat axe approach to a problem already resolved by Mayor Feinstein’s ban on commissioners lobbying on behalf of private clients.

Proposition F is not good government and it is not reform. Proposition F is bad legislation. VOTE NO.

Hon. Amy Meyer
Hon. Susan Berman
Hon. Walter Jebe
Donald Dister
Hon. Bruce Lilenheal
Hon. Doris Kahn
Jim Wachob
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Lynda Daley
Hon. Jean Kuran
Todd Williams
Hon. Thomas Horn
Peter Hanson
Hon. Henry Berman
Herbert Karlan
Hon. Robert McCarthy
William Scoorris
Hon. Richard Guggenhine
Van Hart
Hon. Toby Rosenbloom
Iris Fluellen
Hon. Patrick McGrew
Noam Radan
Hon. Kirk Miller
John Schmidt
Hon. Melvin Lee
James Mock
Hon. Jerry Berg
Thomas Karwasky
Hon. Bonnie Gibson
Wendy Goldberg
Hon. Mary Noel Peppp
Joseph Schwartz
Hon. Mark Buhel
Belle Lazarus
Hon. Tim Carocco
Antonio Barrios
Hon. Jo Hanson
Bruce Barnett
Hon. Kevin Malone
Charles Howell
John Sanger
Walter McGuire
Tom Moore
Sharon Davall
Joyce Mauriello

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

We’re sympathetic to the need for political reform. But it’s a complicated problem, and Proposition F just isn’t the way to go.

Frankly, we can’t tell who is and isn’t affected by this measure. While a handful of people sometimes might abuse their positions, that’s no reason to question the integrity of so many solid citizens who give tirelessly to public service. Proposition F is simply the wrong approach. Please join us in voting NO.

William E. McDonnell
Martin D. Murphy
Frances May McAteer
Eugene C. Payne III
N. A. Sapunar
Suzanne B. McCarthy
Caroline and Michael Figoni

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Concerned about elected officials spending $400,000 to run for supervisor and $1 million on a mayor’s race? Then vote NO on Proposition F.

That’s right. NO.

Proposition F isn’t going to do anything about campaign spending. Prop F simply limits the size of contributions, reducing the current limit from $1,000 to $500. Supervisors can and will continue spending outrageous sums on their re-election campaigns. With Proposition F they’ll just spend twice as much time raising money from twice as many sources, and that makes special interests even more powerful. They can always find ways around campaign limits.

We need campaign spending reform, but Proposition F doesn’t provide it. Please join us in voting No on F.

District 8 Democratic Club
District 9 Democratic Club
Stephen L. Tiber
Linda Chapman
Ruth Gravatt
Dale Carlson
Alan Raznick
James Firth
Miriam Blaustein
Debra Barnes
Lew Sethin
Debra Stein

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

When campaign contributions are limited, political freedom suffers. Your right to free speech includes not only your right to express your views, but also your right to support as much as you want, any candidate who speaks for you.

Minority viewpoints depend heavily on the contribution of a few dedicated supporters to get your message out. To limit your financial support of your beliefs is to silence your political voice.

Only incumbents, who have many opportunities for free media exposure benefit from this assault on free speech. The dangers of a campaign contribution limit far outweigh any possible benefit from this proposition. Defeat Proposition F!

San Francisco Libertarian Party
Michael R. Fowler, Secretary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

You may think Prop F only applies to big-time lawyers and a few legislators who represent developers. Think again!

Prop F would prohibit many community leaders from public service. If it passes, board members and employees of community and charitable organizations could be banned from serving on City boards and commissions.

We appreciate the public need for a government free of “influencing peddling.” But restrictions on “compensated advocacy” ought to be clearly and carefully crafted to protect the voices of community leaders who argue on behalf of the public interest, not private special interests.

VOTE NO.

Hon. Juanita Del Carlo
Mission Hiring Hall

Bob Ross
Publisher, Bay Area Reporter

Hon. Jeffrey Ken Mori
Japanese Community Youth Council, Inc.

Bill O'Callahan
American Red Cross

Hon. George Suncin
Horizons Unlimited

Hon. Jean Rita Alviar
Mission Education Project

Hon. Greg Day
Prik Street Town Hall

Hon. Naomi Gray
Hon. James Foster

Carol Wong
Marlena Marseille

Lee Woods
Jo Daly

Dennis Collins
Hon. H. Welton Flynn

(Organizations listed only for purposes of identification.)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will have no effect on developers' lawyers.

None.

It won't make any difference to state legislators either.

Don't kid yourself. This is not "reform" and it isn't "good government." Proposition F will allow the special interests and influence peddlers to continue exercising influence over our elected officials. It has so many loopholes, lobbying will actively continue, untouched, in the back rooms of City Hall.

And developers will always find ways around campaign contribution limits. As Common Cause has noted, Prop F simply makes tracing their dollars more difficult for the public.

Real reform would directly attack the source of huge contributions — the developers and other special interests that employ the lobbyists to peddle their influence.

VOTE NO.

Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
David Looman
Michael Mason

Rich Waller
Susan Klugerman
Rene Cazenave
Margie O'Driscoll

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
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PROPOSITION G

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid? YES 300 NO 301

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has adopted an ordinance prohibiting the City, with certain exceptions, from purchasing goods or services from companies doing business with South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a declaration of policy that says the City must try to avoid doing business with companies that significantly profit from or help maintain the Apartheid system in South Africa. It calls on other public bodies and private groups to adopt similar policies. It directs the Board of Supervisors to identify the companies which have the greatest ties to Apartheid so that the public can also boycott those companies.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to avoid doing business with companies that help maintain Apartheid, and you want a public boycott of those companies.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to adopt this policy.

Controller's Statement on "G"

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

"The proposed Declaration of Policy be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.

How "G" Got on Ballot

On November 6, 1985 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for the City to boycott businesses with significant ties to South Africa had qualified for the June ballot.

Arlo Hale Smith, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,546 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on October II.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,941 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:
It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This measure calls for a public boycott of companies that aid apartheid.

Any claim of "conflict" between Proposition G and existing anti-apartheid legislation is imaginary: It is the legislative intent of supporters of this measure that it can be construed as a directive for making existing law tougher.

Personal attacks have no legitimate place in a ballot measure campaign. As proponent of this measure, I repudiate all such tactics.

Vote NO on apartheid. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Arlo Hale Smith

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Boycotts are grassroots politics. They've helped the farmworkers, they've helped win integration, and they can help end the legal racism called "Apartheid".

A Gallup poll found 77% of South Africa's black majority favoring international economic boycotts to force the Apartheid regime to accept reform peacefully.

After the Boycott Initiative made the ballot, the San Francisco Supervisors unanimously passed a similar city purchasing policy. The issue that remains is whether to call on the general public to join in, boycotting companies identified by the Supervisors as the worst offenders in each industry.

The companies that would be targeted consider profits to be the "bottom line". Economic pressure is all they understand.

The AFL-CIO, NAACP, and NOW have called a boycott of Shell Oil because of its profiteering from South Africa's oppressive economic conditions. Proposition G supports that and would put the same pressure on other industries as well.

This proposition is supported by the elected county central committee of the Democratic Party, the Peace-and-Freedom Party and the Humanist Party, and by leading attorneys, such as Terry Francois, Terence Hallinan, Tony Serra, Lewis Hope Lee, Marc Van Der Hout, Abby Ginsberg and Terence Redmond.

If South Africa were a democracy, its majority would long ago have voted to end Apartheid. We need to vote Yes—because they can't.

Byt: Arlo Hale Smith, Democratic Party County Central Committee
Paul Kangas, Peace and Freedom Party
Lois Salisbury, Public Advocates*
Dr. Kevin Danaher, Food First*
Jesse James, Mission Rebels
Terry Collins, Community Activist
Tony Gebert, Election Action
Robert McCall, Hotel & Restaurant Employees
Executive Board Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Attorneys speak out against Apartheid:

South African police can arrest anyone without charge. They can hold you incommunicado—no contacts with family, lawyers or press.

They regularly censor news, books, music. They have banned Christmas caroling, funerals and other peaceful gatherings. Groups which criticize the government are forbidden to hold meetings.

Blacks are subject to legal segregation; their property and employment rights are greatly restricted; often, they are simply murdered.

As attorneys, we help people who have legal rights that are being violated. But what can we do for those who have no legal rights?

Boycotts and other economic sanctions are the only way to make the Apartheid government accept reform peacefully.

In the Court of World Public Opinion, Apartheid has been convicted of crimes against humanity. By imposing a sentence of economic isolation, we can end Apartheid.

Vote Yes—take a stand for justice.

Terence Hallinan
Arlo Hale Smith
Terry Francois
Karen Anderson Ryer
Robert R. Bryan
Ann Menasche
Rachel Ginsburg
Leo Pardi
Gabriel Gesmer
Ora Pouchovnick
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is a moderate, responsible but effective proposal to bring economic pressure on the South African government to establish constitutional rights for all of its citizens.

Vote Yes.

---

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

All decent Americans abhor apartheid. However, boycotting U.S. investment in South Africa is counterproductive; it only penalizes the actual victims of apartheid.

U.S. international firms have acted as progressive agents for change through the Sullivan principles. Their investments have improved the social and economic condition of the labor force.

It is improper to penalize their positive contributions.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

We are individuals and organizations working actively to end the racist system of apartheid in South Africa. And we are voting NO on Proposition G.

Why?

(1) Because Proposition G will weaken San Francisco's present divestment law. This law requires companies doing business with the city to sign affidavits that they will make no new contracts with South Africa.

Proposition G has no such provision.

(2) Proposition G provides no mechanism or funding to carry out its declared purpose of "boycotting" South Africa.

Proposition G will not stop South African products from entering the Port of San Francisco.

Vote against this useless, confusing, and deceptive initiative.

---

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1983 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!

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

PROPOSITION H

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Several city and private agencies conduct various programs related to AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a declaration of policy that says San Francisco should support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council, consisting of a Committee on Education and a Fund-Raising Committee. The Research Committee would make recommendations on the most useful AIDS research projects and try to prevent duplication of efforts. The Education Committee would inform the public about the latest research and about ways to prevent AIDS. The Fund-Raising Committee would seek donations and grants for AIDS research and education projects.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

“The proposed Declaration of Policy for an AIDS research and education council and the formation of advisory committees of civic leaders would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, additional expenditure of public funds for AIDS research may result, the amount of which cannot be determined.”

How “H” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for AIDS research had qualified for the June ballot.

Stony Gebert, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 10,540 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on December 6, 1985.

A check of each signature on the petition showed that 7,564 of the signatures were valid. This is more than 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We need a council to expose and address major AIDS issues without the impasse of present medical/political bias.

As taxpayers, we are subsidizing a treadmill of continual AIDS casualties. There are major oversights where AIDS is concerned. Only recently was it learned that CDC statistics suggest 79% of early AIDS cases appear drug-related. We hear AIDS is 100% fatal. Perhaps that is because death may also be drug-related in the way of immuno-suppressive antibiotic and radiation overloads to already compromised immunity systems. Prevailing medicine is both tunnel-visioned and high-profit motivated. Also well-funded. This solution may be part of the problem. Some physicians are beginning to feel where AIDS is concerned many current practices are ethically, medically bankrupt.

Remissions occur. Largely through immunity-enhancing, holistic medicine. Significantly, only 1% of AIDS cases occur among people at risk in the Asian community. Perhaps this is due to less drug abuse or use of an unfunded, ignored resource: herbology as part of diet. More options: homeopathy, acupuncture, etc.

If, as anticipated, upwards of 40% of those testing positive come down with AIDS, we may become overburdened. To ignore all of the above becomes part of the problem. Vote Yes on Proposition H.

Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Rich McKirkey, Former Orderly,
Marketing Associate, Pacific Bell
Joseph P. Clady, AIDS Hospice, Shanti Counselor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There is great need for research and education about AIDS and related conditions.

We need to attack the disease, not its victims.

Knowledge is the only vaccine available today.

Vote Yes.

John Lorenzini, President,
People With AIDS Alliance
Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Jan Beck, Steven Russell, Eugene Ewins, ARC/AIDS Vigil

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There are many possible treatments for AIDS and related conditions which are not being examined by the federal government, especially therapies based on natural substances and processes.

Vote Yes for an AIDS Research Council open to all viewpoints.

Scott Gregory, M.D.
Paul Kangas

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

A tape recording (Talking Book) of the San Francisco Voter Information pamphlet is available from the San Francisco Public Library’s branch for the blind. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

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

Name__________________________________________________________

Address________________________________________________________ Apt. #_______

Telephone No. (required)________________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes ☐ no ☐

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any)____________________________________

Signature_______________________________________________________
PROPOSITION I

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway? YES 307 NO 308

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the Freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a policy statement asking whether or not the Embarcadero Freeway should be torn down.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City’s policy to remain as it is, and you want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to change the City’s policy, and you do not want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway demolished, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by at least $10.2 million in local funds. Potential private sector financing and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “I” Got on Ballot

On March 3 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy placing the question of demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway before the voters had qualified for the June ballot.

Richard Hongisto, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 11,119 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,720 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

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

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
FROM:

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT—VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to 15.7 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown, Fisherman's Wharf and the financial district would be reduced.

Travel within the city would be slowed down at all hours. Vote no to the destruction of the freeway.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:

• Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.

• Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $468 million.

• If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that

—By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will in-
crease from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.

—Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.

—MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.

—Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Judith Tornese

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Tear it down? The concept is preposterous! There are 70,000 cars a day whizzing by on this high speed downtown elevated waterfront freeway! Where will they all go?

Aside from the outrageous demolition costs involved, (some engineers estimate $40,000,000 of taxpayer money!), eyeball observation, logic, and just plain "common sense" dictates that ground level "total gridlock" will result if this expensive freeway is now destroyed.

Nostalgic individuals must realize that the times have changed! We can't bring the Bay back up to Montgomery Street! On behalf of San Francisco's overburdened taxpayers, we urge a NO vote!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled.
Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

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

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?

YES 310  NO 311

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a policy statement that says that the City would replace the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt a policy statement which says that the Embarcadero Freeway would be torn down if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt a policy statement to replace the Embarcadero Freeway under these conditions.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway replaced with a tree-lined six lane boulevard and other traffic and transit improvements, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by approximately $27.5 million. This includes a one-time freeway demolition cost of $10.2 million plus $17.3 million required to match potential federally-funded transit improvements. Potential financing by the State and private sector and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “J” Got on Ballot

On March 5 a declaration of policy regarding the future of the Embarcadero Freeway was delivered to the Registrar from the Mayor and several supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows the Mayor or four or more supervisors to submit a declaration of policy to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

In addition to Mayor Feinstein, the March 5 document was signed by Supervisors Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker, Molinari, Kennedy and Nelder.

POLLs ARE OPEN
FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans now have a chance to remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with an at-grade, six-lane parkway, which will open our waterfront and restore views blocked for years by this large freeway.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for traffic and transit improvements:

- New, shorter freeway ramps connecting directly with The Embarcadero;
- A tree-lined, at-grade, 6-lane Embarcadero Boulevard, with a new waterfront Muni line, a jogging and bicycle path from Fisherman's Wharf to Mission Bay;
- Extension of Muni Metro south to the Caltrain station at 4th and Townsend;
- New ramps connecting I-280 with The Embarcadero;
- Changes in traffic flow and improvements to existing freeway ramps.

Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf will be preserved and enhanced.

The Board of Supervisors has specified that the Embarcadero Freeway will be torn down only if preliminary engineering during the next two years confirms—as traffic and environmental studies already have—that removal of the freeway will not result in more problems than it solves.

San Francisco became eligible for $88 million in federal highway funds for this new system when the Supervisors approved the plan in 1980. The $10.2 million cost of freeway demolition itself can be paid from revenues from low-rise development of the parcels now under the Broadway ramps and the increased values of nearby properties. Strict waterfront zoning limits the size of any development.

Traffic and environmental studies by the California Department of Transportation since 1980 clearly indicate that the new waterfront transportation system will be vastly superior to the existing situation, and that traffic congestion levels will not be notably different with the elevated structure removed.

Vote Yes on J and let's remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with a parkway and transit system—once again let us see our waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J gives the voters a chance to be heard on an important and timely issue. This issue is the replacement of a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway as one element of a comprehensive package of transportation improvements in the Waterfront area.

Last fall, the Board of Supervisors adopted for further study a set of traffic and transit improvements for the Waterfront. These improvements include:

- A new landscaped surface-level boulevard
- Replacement of the Clay/Washington and Broadway on and off ramps with new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom
- Removal of the unused stub of I-280 and construction of new ramps connecting the new waterfront boulevard to Route I-280
- A new light rail transit line linking Fort Mason with the Caltrain Depot
- Extension of the Muni Metro to the train depot, improving the Peninsula Commute Service

A YES vote on Proposition J does not allocate funds for these projects. It does allow for further design and engineering studies, including cost analysis, assessment of impacts on traffic, and other matters. The studies will then be presented to the Supervisors so that they can make an informed decision on the plan. If the studies prove positive, San Francisco will be able to transform its Waterfront for the benefit of all.

Proposition J will ensure that the City will not proceed with the removal of any of the Freeway until all the studies are completed and all potential consequences are assessed. This is the responsible approach. Vote YES on J.

SPUR
League of Women Voters
Embarcadero Citizens Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SAN FRANCISCO'S NEIGHBORHOODS ASK YOU TO VOTE YES ON J.

REDUCE TRAFFIC CONGESTION—YES ON J!
Traffic backed up by the Embarcadero Roadway slows travel and creates congestion in North Beach and other nearby neighborhoods. J will speed traffic flow.

IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION—YES ON J!

(continued)
RESTORE THE WATERFRONT—YES ON J!
San Francisco's waterfront could become a focal point for the city, graced by a grand promenade, instead of the dismal, deteriorating eyesore it is now.
San Francisco's neighborhoods join together to ask your support for an improved Embarcadero. We guarantee the freeway will not be removed unless it is replaced by facilities that will assure a smoother, more efficient traffic flow. YES ON J!
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Robert Bradford
Ruth Gravanis
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Anita Sanchez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SUPPORT PUBLIC TRANSIT—VOTE YES ON J.
SAVE SAN FRANCISCO FROM GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON J.

The revitalization of the Northeastern Waterfront...as included in San Francisco's Master Plan and transit plans, as overwhelmingly approved by the Board of Supervisors and as urged by Mayor Feinstein...will allow almost $90 million in unused federal highway funds to be used for vital downtown and waterfront transit and street improvements which will be a key to reducing needless auto congestion in San Francisco.

PROPOSITION J SUPPORTS IMPORTANT TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS TO THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT. It will:
—extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific/CalTrain depot
—create a new rail line (possibly using historic streetcars) to connect the entire waterfront from Mission Bay to the Ferry Building to Fishermans Wharf and Fort Mason
—set the stage for a possible streetcar line along Third Street
Since the city of San Francisco adopted the Transit First policy in the early 1970's, transit investments in the Muni Metro,

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A SOUND BUSINESS PROPOSAL—YES ON J!

Common sense and good business demand we make the most of our resources. San Francisco's waterfront is an economic and civic asset unrivaled anywhere—yet much of it is cut off by an ugly, noisy, elevated roadway. The traffic improvements called for by Proposition J will benefit workers, tourists, property owners, neighborhoods,...and business.

Traffic flow and transit will move quickly on a realigned, reorganized Embarcadero Roadway, allowing easier, more pleasant access to waterfront businesses.

An improved and beautified Embarcadero will create new commercial opportunities and increase the value of existing property and businesses.

New jobs and an expanded tax base will generate increased revenue for the city as several lots now covered by freeway ramps return to productive private ownership. Though limited to low rise development (40 to 65 feet), tax revenues from development will more than make up the city's share of the project.

in new electric trolley an articulated bus service, and in BART and Golden Gate Transit, have saved downtown San Francisco from gridlock!

IF you are concerned about the future of transit in San Francisco, IF you are concerned about reducing needless auto congestion, THEN we urge you to join Mayor Feinstein and the majority of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in voting Yes on Proposition J.

Norman Reif
San Francisco Muni Coalition
California Transit League
Jack Whooley
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Regina Swed
Tony Kilroy
Hon. Jack Morrison
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Bay Area Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Hon. Amy Meyer, Recreation and Park Commissioner
Alan Lubliner

Robert Meyers
Dennis J. Potts
Kenneth R. Leach
M. Arthur Gensler, Jr., BIA
James T. Chuppell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Dohart, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones

Chuck Forester
David M. Harliley
Donald P. Black
Mrs. Bland Platt
Richard Reinhards
James W. Haas
James Ream
Jill M. Jones
Peter J. Locke
Marjorie G. Stern
John B. Lowry
Lawrence Furlinetti
Nancy Peters
Steven Tabor
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Embarcadero Freeway Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J OFFERS RESIDENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO A ONCE IN A LIFETIME OPPORTUNITY TO RECAPTURE THEIR WATERFRONT.

Converting the Embarcadero into a tree-lined boulevard and building a new streetcar line will make the waterfront more pedestrian and transit oriented, that is, more people oriented.

A freeway structure that is a source of objectionable noise and casts a pall over a large part of the waterfront will be removed.

The waterfront will be opened up to sunlight and fresh air and made more inviting and cheerful to those who wish to walk on one of the world’s outstanding waterports. Air pollution that is now retained by the existing elevated structure will be dissipated.

The transit orientation of the new waterfront will encourage energy conservation. Proposition J will:

— Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero
— Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line
— Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won’t benefit San Francisco. Don’t let outsiders determine our future. VOTE YES ON J FOR A BETTER SAN FRANCISCO.

Sierra Club
Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage
Wilfunda McCreA
Bob Cramer
Rebecca Evans
Richard Livingston
Marilyn Clements
Jessie Lew
Jeffrey Henne
Jane Winstone
Roger Boyer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J GIVES US A CHANCE TO CORRECT A COLOSSAL MISTAKE!

The Embarcadero Freeway should never have been built. The original plan was to build a freeway from bridge to bridge, destroying the Northern Waterfront, Fisherman’s Wharf, Fort Mason, and Marina Green in the process. When the people of San Francisco saw what was happening, they stopped it in mid-air—literally.

Walk under it. Hear the noise. Feel the gloom. See how it cuts out light.

It’s time to remove this mistake.

The new waterfront plan will give us a tree-lined boulevard, a new streetcar line, and a Muni Metro extension to the Southern Pacific/Caltrain depot. It will give us a transit and pedestrian oriented waterfront that will give us pride and pleasure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J!

San Francisco Tomorrow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, with a membership of 1700 working architects in San Francisco, urges a “YES” vote on Proposition J. In 1968 the citizens of San Francisco stopped highway planners from ringing our waterfront with freeways. Today voters have another opportunity to return the waterfront to our citizens. Removal of the Embarcadero Freeway is one part of a carefully researched transit plan for San Francisco. This proposition supplies an unique opportunity to carry out a broad range of transportation improvements that will have many positive effects on the City of San Francisco.

Removal of the freeway will:

1. Return the waterfront to the people by removing this barrier to access and view.
2. Facilitate needed MUNI improvements.
3. Encourage development of the Embarcadero as a grand civic boulevard unifying the City of San Francisco.

The members of the American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition J and “YES” on Proposition J.

Donald Kennedy, FAIA
President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans love Their City, the ambiance, the Bay, waterfront, the views, the healthy neighborhoods.
Freeway builders did their damnest to destroy the City and divide our neighborhoods.
Now we can remove that damned spot, the concrete dinosaur, the hideous barrier that destroys our scenic views, the fence that keeps us from the Bay, the concealer of the Ferry Building.
Correct a mistake.

VOTE YES ON J.

Miriam Blaustein
Charlene Clark
Marie Cleasby
Zach Cowan
Dick Groshold
Rick Hauptman

Tony Kilroy
Jean Korium
Ira Kirlander
Jack Morrison
Andy Nash
Norman Rolfe

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

NO ON PROPOSITION J.
"J" is for JOKE—a cruel joke on us. What will J really do? Add traffic to every street east of Gough. Delay the construction of waterfront streetcar service. Cost millions in local dollars needed to improve MUNI. Create a ground-level freeway on the waterfront as big as Van Ness, with more cars.
I'm a private citizen who's concerned about traffic and what it's doing to our City. If you are too, vote NO on Proposition J.

Steve Colman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
- Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
- Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
- If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
  — By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
  — Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
  — MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
  — Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Blair C. Pascoe

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

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:
1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION A

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by boldface type.

3.202 Office of Risk Management
There is established under the chief administrative officer an office of risk management which shall review, analyze and report to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the finance committee of the board of supervisors the practices of the several departments, boards and commissions of the city and county regarding loss prevention and risk management, including the insurance requirements of the city and county.

The office shall also establish and assist in the implementation of planning and operational guidelines regarding risk management and loss prevention for each department, board or commission. The chief administrative officer may appoint, at his or her pleasure, or contract with, a qualified individual or organization for the operation of the office. The qualifications of the individual or organization operating the office shall include relevant education, training and experience in insurance and risk management.

3.401 City Attorney
(a) The city attorney shall be an elective officer. He shall furnish an official bond in the sum of ten thousand dollars ($10,000). He shall appoint, and at his pleasure may remove, all assistants and employees of his office. He shall devote his entire time and attention to the duties of his office. He must, at the time of his election, be an elector of the city and county, qualified to practice in all the courts of the state, and he must have been so qualified for at least 10 years next preceding his election.

The city attorney must represent the city and county in all actions and proceedings in which it may be legally interested, or, for or against the city and county, or, any officer of the city and county in any action or proceeding, when directed so to do by the supervisors, except where a cause of action exists in favor of the city and county against said officer.

Whenever any cause of action exists in favor of the city and county, the city attorney shall commence the same within his knowledge or when directed so to do by the supervisors. He shall give his advice or opinion in writing to any officer, board or commission of the city and county when requested. Except as otherwise provided in this charter, he shall not settle or dismiss any litigation for or against the city and county, unless, upon his written recommendation, he is ordered so to do by ordinance.

The city attorney shall prepare, or approve as to form, all ordinances before they are enacted by the supervisors. He shall approve, by endorsement in writing, the form of all official or other bonds required by this charter or by ordinance before the same are submitted to the proper commission, board or office for final approval, and no such bonds shall be finally approved without such approval as to form by the city attorney. Except as otherwise provided in this charter provided, he shall prepare in writing the draft or form of all commissions before the same are executed on behalf of the city and county. He shall examine and approve the title of all real property to be acquired by the city and county.

He shall keep on file in his office copies of all written communications and opinions, also all papers, briefs and transcripts used in matters wherein he appears; and books or records and registers of all actions or proceedings in his charge in which the city and county or any officer or board thereof, is a party or is interested.

(b) The duties of the city attorney in connection with the bureau of delinquent revenue collection shall be transferred to and performed by the attorney for said bureau who shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

c) There is established in the office of the city attorney a bureau of claims investigation and administrative

ministration which shall have the responsibility of investigating, evaluating and processing for the several boards, commissions and departments all claims for money or damages made upon the city and county pursuant to section 7.703 of this charter or the general law of the State of California. Claim investigation functions of the police department in existence on June 4, 1986, shall continue as an adjunct to the bureau established under this section. Claims functions of the public utilities commission shall remain under that commission unless transferred to the bureau of claims investigation and administration by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the bureau shall also have the power to investigate events and occurrences giving rise to potential civil liability against the city and county and adjust and settle demands, within dollar limits to be established by ordinance, prior to their presentation as claims. There shall be established by ordinance a revolving fund to satisfy such demands adjusted prior to their presentation as claims. The bureau shall be responsible for the investigation of all claims and the analysis of city policies and practices upon which the bureau shall report and advise the several departments.

The city attorney shall appoint a chief of the bureau who shall serve at his or her pleasure. The chief of the bureau may appoint, subject to confirmation by the city attorney, investigators who shall serve at the pleasure of the chief; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of civil claims investigator or any equivalent classification on the date of approval of this amendment by the electorate shall continue to have civil service status to said position under the civil service provisions of this charter.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by underlining.

7.100 Materials, Supplies and Equipment
The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreements for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals by any department, works of art for museums and other archives or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract. All purchases in excess of one thousand dollars ($1,000) shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases and a permanent record of all such quotations shall be kept. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) for materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section.

The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient uncumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of materials, supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two or more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to that department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned and may advertise for
bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own productive capacity. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall direct the rejection of all articles which may be below standards, specifications or samples furnished. He shall not approve any bill or voucher for articles not in conformity with specifications, or which are at variance with any contract.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall also have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops hereunto maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for and in use in all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.

7.103 Requisition, Contract and Payment

All purchase orders and contracts shall be based on written requisitions, or, for materials, or supplies in common use in the various departments, on the purchaser's records of average use by all departments. Purchase orders and contracts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) must be approved by the chief administrative officer. Beginning with the fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall approve all bids and vouchers for materials, supplies, equipment, and contractual services before the controller shall draw and approve warrants therefor. All contracts for the purchase of materials, supplies and equipment shall be made after inviting sealed bids by publication. All sealed bids received shall be kept on file. When an award of contract is made, notice that the same has been made shall be given by one publication, and any interested person may examine the bids and records at the purchaser's office.

The purchaser of supplies shall by rules and regulations, approved by the chief administrative officer and the controller, designate and authorize appropriate officials in the purchase department to exercise the purchaser's signature powers for purchase orders and contracts approved as provided in this charter.

7.200 Public Works and Purchasing Contracts

The construction, reconstruction, repair of public buildings, purchase of public works or improvements, and the purchasing of supplies, materials and equipment, when the expenditure involved in each case shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), shall be done by contract, except as otherwise provided in this charter. This shall not constitute official misconduct to split or divide any public work or improvement or purchase into two or more units for the purpose of evading the contract provisions of this section. In an emergency, provided an actual emergency be declared by the board of supervisors to exist, and when authorized by resolution of said board, any public work or improvement may be executed in the most expeditious manner. Notwithstanding any other provision in this section or this charter contained, upon the approval of the chief administrative officer declaring the work to be emergency in character, there may be expended by the department of public works the sum not to exceed five hundred dollars ($500) for new construction of any type in or upon unimproved or unsanitary streets.

Any public work or improvement estimated to cost less than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) may be performed under contract or written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county. Any public work or improvement executed by the city, other than routine repair work, shall be authorized by the chief administrative officer when the cost exceeds fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or by the heads of departments not under the chief administrative officer, only after detailed estimates have been prepared and submitted by the head of the department concerned. There shall be separate accounting for each work or improvement so executed, which accounting shall include all direct, indirect and supervisory elements of cost chargeable to such work or improvement, and each cost accounting shall be reported to the chief administrative officer, or to the mayor when such work shall have been performed by departments not under the chief administrative officer. All such accounts shall be reported to the controller. Any public work or improvement, other than those less than fifteen thousand dollars fifty thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), and not performed by the city and county labor, materials, and supplies, and shall, if not performed under contract, be covered by written order or agreement which shall be based on not less than three bids, notice of which shall be given by three days' posting. Records of such bids shall be kept by the department.

When the expenditure for any public work or improvement shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), the same shall be done by contract, except as otherwise provided in this charter. The head of the department in charge shall be responsible for the work for which a contract is to be let, or the purchaser of supplies in the case of purchases of materials, supplies and equipment, shall let such contract to the lowest and responsible bidder not less than ten days after advertising by one publication for sealed proposals for the work, improvements or purchase contracts. Each such advertisement shall contain the reservation of the right to reject any and all bids. The officer responsible for the awarding of any such contract shall require from all bidders information concerning their experience and financial qualifications, as provided by general law relative to such investigations authorized by department of public works.

The board of supervisors, with the approval of the chief administrative officer for bids in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or the department head concerned, with the approval of the board or commission to which he is responsible, may reject any and all bids and readvertise for bids.

The department head or the purchaser of supplies, as the case may be, shall have power to sign such contract for the estimated expenditures thereunder not in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000). Any contract involving the expenditure of more than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), if for the purchase of materials, supplies or equipment, shall require the joint approval of the purchaser of supplies and the chief administrative officer. If such contract is for any public work or improvement, it shall require the joint approval of the department head and the chief administrative officer for amounts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), relative to departments under his jurisdiction, or the signature of the department head and the approval by resolution of the board or commission concerned for departments not under the chief administrative officer.

The board of supervisors, by ordinance, shall establish procedures whereby applicable city and county departments may file sealed bids for the execution of any work to be performed under contract. If such bid is the lowest, the contract shall be awarded to the department. Accurate unit costs shall be kept of all direct and indirect charges incurred by the department under any such contract, which unit costs shall be reported to and audited by the controller monthly and on the completion of the work.

In any case where the lowest gross price or unit cost bid is not accepted, and a contract is entered into with another bidder, written report shall be made to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the controller by the officer authorized to execute the contract, with the reasons for failure to accept such lowest bid.

If any provision of this section is in conflict with any provision of section 7.100 of the charter, the provisions contained in section 7.100 shall govern and control.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.

7.201 Public Works Contracts Procedure by Ordinance

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter and, in particular, the provisions of section 7.200, the board of supervisors shall by ordinance determine the monetary limits not to exceed fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), within which the construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements may be done by contract or by written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county, consistent, save as to monetary limits, with the manner provided for in section 7.200 and 7.201.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D, Continued from page 25

point two commissioners to terms of one year each, one commissioner to a term of two years, one commissioner to a term of three years and one commissioner to a term of four years. Thereafter, the terms of the commissioners shall be for four years from the commencement thereof. No less than one-four members of said commission shall be of the same sex, and one member shall have prior experience representing labor and one member shall have prior experience representing management.

The sections so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of one hundred dollars ($100).

Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of examining and adopting examination questions shall not be open to the public. The meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission, other than the regular daily working hours of 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Such persons and persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

In accordance with section 3.500, the commission shall have the power and it shall be its duty to appoint an executive assistant to be the administrative head of the affairs under its control who shall serve at its pleasure; provided, however, that any person who has a civil service status to the position of assistant secretary to the civil service commission on the effective date of this section as amended shall continue to have civil service status in the position of executive assistant under the civil service provisions of this charter.

3.661 General Powers and Duties

(a) The civil service commission shall be the employment and personnel department of the city and county and shall determine appointments on the basis of merit and fitness, as shown by appropriate tests.

The commission shall classify, and from time to time may reclassify, in accordance with duties and responsibilities of the employment and training and experience required, all places of employment in the departments and offices of the city and county not specifically exempted by this charter from the civil service provisions of such, or which may be created hereafter by general law and not specifically exempted from said civil service provisions. The commission shall likewise classify all other positions or other places of employment in the city and county service specifically exempted from the civil service provisions of this charter, but which, by the provisions of this charter or from time to time may reclassify classification for salary standardization purposes on the basis of duties and responsibilities of the employment and training and experience required. The civil service commission shall be the judge of such classification.

The commission shall also, in accordance with duties and responsibilities, allocate, and from time to time may re-allocate, the positions to the various classes of the classification. The allocation or reallocation of a position shall not adversely affect the civil service rights of an occupant regularly holding such position. No person shall hold a position outside of the classification to which he has been appointed; provided that every employee of any department or office shall discharge any of the duties pertaining to such department or office to which his chief may temporarily assign him.

The class titles and class numbers assigned to positions by the commission shall be used in all records, reports, statements and communications, including the compensation schedule, annual budget and salary ordinance, payroll, and appropriation ordinances.

The commission shall adopt rules to carry out the civil service provisions of this charter and, except as otherwise provided in this charter, such rules shall govern applications; examinations; eligibility; duration of eligible lists; certification of eligibles; appointment; transfers; promotions; resignations; lay-offs or reduction in force, both permanent and temporary, due to lack of work or funds, reemployment, or completion of work; the filling of positions; temporary, seasonal and permanent; classification; approval of payrolls; and such other matters as are not in conflict with this charter. The commission may, upon one-week's notice, make changes in the rules, which change shall thereupon be printed, and be in force; provided that no such changes in rules shall affect a case pending before the commission. The secretary may certify eligibles and payrolls and conduct examinations under the rules of the commission.

The commission shall have power to institute and prosecute legal proceedings for violations of any of the civil service provisions of this charter.

(b) The civil service commission shall establish an inspection service for the purpose of investigating the conduct of and action of appointees in all positions and of securing records of service for promotion and other purposes. All departments and agencies shall cooperate with the commission in making its investigations and any person hindering the commission or its agents shall be subject to suspension.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the civil service commission shall by rule establish procedures for the investigation and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. The determination rendered under civil service commission procedures shall be final and shall forthwith be enforced by every employee and officer.

3.661 General Powers and Duties

(a) The civil service commission shall have the power to inquire into the operation of the personnel system of the city and county to ensure compliance with the principles set forth in section 3.330. After such inquiry, the commission may recommend to the personnel director, as established pursuant to section 3.663, the mayor or to any other officer of the city and county such action as the commission believes necessary to carry out the civil service provisions of this charter. In any hearing conducted by the civil service commission or by any hearing officer it appoints, the commission or the hearing officer shall have the power to subpoena and require the attendance of witnesses and the production of records as provided in section 3.701.

(b) The civil service commission may require periodic reports from the personnel director in a manner and form which it shall prescribe.

The civil service commission may hear appeals from an action of the personnel director with respect to:

1. Allegations of discrimination. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the civil service commission regarding allegations of discrimination shall forthwith be enforced by every officer and employee.

2. Allegations of fraud.

3. Allegations of conflict of interest, pursuant to section 8.105.

(d) No action by the personnel director which is the subject of any appeal shall be stayed during the appeal process except by the unanimous vote of the civil service commission.

(e) The commission shall be notified of the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal of personnel regulations and may comment on such proposals. The adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing political fraud or allegations of discrimination shall be subject to ratification by the commission. In addition, the adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions to director and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the civil service commission and whose job function is placed under the department of personnel administration shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job function had not, by amendment to this charter, been placed under the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration.

The department of personnel administration shall be the personnel department for the city and county and shall provide a means to recruit, select, certify, appoint, train, evaluate, promote career development, classify positions, administer salaries, administer employee discipline, discharge and other personnel activities in order to maintain an effective and responsive work force.

3.663 Personnel Director

(a) A personnel director shall be appointed and serve at the pleasure of the mayor provided, however, that the personnel director shall be selected from candidates nominated by any civil service commission and confirmed by vote of the board of supervisors. The mayor may appoint acting personnel director pending confirmation. The personnel director shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am appointed to appoint qualified employees to public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of personnel director in the spirit of this declaration."

(b) The personnel director shall conduct appropriate examinations for employment, establish eligible lists based on their results and provide for certification of eligibles. The action of the personnel director on examination matters including,
but not limited to, announcements, minimum qualifications, classes of applicants, components, construction, weight, condition, type, list length, duration and certification shall be final.

(e) The personnel director shall adopt personnel regulations which, except as otherwise provided in this charter, shall govern both the administrative matters within the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration and the exercise of the authority granted in this section, including, but not limited to, recruitment; applications; examinations; eligibility; duration of eligible lists; certification of eligibles; permanent, temporary and provisional appointments; regular personnel examinations; temporary examinations; lay-offs; suspension in force due to lack of work or lack of funds, reorganization, retenchment or completion of work; and classification. No personnel regulations shall be adopted, amended or repealed without a prior public hearing upon at least two weeks public notice by the personnel director and after meet and confer sessions with recognized employee organizations as required by state law. All civil service commission rules relevant to the foregoing as well as the provisions of former sections 8.322, 8.323, 8.326, 8.328, 8.329, 8.330, 8.331, 8.332 and 8.340 of this charter shall become personnel regulations on the effective date of this charter amendment.

(f) The personnel director shall conduct the salary surveys for the civil service commission as set forth elsewhere in this charter.

(g) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall establish procedures to review and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the personnel director shall for all time be enforceable by every employee and officer, unless the decision is appealed to the civil service commission in accordance with personnel regulations.

(h) The personnel director shall investigate all employee complaints concerning job related conduct of City and County employees and shall promptly report to the source of the complaint.

(i) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall promote effective and efficient management through personnel programs that enhance employee welfare and competency.

(j) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall provide a procedure for resolution of employee disputes which shall be consistent with other provisions of this charter and shall be utilized by all department heads and appointing officers upon the expiration of the existing term of appointment, if applicable.

(k) Consistent with the foregoing and other applicable provisions of this charter, the personnel director shall delegate to the various appointing officers appropriate personnel responsibilities, including but not limited to appropriate disciplinary procedures, and consult with appointing officers with respect to personnel regulations affecting the employees.

(l) Personal services contracts shall be reviewed and approved by the personnel director in accordance with the provisions of appropriate personnel regulations. Personal services contracts reasonably expected to involve payment by the city and county of more than ten thousand dollars ($10,000) shall be also reviewed and approved by the Commission. Failure of the Commission to act within 30 days of submission of the contract by the personnel director shall be deemed to constitute approval by the commission.

(k) The personnel director shall establish a system of job classification. The provisions of section 8.200 shall govern whenever new classifications are created or existing positions are reclassified. The personnel director shall be the judge of such classification determinations.

(l) From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the department of personnel administration shall determine whether a position within a classification is, "in character", temporary or permanent. Appointments—made on a provisional or temporary basis when completion is required, is a provisional basis.

(m) Excepting sections 8.350, 8.360, 8.361, 8.105, 8.107, but the second to the last paragraph of section 8.341, section 8.346, the last sentence of section 8.408, but all the last three words in the first sentence of the third paragraph of section 8.401, sections 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.406, 8.407 and 8.408 and the words "civil service commission" or "commission" appear in the personnel provisions of this charter, they shall be replaced by the words "department of personnel administration", "department", "personnel director" or "director" as the context permits, the word "rule" or "rules" replaced by the words "personnel regulation" or "regulations," the words "general manager, personnel" and "secretary of the civil service commission" shall be replaced by the words "personnel director" and the words "section 3.663" shall be replaced by the words "section 3.662" or "section 3.663", as appropriate.

The clerk of the board of supervisors, after consultation with the city attorney, is hereby directed to conform the language of the charter as herein amended when next the charter is submitted for republication.

8.322 Protest of Written Questions and Answers

After the written portion of a civil service examination—has—been—held, the questions used and answers thereon, shall be available for review by the participants. This review period shall not apply to questions and answers on any continuous or standardized—entrance—or concurrent—entrance and promotional written—tests. During the review period, participants shall be granted the opportunity to protest questions or answers they believe to be incorrect or improper. After all protests have been acted on and after the final rating key has been adopted, the identification sheets have been opened, further changes in the rating key shall not be made.

8.323 Protest of Tentative List of Eligibles—

Following the completion of any examination, a tentative list of eligibles shall be posted for the inspection of the public and of participants. The posting period shall be for a minimum of one (1) month and five (5) working days for promotional examination and two (2) working days for entrance examination. During this period a fee for the inspection of the public shall be charged by the civil service commission. The amount of such fee shall be established by ordinance of the board of supervisors. The fee shall be collected for eligibles who wish to inspect their own papers. Inspection of eligible papers shall be made available to public inspection only if all documentation supporting the eligibles' rating and score unless excepting the identity of the examiner giving any mark or grade in an oral examination or the questions and answers on standardized—entrance—or concurrent—entrance and promotional written—tests shall be provided. Only participants in the examination may file a protest. No protests are received during the posting period of the eligible list is automatically adopted. An examination may be received during the posting period the eligible list is automatically adopted. If protests are received during the posting period the examination and section of the general manager, personnel shall be expedited so that final adoption of the eligible list is not delayed beyond sixty (60) days after the date of posting. Eligibles who, as a result of their ranking, would receive a notice of appointment regardless of the outcome of the protest(s) may be offered employment from among lists pending the resolution of any protest(s) and amendment to the adopted eligible list.

8.326 Promotions in General

Except as specifically provided for in section 8.327, the Civil Service Commission shall provide for examinations on an entrance, promotional and temporary basis. Consideration shall be given to permanent employees in separate promotional examinations and in promotional examinations which are combined with entrance examinations for city and county service. When the passing mark has been attained and may include evaluation of work performance and other criteria, the examination announcement is issued for a class on a competitive and/or non-competitive basis. The resulting list of eligibles which shall include all successful applicants in both competitive and entrance examinations in order of relative performance.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this or any other provision of the charter, an employee who has been certified to a regularly adopted eligible list for a non-permanent position in a civil service classification shall be permitted to participate in promotional examinations on the same terms and conditions as a person holding a permanent appointment to a position in that same classification, subject to the demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period of time for the position and in the examination provided by rule of the civil service commission.

The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to promotional examinations announced after its effective date.

8.328 Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave—

Employees under permanent civil service appointment who, because of absence due to military leave after June 27, 1950, did not participate in a promotional examination held after June 27, 1950, and during time of war as defined in section 8.324 of this charter, shall, for the purpose of this amendment, be deemed to be appointees in their classifications from the time their names were reached for permanent certification while in the military service.

In order to qualify for participation in a similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section, such employees—desires to participate therein must make application in writing to the civil service commission within thirty days after the abridgment of their military leave, or within thirty days after the effective date of this amendment. Failure to file such written—application in a similar examination as herein provided shall be deemed a waiver of all rights of the employee to participate in such similar promotional examination.

The civil service commission shall arrange to hold such similar promotional examination within a reasonable time after employees eligible to request participation in a similar examination under the provisions of this section have indicated their desire to participate, or have waived their—right to participate, as herein provided.

The civil service commission shall be the sole judge of the adequacy of such similar promotional examination. If the employee obtains in the similar promotional examination a score rating equal to or
more than the minimum passing mark established by the civil service commission for inclusion on the list of eligibles resulting from the original promotional examination, his name shall thereupon be entered on the eligible list resulting from the original promotional examination in accordance with the relative excellence obtained by all the qualified participants in the original and similar promotional examinations. Such list of eligibles shall not be open to appointment from such list of eligibles in accordance with civil service rules to any vacancy thereafter occurring, and subject to satisfactory completion of a probationary period as provided in section 8.340 of this charter for a period of four years after the date on which their name is entered on the eligible list and before eligibles possessing standing through examinations held subsequent to the original promotional examination.

If it is determined by the civil service commission that the name of such person would have been reached for permanent appointment from the list of eligibles established as a result of the original promotional examination during his term of military service had the name of such person appeared thereon, then such employee, upon appointment to a permanent position as herein provided, shall be granted seniority in such appointment from the date his name would have been reached had his name appeared thereon, but such seniority shall be used only for the purpose of determining salary increments and calculating city and county service credits in other promotional examinations held subsequent to the original promotional examination herein authorized. For all other purposes, seniority of service shall date from the date of appointment as a result of qualifying in the similar promotional examination as herein authorized.

Such employees who qualify for appointment as a result of a similar promotional examination as herein provided, and who are appointed to permanent positions, shall be permitted to participate in other promotional examinations for which they are otherwise eligible, while serving under probationary appointment in the position to which they were appointed as a result of the similar promotional examination, provided that certification from lists of eligibles established from such other examinations shall have been completed, in accordance with the provisions of section 8.329 of this charter.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules to govern the administration of similar promotional examinations herein authorized, and appointments and other matters resulting therefrom.

8.329 Certification of Eligibles; Rule of Three

Whenever a position controlled by the civil service provisions of this charter is to be filled, the appointing officer shall make a requisition to the civil service commission for a person to fill it. Thereupon, the commission shall certify to the appointing officer the names and addresses of the three persons standing highest on the list of eligibles for such position. In case the position is promotional, the commission shall certify the names of the three persons standing highest on such list. If less than three names are on the list on which certification is to be made, there shall be certified the number thereon. The appointing officer shall fill the position by the appointment of one of the persons certified. The provisions of this section as herein amended at the election of November 2, 1976, shall be applicable only to lists of eligibles finally adopted by the city council in accordance with the provisions of Section 8.323 of this charter on or after the effective date of this amendment. In making such certification, sex shall be disregarded except when a statute, a rule of the commission or the appointing officer specifies sex.

From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the commission shall determine whether the position is; in character; temporary; seasonal or permanent; and shall notify the candidate in accordance therewith to the end that the candidate may have knowledge of the probable duration of employment. The commission shall provide for such waiver of temporary or seasonal employment as it may deem just to candidates.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this or any other provision of the charter, an employee who has been certified from a regularly adopted eligible list to a permanent position in a civil service classification shall be entitled to appointment to a permanent position within that same classification before the commission certifies to the appointing officer the names and addresses of persons standing higher on the list of eligibles who are not then current employees, subject to a demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the commission. The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to requisitions for permanent positions filled from and after January 1, 1980.

8.330 Duration of Lists of Eligibles

The civil service commission may remove all names from the list of eligibles after they have remained thereon for ten years; and all names thereon shall be removed at the expiration of four years. The commission may, however, provide in the examination announcement that the list of eligibles secured thereby shall automatically expire at a date not less than two or more than four years after the adoption of such list.

8.331 Limited Tenure Appointments

When in time of war declared by the Congress of the United States eligibles are not available for appointment from the regular examination procedure as provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof, the civil service commission may qualify applicants for wartime appointments to positions through informal and non-competitive tests. Such tests and appointments resulting therefrom shall be governed by the provisions of this section and by rule of the civil service commission adopted pursuant thereto and the tests shall be adequate in the judgment of the civil service commission to determine the capacity of applicants to perform the duties of the positions to be filled pending creation of lists of eligibles through the regular examination procedure as provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof; appointments made under the provisions of this section shall be designated "limited tenure appointments" and may continue only until register of eligibles are established through the regular examination procedure provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof but in no event to exceed six months beyond the cessation of hostilities. Limited tenure appointments may be terminated by the appointing officer at any time for lack of work or funds. Limited tenure appointments may be terminated by the appointing officer for good cause at any time with the approval of the civil service commission without reference to the procedures governing removals. Persons serving under limited tenure appointments shall be eligible for appointment as in this section provided by reason of such service acquire no right or preference to permanent civil service status as defined elsewhere in this charter or by rule of the civil service commission which is conferred on persons completing probationary appointments made from lists of eligibles established through the regular examination procedures as provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 of the charter. Service after January 1, 1951 under limited tenure appointment by platform employees of the municipal railway shall not be included in the calculation of service of such employees for the purpose of determining assignments of runs when such assignments are made on the basis of seniority of service.

Non-civil service appointments in the absence of civil service eligibles as provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 of this charter shall not be authorized if applicants qualified for limited tenure appointments are available. The civil service commission shall make every effort consistent with current conditions to maintain adequate registers of eligibles in accordance with the procedures provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules to carry out the provisions of this section and to govern the administration of limited tenure appointments.

In time of national emergency declared by the President of the United States, while any act authorizing compulsory military service or training is in effect, the provisions of this section may also be made operative upon recommendation of the civil service commission and approval of the board of supervisors by ordinance enacted by two thirds of the board. Authority for limited tenure appointments, if established pursuant to the authority of this paragraph, shall cease six months after repeal by the board of supervisors of the ordinance which authorized such appointments.

8.332 Temporary and Emergency Appointments

When no list of eligibles exists or no eligible is available on an existing list for a position in the class requisitioned by the appointing officer, and immediate service in the position is required by the appointing officer and another list exists which is deemed by the civil service commission to be suitable to provide temporarily the service desired, the commission shall certify for civil service temporary appointment an eligible from such list; if no such other list deemed by the commission to be suitable exists, the commission pursuant to its rules may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment thereto for a period not exceeding one hundred and thirty working days. Non-civil service or emergency appointments extended beyond ninety days must be approved by the civil service commission. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such thirty working days and the working days at the time a civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in section 8.329 of this charter.

If a list of eligibles exists for the position requisitioned, but immediate service is deemed necessary by the appointing officer pending the time an eligible from such list is certified and reports for duty as such position, if its annual service or emergency appointment is a non-civil service or emergency appointment thereto for a period not exceeding thirty working days. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such thirty working days at the time a civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in section 8.329 of this charter.

No person shall be compensated under any non-civil service or emergency appointment or appointments as authorized under the provisions of the foregoing paragraphs of this section for a period exceeding one hundred and thirty working days in any fiscal or calendar year, and no claim or warrant therefor shall be allowed paid for any compensation in excess of such one hundred and thirty working days in any fiscal or calendar year.

If no eligibles are available for appointment to a permanent position in the class requested by the appointing officer the commission shall immediately hold an examination and establish an eligible list for such class. If such appropriation is insufficient to meet the cost of said examination, the report to the mayor the estimated cost thereof, and the
mayor shall request and the supervisors shall make supplemental appropriation therfore in the manner provided herein for supplemental appropriations.

8.340 Dismissal During Probation Period
Any person appointed to a permanent position shall serve a probationary period. The civil service commission personnel director shall by rule establish a period of not more than six months' service and up to a maximum of twelve months' service for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed rank of the police department, fire department, sheriff's department and San Francisco International Airport police force shall be for twelve months except that with respect to members of the uniformed rank of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve months' service from the day following completion of the prescribed department field training officer program, but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment; provided further that probationary members of the uniformed ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in section 8.343 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four months may be established for executive and management classification, and in the event during the probationary period the appointing officer may terminate the appointment upon giving written notice of such termination to the employee, and to the civil service commission specifying the reasons for such termination. Except in the case of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments the civil service commission shall review the termination. The civil service commission shall by rule establish the procedures for such review. If the appointment resulted from an entrance examination the commission may declare such person dismissed or may return the name to the list of eligibles under such conditions for further appointment as the commission may deem just. If the appointment resulted from a promotional examination the employee shall have the right of appeal and hearing before the civil service commission. The commission shall render a decision within thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person dismissed; or (b) order such person reinstated to the position without prejudice or any back pay, or may request the division order that the employee be paid salary from the time of the termination of the appointment; or (c) order the return of such person to a position in the classification from which that person was promoted and may reestablish the employee's eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same promotional classification under such conditions as the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall be final. Immediately prior to the expiration of the probationary period the appointing officer shall report to the civil service commission as to the competence of the probationer for the position, and if competent, shall recommend permanent appointment. Nothing in this section shall prevent the civil service commission from terminating the probationary period for the purpose of future employability including terminations in the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments.

8.407 Definition of Generally Prevailing Rates of Wages
Notwithstanding any provision of section 8.401 or any provision of any other section of this chapter, contrary to the generally prevailing rates of salaries and wages for those employees covered by section 8.401 of the charter shall be determined by the civil service commission as set forth below.

The civil service commission personnel director shall conduct a comprehensive investigation and survey of basic pay rates and wages and salaries in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment for like work and like service, based upon job classifications as provided in section 5666.3.662 of this charter and shall make its findings, based on facts and data collected from the basic pay rates for each benchmark class of employment solely in the manner hereinafter provided. A benchmark class is defined as a "key class" within an occupational grouping selected as the class for which a representative sample of data will be collected.

Basic pay rate data for public and private employment shall be collected solely from the Bay Area counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, San Francisco and Santa Clara; provided, however, that for any benchmark class of employment for which the civil service personnel director determines there is insufficient data from Bay Area public jurisdictions the personnel director shall survey major public agencies in the state employing such class, major public agencies to be defined as those employing more than 3,000 persons.

The civil service personnel director shall collect basic pay rate data for like work and like service from Bay Area public jurisdictions as follows:
(a) The counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara.
(b) The ten most populous cities in these five Bay Area counties based on the latest federal decennial census.
(c) Agencies of the state and federal governments and from the city, districts and other special districts in the six Bay Area counties as determined by the civil service commission personnel director.
(d) The personnel director shall collect public basic pay rate data from recognized governmental Bay Area salary and wage surveys of private employers in the city and county of San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. The data collected shall be limited to basic rates of pay and salaries actually being paid by public and private employers for like work and like service.

The term "prevailing rates of wages" for employers governed by chapter section 8.401 and this section shall be defined by the annual weighted average of the midpoint of the basic pay rates, excluding fringe benefits, for surveyed public employers and the median of the pay rates for private employers to be determined as follows:
(1) Multiply the medians of the private and the midpoints from public employment data base by the number of employees in the given classification from each data base.
(2) Add the products of (1);
(3) Divide the sum in (2) by the total number of employees surveyed for that classification; and
(4) Extend this figure by 10 percent to establish the maximum of the range and reduce this figure by 10 percent to establish the minimum.

When fixing rates of compensation the board of supervisors shall fix basic pay rates as close as reasonably possible to prevailing rates, provided, however, that the board of supervisors shall not set the maximum rate of pay for any class in excess of the maximum prevailing rate for that class; provided further, however, that no employee shall have his basic pay rate reduced to conform to prevailing rates except as provided for in section 8.406. For those classifications of employment in which the practice is customary, the schedules of compensation shall provide for minima, not less than three intermediate, and maxima salary steps and for a method of advancing the salary of employees from minimum to intermediate to maximum with due regard for seniority of service. The term "basic pay rate" as used in this section is hereby defined as applying only to the basic rate of wages, with included range scales, and does not include any other benefits of employment or working condition benefits.

It is the declared intent of the qualified electors of the city and county that neither the board of supervisors nor the mayor have any legal power to provide any benefits of employment except those enumerated already provided for in the charter. And any addition, deletion or modification of benefits of employment enumerated in the charter shall be made only by a majority of the board at a general election or at a special election of the city and county. The qualified electors expressly state that they understand that benefits of employment are sometimes referred to as "fringe benefits" of employment and the qualified electors expressly reserve the right to either grant or deny such benefits except those conditions of employment commonly referred to as "working conditions". Any reference to "working conditions" shall mean those compensations which must necessarily be provided in order for the employee to perform his job description duties efficiently and safely, and shall include but not be limited to such working conditions and benefits as are typically included in the administrative provisions of the state's general standardization ordinance and the salary ordinance.

The board of supervisors may, in its discretion, provide working condition benefits for employees covered under this section and section 8.401 of this charter only in accordance with the following provisions:
(1) The civil service personnel director shall determine, certify and recommend to the board of supervisors the working condition benefits and benefits as are typically included in the administrative provisions of the state's general standardization ordinance and is provided to not less than 50 percent of the employees of the class in the jurisdiction covered by the salary survey.
9.108 Initiative, Referendum, and Recall
(a) The registered voters shall have power to propose by petition, and to adopt or to reject at the polls, any ordinance, act, or law passed by the board, or by the elected supervisors, and the power conferred upon the board of supervisors to enact, or any legislative act which is within the power conferred upon any other board, commission or officer, to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinance, act, charter amendment or other measure may be so proposed by filing with the registrar a petition setting forth said measure in full, signed by registered voters of the city and county as many in number as the percentages hereinafter required of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election. Any declaration of policy may be submitted to the electors in the manner provided for the submission of ordinances; and whenever the qualified electors voting on said declaration, it shall thereupon be the duty of the board of supervisors to enact an ordinance or ordinances to carry such policies or principles into effect, subject to the referendum provisions of this charter.
Any ordinance which the supervisors are empowered to pass may be submitted to the electors by a majority of the board at a general election or at a special election called for the purpose, said election to be held not less than thirty days from the date of the call. Any such ordinance may be proposed by one-third of the supervisors, or by the mayor, and when so proposed shall be submitted to the electors at the next succeeding general election. No ordinance passed by the supervisors granting any public utility franchise
or privilege, shall go into effect until the expiration of sixty days from the date it becomes final. At the end of such sixty days such ordinance shall be in force and effect, unless within such period there shall be filed with the registrar a petition signed by registered voters equal in number to five percent of the entire vote cast for mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election, requesting that such ordinance be submitted to the electors. In case such petition is filed, such ordinance shall not go into effect until approved by a majority of the voters voting thereon at a general or special election.

If, before the time any other ordinance involving legislative matters becomes effective, there shall be filed with the board of supervisors a petition signed by qualified electors of the city and county equal in number to at least ten per centum of the entire vote cast for all candidates for mayor at the last preceding general municipal election at which a mayor was elected, protesting against the passage of such ordinance the same shall be suspended from going into operation, and it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to reconsider such ordinance, and if the same be not entirely repealed, said board shall submit the ordinance to the vote of said electors either at the next general municipal election or at a special election to be called for that purpose, and such ordinance shall not go into effect or become operative unless and until a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon shall vote in favor thereof. The provisions of section 9.109 and 9.110 of the charter shall apply to and govern the verification and certification of such petition.

Annual budget and appropriation ordinances, supplemental appropriation ordinances, the annual salary ordinance, or ordinances amending the same, the ordinances levying taxes, any ordinance appropriating money from the emergency reserve fund, ordinances authorizing the city attorney to compromise litigation, and ordinances necessary to enable the mayor to carry out any of the powers vested in him in the case of public emergency as defined in section 3.100 of the charter, as ordinances relative to purely administrative matters, shall not be subject to referendum.

Any elective official, the chief administrative officer, the controller or any member of the board of education or public utilities commission may be recalled by the electors. The procedure to effect such recall shall be as follows: A petition demanding the recall from office of the person sought to be recalled shall be filed with the registrar. Said petition shall contain a statement of the grounds on which the recall is sought. Any insufficiency of form or substance in such statement shall in no way affect the validity of the election and proceedings held thereunder. No recall petition shall be filed against any officer until he has held his office for at least six months.

(b) In the event the representative of the board of supervisors, mayor and the representatives of recognized employee organizations do not reach an agreement through the meet-and-confer process on matters contained in the annual salary standardization ordinance by March 15 of any year, the mayor shall recommend and the board shall adopt, approve or reject a schedule of compensation which reflects current prevailing rates for the classifications covered by Section 8.401 of this Charter the last good faith offer presented by the mayor or his representative.

In any year when an agreement on matters contained in the salary standardization ordinance has not been achieved, the city service commission personnel director, upon receipt of a written demand from a recognized employee organization made upon the mayor and the personnel director shall prepare, prior to April 1, a schedule of compensation and administrative provisions which reflect additional rates that would be payable, and working conditions, based upon the last demands made by the recognized employee organization(s) which participated in the meet-and-confer process.

said schedule shall be transmitted to the registrar of voters for submission to the electors of the city and county, in the general election or a special election called for the purpose, and said special election shall be held no less than sixty (60) days from the date of the call. No such schedule shall be withdrawn after it has been received by the registrar of voters. At said election, the ballot shall contain the following two alternatives:

(1) Approval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

(2) Disapproval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

If a majority of the valid votes cast in the election favor paying the additional rates set forth in the schedule of compensation based upon the last demands of the recognized employee organizations which engaged in the meet-and-confer process, it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to amend the salary standardization ordinance to reflect said increased
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TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDNANCE

PROPOSITION E

located across Phelan Avenue from the presently occupied campus of City College and consisting of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted, between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

Section 3. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall disapprove or deny, WITH NO EXEMPTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS, any building permit application for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, which consist of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

Section 4. The term "building permit" includes building permits, site permits and any other permits for the performance of construction work.

Section 5. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of the ordinance shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. No part of the ordinance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent implementation of the policy stated above.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDNANCE

PROPOSITION F

NOTE: All sections are new.

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

Section 1. The People of the City and County of San Francisco desire and are entitled to a local government whose officers do not engage in, assist or promote compensated advocacy on behalf of private interests before City and County commissions and boards while also serving as City and County officers.

Section 2. No officer of the City and County may, during the term of office, engage in compensated advocacy before any City and County board or commission, or any member of the board or commission or its staff, in order to represent any private interest. The officer represents the officer receives, directly or indirectly, any compensation, reward or gift.

Section 3. Officers of the City and County shall not discuss matters pending before their commission or department with other City and County officers or state legislators when those other officers or state legislators are acting as compensated advocates for a private interest.

Section 4. No member of the California State Legislature shall appear before any City and County board, department or commission as a compensated advocate representing a private interest.

Section 5. In the financing of city and county campaigns: (a) No person other than a candidate shall make, and no campaign treasurers shall solicit or accept, any contribution which will cause the total amount contributed by such person with respect to a single election in support or opposition to such candidate, including contributions to political committees supporting or opposing such candidate, in excess of $500.00. (b) If any person is found guilty of violating the terms of this section, each campaign treasurer who received part or all of the contribution or contributions which constitute the violation shall pay promptly, from available campaign funds, if any, the amount received from such person in excess of the amount permitted by this section to the City and County Treasurer or other public officer for deposit in the General Fund of the City and County, (c) This section shall not apply to any in-kind contribution of television or radio airtime to any candidate or committee granted to said candidate or committee pursuant to the "Fairness Doctrine" articulated in Cullman Broadcasting, 40 FCC 576 (1963).

Section 6. Any person violating the terms of this ordinance shall be subject to the penalties set forth in San Francisco Charter Section 8.105. Such penalties shall include, but not be limited to, removal from office.

Section 7. If any provision of this ordinance, or its application to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, it is the expressed intent of the people of the City and County of San Francisco that the remainder of the ordinance, or the application of such provision, or any other provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.
rates and the same shall be in lieu of said annual compensation, and notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, said rates shall become effective and be payable as if adopted prior to April 1, of any year.

The provisions of sections 3.100 and 3.100-1, relating to the emergency powers of the mayor, shall not be applicable to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

11.05 Effective Date of Amendments
The effective date of the amendments, additions and deletions to the civil service provisions of the charter shall be ninety (90) days after the acceptance and filing thereof with the Secretary of State.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED
PROPOSITION G

We the people of San Francisco declare this to be our policy:
1) IT IS IMPROPER TO PROFIT FROM OR PROVIDE SUPPORT TO THE RACIST POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SYSTEM IN SOUTH AFRICA, KNOWN AS APARTHEID.
Therefore it is necessary to sever commercial ties to South Africa, until people of all races obtain equal rights in that country, including equal voting rights.
2) COMPANIES HAVING SUBSTANTIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH APARTHEID MUST BE CONSIDERED IRRESPONSIBLE.
(a) The Board of Supervisors must determine which companies doing or seeking business with the City have the greatest ties to Apartheid. Companies that have a significant involvement in profiting from or maintaining the Apartheid system, may, on that basis, be deemed "irresponsible bidders."
In purchasing goods and services and awarding other contracts, the City must give priority to avoiding such companies; the degree of the preference must be in proportion to the company's complicity with Apartheid, according to the following criteria:
— how much business the company does in or with South Africa;
— how much the company profits from that business;
— how much support the company provides the Apartheid government in taxes, loans, payments or other funding;
— the nature of the company's South Africa business;
— the degree of the company's cooperation with South African political censorship or secrecy agreements;
— the degree to which the company provides the South African government with the technology, materials and other means to maintain and enforce Apartheid.
(b) City funds must not be deposited or invested with any bank or other company which does business in or with, or makes loans to, South Africa.
(c) If any exception to the above policies is found to be necessary or appropriate, the responsible official must promptly and publicly report it to the Board of Supervisors, clearly describing the exception and the reasons for it.
The term "city" includes all agencies, departments, officials, employees, units and subsidiaries of the city and county of San Francisco, and all funds administered by or on behalf of the city or county.
3) WE CALL ON ALL OTHER PUBLIC BODIES AND PRIVATE OR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS TO ADOP SIMILAR POLICIES.
(4) WE CALL A GENERAL PUBLIC BOYCOTT, FOCUSING ON THOSE COMPANIES HAVING THE GREATEST TIES TO APARTHEID.
The Board of Supervisors must determine and announce which company or companies are the worst offenders within each major industry, so that the public can focus its boycott on those companies.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED
PROPOSITION H

SUMMARY: THIS INITIATIVE STATES THAT THE AIDS EPIDEMIC IS A MAJOR PUBLIC HEALTH PROBLEM OF CONCERN TO EVERYONE, REQUIRING INCREASED SUPPORT FOR RELATED MEDICAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION. IT CALLS FOR A COUNCIL FOR AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION OR A SIMILAR UNITED EFFORT TO STOP AIDS.
We the people of San Francisco hereby adopt the following policy:
The AIDS epidemic has rapidly become a major public health problem, costly both in human lives and in general community resources.
The first steps in dealing with such a crisis are:
— the scientific research needed to discover and understand the cause, causes, co-factors, prevention, diagnosis and treatment of the disease, and
— the education of the public about the lessons of that research;
A proper program of research and education pays for itself in the long run;
Prompt action is urgent, because of the rapidly growing number of victims affected, increasing not only the suffering but also the difficulty of eradicating the disease;
The leadership and support of such an effort is everyone's responsibility;
While San Francisco's role in the overall effort against AIDS has been viewed as a positive example to other areas, the continued rapid increase in the spread of the disease means that we cannot afford to rest on our laurels or leave further responsibility to others.
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:
We call on all appropriate government bodies as well as medical, professional, charitable and community organizations and concerned individuals to join together in an all-out effort to stop AIDS;
We call for support to an organized united effort along the lines of an AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION COUNCIL, including, in some form:
— A COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, to provide informed evaluations as to priorities among research projects and proposals, recommending those which are most cost-effective and most likely to produce early results useful in the prevention or treatment of the disease, to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts or neglect of promising approaches, and to provide the council with complete and up-to-date information regarding comparative results of experimental treatments, prevention programs and other existing research;
— A COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, to inform the public regarding prevention and other research findings, and to inform relevant government officials and the general public, concerning the factual basis for a re-ordering of current public funding priorities toward an increased war against disease, including research and education against aids and related conditions;
— A FUND-RAISING COMMITTEE, to solicit donations, lobby for grants, organize benefits and other fund-raising projects spreading the financial burden by appealing to many sources;
We ask the council and committees to be responsive and accessible to public input, to include representation of all interested groups, to consider all viewpoints, and to be capable of prompt action;
We ask appropriate city officials to determine whether a suitable form of such a council already exists; if it does, we wish the city to support it actively; if not, we wish the city to seek to encourage its formation by such means as may appear proper.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED
PROPOSITION I

SUMMARY: This initiative asks "Shall we tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?" The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated portion of Route 480 known as the Embarcadero Freeway. This initiative declaration of policy will give the voters the opportunity to establish the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco regarding the proposed teardown of the Embarcadero Freeway.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED
PROPOSITION J

Shall the City replace a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if such replacement would open up the Waterfront to its citizens, improve the tax base, and create a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic?
Candidates

FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER
JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco
My age is 42

My qualifications for office are: The Bill of Rights guarantees that every person accused of a crime shall have the effective assistance of counsel. Whether an individual is rich or poor, that person is entitled to a competent and dedicated attorney.

In San Francisco it is the duty of the Public Defender to uphold this sacred right. In every case, we provide the client with the best defense under the law.

In the last 7 years, my outstanding staff has done this work with the highest degree of professionalism. In the next 4 years, that same strong, professional, independent and ethical representation will continue.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John D. Bardis, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Sala Burton, 8 Slate Blvd., Representative in Congress, 5th District
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
George Christopher, 1700 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 4th St., Clerk
Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Artist/Community Organizer
Brian Getz, 55 22nd Ave., Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson, Sheriff of San Francisco
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., International Vice President, ILGWU
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for Children & Youth
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070 26th Ave., Executive Assistant to Sala Burton M.C.
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
Carole Miglion, 561 28th St., Community Health Director
Linda Ann Post, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative
Jim Rivaldo, 430 Steiner St., Political Consultant
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Member, SF Community College District Governing Board
Yori Wada, 365 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel W. Walker, 562 Campbell Ave., President—Local 250-A Transport Workers Union of America
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiltcitas Ave., Minister
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor
C. R. Zanca, 1966 Pacific Ave., Auto Repair Proprietor

FOR ASSESSOR
SAM DUCa

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor

My qualifications for office are: I was elected your Assessor in 1978 and re-elected in 1982. My years in the Assessor's Office were spent in a professional appraisal capacity personnel and administration. I have two university degrees, the coveted MAI designation, and am the recipient of a special Congressional Advisory Board award from the United States Congress. I have served in an advisory capacity, both nationally and internationally, in property tax administration and will continue to serve the taxpayers of the City and County of San Francisco in dealing with Article XIIIA of the State Constitution. My community involvement includes participation in cultural, civic business organizations.

Sam Duca

The sponsors for Sam Duca are:
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1780 Broadway St., Investor
Eugene L. Friend, 2910 Lake St., Investor
Nancy Pelosi, 40 Presidio Ter., Housewife and volunteer in politics
Walter H. Shorenstein, 740 El Camino del Mar., Chairman, Milton Meyer & Co.
Stanley Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Emma W. Louie, 1227 Jackson St., Housewife
Alfred S. Wilsey, 2590 Jackson St., Ch. of Exec. Comm. of Diversified Holding Co.
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hinckley Walk, Physician
Gerson Bakar, 2310 Hyde St., Investor
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired
Joseph C. Grengel, Sr., 866 Faxon Ave., Publicity Dept. — S.F. Giants
James A. Scatena, 101 St. Elmos Way, Chairman of the Board, Scatena York Co.
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher
Frances May McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Recreation & Park Commissioner
Frederick F. Campagnoli, 2609 Larkin St., Attorney
Betty Brooks, 1738 26th St., Field Representative
Jesu Tertuel Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Businessman
Cyril I. Magnin, 994 California St., Merchant
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John H. Swanson, 145 Lake Merced Hill South, Bowling Alley Owner
Frances G. Goldman, 745 El Camino Del Mar, Child Guidance
Irma M. Bernardo, 2182 34th Ave., Housewife
Leo J. Murphy, 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Charles M. Cunningham, 475 Connecticut St., Self Employed
Lawrence V. Eppinette, 815 Fell St., Contra Costa County
Mary M. O'Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Volunteer & Homemaker
Elizabeth R. Duce, 16 Wawona St., Homemaker
BALLOT TYPE
D501

DEVELOPMENTAL DISTRICT
17th Assembly District
8th Senate District
5th Congressional District

Application for Absentee Ballot is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

Name
Residence Address
Mailing Address
Signature

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

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

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

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:
The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible. This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter en route to the polls have not been considered.
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YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 5, 1986.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
- are a U.S. Citizen,
- are at least 18 years of age on election day,
- are a resident of California, and
- are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, such as this one, you can only choose among the candidates of your party.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Senator, State Assemblymember, County Central Committee, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your polling place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 3, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

Q—Can a worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
- mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see enclosed card).

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

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
- your home address,
- the address where you want the ballot mailed,
- then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail by absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 3, 1986.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS CONCERNING VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

STEP 1

Insert the ballot card all the way into the Votomatic.

Nota: Si hace algun error, devuélvalo a su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

Using both hands:

INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

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

D 第一步

請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

D 第二步

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

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

C 第二步

請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

Hold punch vertical (straight up). Punch straight down through the ballot card to indicate your choice. Do not use pen or pencil.

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

D 第三步

請把帶鋲之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

After voting, withdraw the ballot card and place it inside the envelope pocket, with the stub showing.

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

D 第四步

投票選後之，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。

在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO UNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta al nombre del candidato. Cuando hay dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidado (write-in) calificado, escribe el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SÍ" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borraduras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe ó estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvalo al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

請用附在投票紀錄器上之打孔針在選票上打孔；千萬不要用鋼筆或鉛筆。

選民須知：

投票時所選擇的任何其候選人，請在選票上所點指之候選人名打孔。如果有兩個或以上候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上所點指之候選人中，選擇你要投選的候選人打孔，但不要超過要選舉的候選人數。

投票合格的非候選人，請在非候選人選票信封所附之預定位置上填下該候選人所點指的數字和姓名。

投票任意投票，請在選票上所點指「YES」或「NO」字樣打孔。

選票上若有顯著污點或損壞者，選票作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔錯了，請撕掉選票；或撕掉了，弄傷了非候選人的選票信封，應把該選票連同給選舉區的選務員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

請在下頁開始投票

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Voting Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOBERNADOR</strong> (Governor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM BRADLEY</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor, City of Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcalde, Ciudad de Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUGH G. BAGLEY</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK L. THOMAS</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EILEEN ANDERSON</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singer and Dancer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantante y Ballarina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES “CHUCK” PINEDA, JR.</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Hearing Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oficial de Audiencias Estatales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vote for One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Voting Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VICEGOBERNADOR</strong> (Lieutenant Governor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEO T. McCARTHY</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicegobernador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vote for One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Voting Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECRETARIO DE ESTADO</strong> (Secretary of State)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH FONG EU</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State of California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretario de Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>GRAY DAVIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Legislatura de California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN GARAMENDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Senator, Businessman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senador Estatal, Hombre de Negocios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALISTER McALISTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assemblyman, 18th District, California Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asambleista, Distrito 18, Legislatura de California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California State Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tesorero del Estado de California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney General, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procurador General, California</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
### Member, State Board of Equalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLIS</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERT DE LOTTO</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN): To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### United States Senator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT J. BANUELOS</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES GREENE</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIAN LANTZ</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN CRANSTON</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN): To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

---

**Democratic Party**

**Election Primaria 3 de Junio de 1986**

**State Senator**

**United States Senator**
**United States Representative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SALA BURTON</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW KLEIN</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL MOBERG</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*WRITE-IN* To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

**State Senator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOUIS J. PAPAN</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM GONZALEZ</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*WRITE-IN* To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

**Member of the State Assembly**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART AGNOS</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*WRITE-IN* To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patricia C. Fitzgerald</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Deputy Sheriff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Malone</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>County Supervisor of Elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Moore</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>County Auditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise M. Minnick</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District Attorney for Juvenile Criminal Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Landowne</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Director of Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Post</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Director of Financial Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George W. Wong</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Director of Civil Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali Cho-Wah Wong</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Director of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance K. Jones</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Director of Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra A. Barnes</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Director of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guido E. Mannini</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Director of Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary O'Conner</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Director of Parks and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal Roselli</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Director of Environmental Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidate vote totals:
- Patricia C. Fitzgerald: 208
- Kevin Malone: 206
- Thomas Moore: 203
- Louise M. Minnick: 200
- Jim Landowne: 199
- Linda Post: 197
- George W. Wong: 196
- Ali Cho-Wah Wong: 195
- Constance K. Jones: 192
- Debra A. Barnes: 191
- Guido E. Mannini: 190
- Gary O'Conner: 189
- Sal Roselli: 186

Vote summary: Patricia C. Fitzgerald received the highest vote total, with George W. Wong and Ali Cho-Wah Wong receiving the lowest totals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent de Instrucción Pública</td>
<td>DANIEL NUSBAUM</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Advocate</td>
<td>JEANNE BAIRD</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>SAM DUCA</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $850,000,000 to provide food and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>COMMUNITY PARKLANDS ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for acquiring, developing, improving, rehabilitating, or restoring urgently needed local and regional parks, beaches, recreational areas and facilities, and historical resources.</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>WATER CONSERVATION AND WATER QUALITY BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $150,000,000 to provide funds for water conservation, groundwater recharge and drainage water management, and clarifies language in the Clean Water Bond Law of 1984.</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>DEPOSIT OF PUBLIC MONEYS IN CREDIT UNIONS. Authorizes Legislature to provide for deposit of public moneys in any credit union. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect. Legislation already approved implementing measure could result in greater interest income to state and local governments.</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. Provides exception to property tax limit when acquisition or improvement of real property approved by two-thirds of voters. Fiscal Impact: By itself, measure has no fiscal effect. No increase can occur in local property tax rate unless bond issue is approved by two-thirds vote. State costs for tax relief programs could increase. State income tax revenues could decline as taxpayers deduct greater amounts for property tax payments.</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>ALLOCATION OF VEHICLE LICENSE FEE TAXES TO COUNTIES AND CITIES. Requires allocation of Vehicle License Fee taxes to local governments. Fiscal Impact: Measure would have no direct fiscal effect. Prevents Legislature from changing the law to take vehicle license fees away from counties and cities. Measure would not prevent state reducing other forms of aid to local governments or changing existing formula for dividing vehicle license fee revenues between counties and cities.</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>LEGISLATORS' AND JUDGES' RETIREMENT SYSTEMS. Limits retirement allowances for persons entering Legislators' and Judges' Retirement Systems after January 1, 1987. Fiscal Impact: Minor savings to state in future years if rate of inflation exceeds increase in salaries paid to current officeholders.</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disposiciones sometidas al voto de los electores — Proposiciones Estatales

236 SI 贰成
237 NO 反对

ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1986. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $500,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en la compra de granjas y casas para los veteranos de California.

239 SI 贰成
240 NO 反对

ACTA DE TERRENOS DE PARQUES DE LA COMUNIDAD DE 1986. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $100,000,000 para la adquisición, desarrollo, mejoramiento, rehabilitación o la restauración urbanística adecuada de parques, playas, áreas de recreación y los recursos históricos locales y regionales.

242 SI 贰成
243 NO 反对

LEY DE BONOS PARA LA CONSERVACIÓN DE AGUA Y CONTROL DE LA CALIDAD DEL AGUA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $150,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la conservación del agua, restauración de aguas subterráneas, manejo adecuado del agua de lluvia, y clarificación del lenguaje en la Ley de Bonos para Agua Limpia de 1984.

246 SI 贰成
247 NO 反对

DEPÓSITO DE FONDOS PÚBLICOS EN COOPERATIVAS DE CREDITO. Autoriza a la Legislatura para que disponga el depósito de fondos públicos en cooperativas de crédito. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. La legislación ya aprobada que pone en marcha la medida podría resultar en mayor ingreso de intereses para los gobiernos locales y estatales.

249 SI 贰成
250 NO 反对

FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD: Dispone exenciones a los fondos de impuestos a la propiedad en el caso de adquisición o mejoramiento de la propiedad inmueble al ser aprobada por dos terceras partes de las entidades. Impacto Fiscal: Ninguno.

254 SI 贰成
255 NO 反对

ASIGNACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS POR PASOS DE LICENCIA DE VEHICULOS A LOS CONDADOS Y CIUDADES. Requiere la asignación a los gobiernos locales de los impuestos recaudados por pasos de licencias de vehículos. Impacto Fiscal: La medida no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo. Implica que la Legislatura pueda combinar la ley para tomar los fondos provenientes de licencias de vehículos en las ciudades y condados. La medida no evitará que el estado pueda reducir otras formas de asistencia a los gobiernos locales o que pueda cambiar la fórmula actual de dividir los fondos provenientes del pago por licencia de vehículos entre los condados y ciudades.

258 SI 贰成
259 NO 反对

SISTEMAS DE JUBILACIÓN DE LOS LEGISLADORES Y JUECES. Limita las pensiones de jubilación para aquellas personas que se adhieran al Sistema de Jubilación de los Legisladores y Jueces después del 1 de enero de 1987. Impacto Fiscal: Ahorros menores para el estado en años futuros si la tasa de inflación excede el aumento en los salarios que se pagan a las que actualmente ocupan cargos.
### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>49</strong> NONPARTISAN OFFICES. Prohibits a political party or party central committee from endorsing, supporting, or opposing a candidate for nonpartisan office. Fiscal Impact: No direct state or local government fiscal impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50</strong> PROPERTY TAXATION. DISASTERS. Base-year value of property damaged or destroyed by disaster transferable to comparable replacement property in same county. Fiscal Impact: Local property tax revenues would decrease by an unknown amount. County assessor and tax collectors would have nonsignificant higher administrative costs. State would replace revenues lost by school and community college districts. State income tax revenues could increase due to lower property tax deductions on replacement properties. These state costs and revenues cannot be estimated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>51</strong> MULTIPLE DEFENDANTS TORT DAMAGE LIABILITY. Plaintiff's non-economic damage recovery limited to defendant's liability based on defendant's percentage of fault. Fiscal Impact: Substantial savings to state and local governments. Savings could be several millions of dollars in a year, varying significantly from year to year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>52</strong> COUNTY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county correctional facilities and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of four hundred ninety-five million dollars ($495,000,000).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

| **A** Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgements against the City? |
| **B** Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him? |
| **C** PROPOSITION C HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THE BALLOT BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. |
DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

262 SI 贲成
263 NO 反对

CARGOS NO PARTIDARIOS. Prohibe a un partido político o a un comité central de un partido político patrocinarlo, apoyarlo o oponerse a un candidato a un cargo no partidario. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún Impacto fiscal directo a los gobiernos estatales o locales.

49

266 SI 贲成
267 NO 反对

IMPUESTOS A LA Propiedad INMUEBLE DEBEASTRES. El valor en año base de propiedad inmueble dañado o destruido por un desastre puede ser transferible a propiedad inmueble de reemplazo comparable en el mismo condado. Impacto Fiscal: Los réditos provenientes de impuestos locales a la propiedad disminuirían en una cantidad desconocida. Los tasadores y recaudadores de impuestos del condado tendrían insensitivos costos administrativos más altos. El estado reemplazaría los réditos que los distritos escolares y de colegios de educación superior dejarán de percibir. Los réditos del impuesto estatal a la renta podrían aumentar debido a menores deducciones en el impuesto a la propiedad en las propiedades de reemplazo. Estos costos y réditos estatales no pueden ser calculados.

50

273 SI 贲成
274 NO 反对

RESPONSABILIDAD CIVIL DE MULTIPLES PARTES DEMANDADAS EN JUICIOS DE AGRARIOS INDEMNIZABLES. Limita la indemnización que puede recibir el demandante por daños económicos a la responsabilidad del demandado basándose en el porcentaje de la culpabilidad del demandado. Impacto Fiscal: Ahorrará sustanciales para los gobiernos estatales y locales. Los ahorros podrían ser algunos millones de dólares al año, que variarían significativamente de año en año.

51

273 SI 贲成
274 NO 反对

ACTA DE BONOS PARA DESEMPEÑO DE CAPITAL PARA INSTALACIONES CORRECCIONALES DE CONDADOS DE 1985. Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelación, y reemplazo de instalaciones correccionales de los condados y la ejecución del mantenimiento diario en estas mismas en conformidad con una emisión de bonos por ciento de los doscientos noventa y cinco millones de dólares ($425,000,000).

52

PROPUESTAS DE LA CIUDAD & CONTADO

278 SI 贲成
279 NO 反对

"¿Deberá la Ciudad establecer una oficina de administración del riesgo y un despacho de investigación y administración de demandas, para estudiar y reducir el riesgo de pleitos y sentencias contra la Ciudad?"

A

281 SI 贲成
282 NO 反对

"¿Deberá autorizar al Comprador a firmar contratos por menos de $50,000 sin la aprobación del Jefe Administrativo y a permitir que sus agentes firmen contratos en su lugar?"

B

OFFICIALMENTE ELIMINADA

正式撤消

C
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong> Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong> Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong> Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $300?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong> Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong> Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong> Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong> Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# VOTER SELECTION CARD

**PRIMARY ELECTION**
**JUNE 3, 1986**

**POLLS ARE OPEN**
FROM
7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.

---

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42 236 237</td>
<td>A 278 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 239 240</td>
<td>B 281 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 242 243</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 246 247</td>
<td>D 288 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 249 250</td>
<td>E 292 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 254 255</td>
<td>F 296 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 258 259</td>
<td>G 300 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 262 263</td>
<td>H 303 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 266 267</td>
<td>I 307 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 270 271</td>
<td>J 310 311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR CANDIDATE SELECTION

---

NO 反對

NO 反對

SI 贏成

SI 贏成

NO 反對

NO 反對
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

VOTER SELECTION CARD

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>County Central Committee*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate</td>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td>10.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. Public Inst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to your sample ballot for the number of County Central Committee members to be elected. The number varies with each district.

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR PROPOSITIONS.

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

D Shall the City transfer the generation and distribution of electric power to the Civil Service Commission, which has power to change civil service regulations?

E Shall the City deny or revoke a permit to be issued for the construction of a dam or reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenue?

F Shall the City prohibit competitors from being considered for contracts before any city commission, i.e., a competitor for municipal office?

G Shall it be the policy of the people to select the person having the greatest ties with South Africa?

H Shall it be the policy of the public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?

I Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?

J Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?

NONPARTISAN BALLOT

NO 304

YES 307

NO 308

YES 310

NO 311
289 NO 反對

292 SI 贊成

293 NO 反對

296 SI 贊成

297 NO 反對

300 SI 贊成

301 NO 反對

303 SI 贊成

304 NO 反對

307 SI 贊成

308 NO 反對

310 SI 贊成

311 NO 反對
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT — An official list of candidates and propositions.

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

VOTE BY MAIL — See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

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

MEASURE — Another name for proposition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

COMPENSATED ADVOCACY — Compensated means being paid for doing something; Advocacy means speaking or writing on behalf of someone else. Proposition F concerns the issue of compensated advocacy.

RISK MANAGEMENT — This field covers two areas: (1) deciding on when it is better to buy insurance and when it is better to be self insured or uninsured, then shopping for the insurance; (2) identifying hazardous conditions on one’s property and seeing that they are corrected so that liability and damage claims will be avoided. Proposition A concerns risk management.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

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

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

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

PROPOSITION A

Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgements against the City?

YES 278 NO 279

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Consultants hired by the Chief Administrative Officer are available to City departments that have questions about "risk management", such as how to keep damage claims to a minimum and how to find the best insurance rates. In some cases, the departments use these consultants. In other cases, the departments make their own decisions. When damage claims are filed, some are handled by the City Attorney's Office and some are handled by City departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would amend the City Charter to create an Office of Risk Management, under the Chief Administrative Officer. The office would set risk management guidelines for all City departments, boards and commissions. Proposition A would also establish a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration in the City Attorney's Office. The bureau would be responsible for investigating, evaluating and processing all damage claims made against the City, except those claims made against the Public Utilities Commission and the Police Department. The bureau would also have the power to investigate potential suits against the City and to make settlements within dollar limits to be set by ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer and a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want damage claims and risk management decisions to continue to be handled the way they are now.

Controller's Statement on "A"

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not affect the cost of government. However as a result of its potential future application and the exemption of certain employees from the civil service provisions of the Charter, costs may be affected in an amount presently indeterminate."

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On March 10 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted "No."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON A

Last fiscal year, over 6,400 claims and law suits were filed against the City, costing us more than $10 million in settlements. I believe that it is time to change the way we handle our claims, secure insurance, prevent risks and settle legitimate claims against the City.

Last summer, we appointed a task force of citizens, under San Francisco Bar President Jerry Falk, to make recommendations on how to streamline our procedures and save money at the same time. The present system is very slow, costly, and inefficient.

Currently, all claims are investigated by the department involved. The City Attorney cannot act on any claim until the department is ready. This results in delay and duplication of effort and increased costs. A centralized and accountable Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney would be more efficient, cost-effective, and professional. It would enable the City to settle many claims quickly, before litigation is begun, saving the City the costs of defending itself in court and lowering the average cost of settling a case.

This can be accomplished without creating new jobs by simply moving into one office the city positions presently scattered throughout the government.

Vote “Yes” on A. Reduce the cost of City government.

Adoption of this measure would also formally establish responsibility for Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer, where it has been unofficially since 1978. With this strengthened authority, the Risk Management Office would be responsible for the gathering of claims data on a City-wide basis, the creation of incentives for both reducing the possibility for injuries and damage and the number of claims for each department, the coordination of insurance purchasing and specific suggestions to avoid and reduce risk.

This amendment is presented with the recommendation of the Mayor’s Task Force on Claims and Judgments, the Chief Administrative Officer, City Attorney, the President of the San Francisco Bar Association, and the President of the Lawyers’ Club of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Each year the City spends almost $10 million to settle damage claims. It is estimated that the overall costs to the City for all risk-related activities exceeds $125 million a year. It is time for action to be taken to reduce these huge expenditures. This charter amendment is designed to do just that.

Claims Investigation and Adjustment

Right now, the City claims investigation process is decentralized and largely unorganized. Each department investigates its own claims. Investigators may or may not be specially trained for their duties. There is no uniformity of investigation procedure or claims reporting. In only a few departments do investigators contact injured parties within days of an accident in order to settle the claim quickly and economically.

This amendment will create a claims investigation and adjustment bureau in the Office of the City Attorney. Claims investigation and adjustment activities will be centralized, economized and made much more efficient. The new bureau will be able to respond immediately to accidents and claims, providing quick compensation to deserving persons while at the same time producing a prompt, professional investigation. This reform is greatly needed.

Risk Management

Presently, there is no overall plan for the management of the City’s risk exposure: insurance purchasing, avoidance of industrial accidents, gathering data on accident patterns, etc. Again, risk management as a function is fragmented among the various City departments. As a consequence, departments cannot develop the necessary expertise to manage themselves to reduce risk-related costs.

This measure will establish a risk manager under the Chief Administrative Officer. For the first time, overall City planning will be possible in order to control risk. Departments will be told what activities are producing injuries or damage and advised on corrective measures. Private industry has been utilizing risk managers of this type for years. It is time that the City did the same.

This amendment will reduce the cost of government and insure a more efficient delivery of City services to all San Franciscans. We urge you to give it your unqualified support.

Board of Supervisors

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
Risk Manager; Claims Investigation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This charter amendment was proposed by a citizens’ task force appointed by Mayor Feinstein. Its mission was to propose ways of reducing the number and financial costs of claims and lawsuits against the City.

The amendment has two principal features. The first is to centralize within the City Attorney’s office the investigation of claims filed against city departments. This will allow for improved training and supervision of the investigators, who presently are scattered throughout city government. The result will be more efficient, cost-effective and professional investigation of claims. By improving the quality of claims investigation, the City can identify those claims which have merit and attempt to reach early—and less costly—settlements. Meritorious claims will be denied with greater confidence that if suit is filed it can be defended successfully.

The second major feature of the amendment will establish a Risk Management office under the Chief Administrative Officer. Risk management is a concept widely used in private business. Risk managers are professionals skilled in reducing the overall cost of claims. The Risk Manager would be responsible for coordinating the City’s insurance program, data collection, and correcting problems within the City which lead to claims. The Risk Manager would review those claims which have been filed against the City. Where it appears that an unsafe condition or practice has led to a claim, the Risk Manager would suggest to the affected department that corrective measures be taken. Reports to the Mayor and to the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors of the recommended corrections and the actions taken would ensure that the various departments will be responsive.

The City cannot eliminate claims and lawsuits against it. But it can limit its exposure by managing the claims process more effectively. This measure will reduce injuries and reduce claims, and that is good for everyone.

Jerome B. Falk, Jr.
Chair, Mayor’s Task Force on Claims and Judgments Against the City

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, May 31, 1986

12 Noon  State Senate, Assembly, Congress and State Propositions
1:00      Proposition A—Risk Management & Claims
1:15      Proposition B—Purchaser & Contracts
1:30      Proposition D—Civil Service
2:15      Proposition E—Balboa Reservoir
2:30      Proposition F—Compensated Advocacy
3:00      Proposition G—Apartheid
3:20      Proposition H—AIDS
3:30      Propositions I, J—Embarcadero Freeway
3:50      Statewide Candidates

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

PROPOSITION B

Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?

YES 281
NO 282

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchaser must get the approval of the Chief Administrative Officer before signing certain contracts for more than $15,000. Only the voters may change that dollar limit. The Purchaser must personally sign every contract that comes through his office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would raise the limit on contracts requiring the Chief Administrative Officer's approval to $50,000. It would also allow the Board of Supervisors to change that limit by ordinance. Proposition B would also permit the Purchaser to name certain people in his office to sign contracts on his behalf.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer's approval only on contracts for more than $50,000. You also want the Purchaser to be able to name certain people in his office to be able to sign contracts on his behalf.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to require the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer's approval on contracts for more than $15,000. You also want him to sign all contracts himself.

Controller's Statement on "B"

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On March 3 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON B:

The City’s Charter requires that a permanent, non-elected City official, the Chief Administrative Officer, review all purchases and contracts above $15,000. Of course, CAO approval of major contracts is very important. But, due to inflation, the number of contracts that have to go to the CAO for approval is always increasing. Today there are too many documents requiring CAO approval. This slows down the purchasing process, occupies staff time — and ultimately costs the City money. Proposition B will raise the CAO approval level to $50,000, and help the City to improve the efficiency of its purchasing operations.

The City’s budget includes more than $250 million for purchases on tens of thousands of contracts. At the current $15,000 review limit, the CAO must approve thousands of documents every year — a costly, time-consuming process. In the long run the City loses money because of the inordinate length of time required to complete all the paperwork.

An adjustment must be made to remove the smaller contracts from this cumbersome process. Review and approval of contracts under $50,000 should be under the responsibility of the City Purchaser, a highly trained and experienced professional, who reports directly to the CAO. By changing the present $15,000 to $50,000, it will be possible for the CAO to give each document that comes to him the attention it requires. And, by placing its orders and paying its bills faster, both the City and businesses will benefit — especially small business and those owned by minorities and women. Proposition B will allow future adjustments to the limit to be made by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility will ensure the City's ability to adjust to inflation and changes in the market.

This amendment comes to you with the recommendation of auditors, controllers, bankers, and others who exercise fiduciary responsibility within their own organizations.

VOTE YES ON B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will make essential changes to update the purchasing and payment procedures under the Chief Administrative Officer. These measures are necessary and desirable because they will save the City money by significantly increasing our management efficiency.

Right now, the City loses because it takes too long for contracts to be reviewed and payments okayed, which means that early payment incentives go unutilized. The CAO has to approve every contract greater than $15,000 — and with City purchases last year over $250 million, the paperwork logjam is vast and overwhelming.

An increase in the review limit from $15,000 to $50,000 will make an adequate adjustment for inflation — $50,000 now is only about $15,000 in 1967 dollars. Proposition B will also enable the City Purchaser, who reports to the CAO, to maximize potential savings through early payments by designating appropriate personnel to approve contracts up to $50,000. These “Good Business” amendments are consistent with private sector practices and should be incorporated by the CAO in the City’s best interests.

Finally, Proposition B will give the City the ability to respond quickly to changes in the market place by allowing changes in the CAO review limit by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility is necessary to ensure that in the future we will not lose money because of institutional rigidity. Control is maintained with the necessity of Board action and Mayoral approval to adjust the review limit, and this same feature will allow for change when desired.

Vote yes on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

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

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the civil service system of the City of San Francisco. The structure of the civil service system and certain rules governing its operation are written into the Charter and can only be changed by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would make major changes. A Department of Personnel Administration would run the Civil Service system and would be able to change rules with Commission approval. Major features of Proposition D are described below. The complete charter amendment is printed in this voters' handbook.

Department of Personnel Administration

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Certain civil service rules governing the general operation of the system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs, are written into the Charter and carried out by the Civil Service Commission. Only the voters can change these rules.

THE PROPOSAL: A department of Personnel Administration would be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. A Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor would run the Department. Certain rules governing examination, selection and appointment would be taken out of the Charter. The Personnel Director would be able to change these rules with the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

Civil Service Commission

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the general operation of the civil service system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs. The Commission also hears and decides appeals on civil service matters.

THE PROPOSAL: The Civil Service Commission would no longer be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. The Commission could investigate the operation of the system, approve rule changes proposed by the Personnel Director, and hear and decide appeals only on claims of job discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest.

Employee Relations

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors appoints an Employee Relations Director to negotiate contracts with City employees; the Board approves all contracts.

THE PROPOSAL: The Mayor or his or her agent would negotiate with City employees; the Board of Supervisors would still approve all contracts.

What your vote means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing civil service system.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy
(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partrian, political, social or other considerations. Consistent with the City's and County's affirmative action goals, no applicant or employee shall be selected, appointed, reduced in rank, removed or in any way favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, union activities, political affiliation or sexual orientation.

(b) The purpose of the civil service system is to obtain for the city and county the best qualified persons to fill city and county positions in a timely and economical manner, using professional, fair and equitable personnel selection and personnel management practices with consideration of the following merit principles:
1. Recruiting, selecting and advancing employees on the basis of their ability, knowledge, skills and performance relative to the work to be performed.
2. Establishing equitable and adequate compensation, as provided elsewhere in this charter.
3. Training employees, as needed, to promote productivity and high quality performance and to facilitate career development.
4. Retaining employees during good service and separating employees for good cause.
5. Assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration, with proper regard for their privacy and constitutional rights; and assuring equal employment opportunity, based on the person's ability to do the job.
6. Assuring that employees are protected against coercion for political purposes and are prohibited from using their official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the outcome of an election or a nomination for office.

(c) This charter does not limit the power of departments, agencies, or other subdivisions of the city and county in their exercise of management prerogatives including but not limited to:
1. Directing employees in the performance of their duties;
2. Hiring, promoting, transferring and assigning employees from those qualified;
3. Classifying positions in accordance with Section 3.663 (b);
4. Disciplining employees;
5. Laying off employees because of lack of work, lack of funds or other reasonable cause;
6. Determining the mission of its departments and divisions, and its budget, organization, the number of its employees, and the numbers, types, classifications and grades of positions or employees assigned to an organization unit, work project, shift or tour of duty, and the methods and technology of performing its work.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy
(a) All employees in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service, and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. No person shall in any way be favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, age, religion, national origin, or other non-merit factors.
(b) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in subsection (a) or any other provisions of this charter, it shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, consistent with a policy of acquiring qualified personnel for the service of the city and county, to encourage the hiring of blind persons. It shall further be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that no other qualified blind person shall be discriminated against in examination, re-examination, appointment, re-appointment, waiver of eligibility for appointment or reappointment, promotion or demotion in any class, subclass or position in the civil service unless eyesight is indispensable for the performance of the duties and responsibilities of the class, subclass or position. It shall be the duty of the commission to classify, and from time to time it may reclassify, places of employment in the civil service the duties of which may be efficiently performed by qualified blind persons, and to conduct appropriate examinations which will fairly test the capacity of blind persons as well as sighted persons to perform such duties.
(c) The commission shall be appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

3.203-2 Employee Relations Director
Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3.310 of this charter, the employee relations director shall be appointed by the Board of Supervisors and shall hold office at the pleasure of said board.

3.102 Employee Relations
It shall be the duty of the mayor to meet and confer with employee representatives on behalf of the city and county and all its constituent boards, commissions, departments and agencies as required by applicable law. These duties may be performed by a designee of the mayor who shall serve at the pleasure of the mayor. Nothing herein shall limit the mayor from contracting for the performance of these duties.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the mayor shall submit all memoranda of understanding or ordinances to be enacted pursuant to Article VIII of this charter heretofore before submission to the Board of Supervisors with its approval or rejection.

3.660 Commission; Composition; Meetings
There is hereby established a civil service commission, which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county who have the general powers and duties set forth in section 3.661.

The civil service commission shall consist of five members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners shall be in office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and this charter section as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following. The respective terms of the commissioners who shall hold office on the effective date of this section as amended shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date. Thereupon, the mayor shall appoint

continued on page 73
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Vote YES and join 34,000 San Franciscans who signed petitions to get this crucial reform on the ballot. “D” clears the way to modernize Civil Service so that it is fair and efficient. The present system is a 50-year conglomeration of rules that tie the City’s hands—

— A protest by one applicant can hold up hiring for an entire job classification for months—even years.
— Often tests cannot be given frequently enough to maintain current tests of qualified employees. This leads to delays and temporary appointments that make hiring top candidates all but impossible.
— Appointments to jobs are restricted to the top three names on a list even though more than three people have the same score!
— Many provisions are out of date. Some deal with hiring during the Korean War. Others limit our ability to carry out affirmative action.

“D” would remove archaic rules from the Charter so they could be changed as the times require—subject to meet and confer and public hearings. Job tests could be expedited; hiring and promotions speeded up; opportunities opened to women and minorities.

Specifically, Proposition D:
1) Creates a Department of Personnel Administration at no additional cost. Like other U.S. cities, day-to-day administration would be the responsibility of a director, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Supervisors.
2) Makes the Civil Service Commission the oversight body to set policy and hear appeals. Rulings would have to be within 60 days, eliminating endless delays.
3) Moves the office of labor relations from the Supervisors to the Mayor, who must make the tough-minded decisions to balance the budget. Never again could the Board give labor $27 million for “comparable worth.”

This reform is the product of years of work with SPUR, League of Women Voters, Chamber of Commerce. Members of the Board of Supervisors could have put the reform on the ballot last year but bowed to some labor leaders, and 34,000 San Franciscans had to do the job for them.

Proposition D will enable City government to work better for you. Vote YES.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON ‘D’

Proposition D is a complex proposition with a simple goal: remove the archaic restrictions on the hiring, promotion, or firing of city employees and bring San Francisco’s personnel system into the modern age.

Archaic is the only way to describe a system that keeps equally qualified people from competing for a job, and that takes months—sometimes years—to fill vacancies.

For example, if 50 people score equally high on a competitive examination, shouldn’t they all have a chance for any job for which they are eligible? Not under the current system, which requires complicated tie-breaking rules not at all related to a person’s qualifications or abilities.

Or what about being able to hire the best person available for a given job? Currently, eligibility lists are frozen for two years and every person on each list, including the lowest-scoring, must be offered a job before the highest-scoring person on a more recent list. Private businesses couldn’t function saddled with such absurdities.

Proposition D cuts through the red tape. It creates a modern personnel department, with a director responsible for carrying out rules to ensure fairness and efficiency. Accountable to the Mayor, the director would be selected from a list provided by the Civil Service Commission, and subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.

The Civil Service Commission remains an independent body, with the right to approve new personnel rules and hold hearings on abuses. Also under ‘D’, negotiations with employee unions would be under the Mayor, subject to approval by the Supervisors, providing checks and balances in balancing our budget.

With greater accountability and continued checks and balances, Proposition D will open the way to more efficient government in our City.

Bill Maher, Supervisor
Louise Reine, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON ‘D’

Proposition D is a necessary reform to the City’s Civil System. As the City’s Chief Administrative Officer for almost ten years, I have found that quality employee hiring is difficult and the process causes long delays.

The current system is:
• inflexible. The City cannot hire and promote the most qualified persons.
• inefficiently administered by a commission. Other large

(continued)
cities do not have such a bureaucratic process.

- antiquated. Civil service rules represent practices of the 1950s rather than the 1980s.

The new system:
- allows the Mayor to appoint an effective personnel director, who controls administration and procedures.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

It's 1986 and we're still trying to manage City business as if it were 1932. As heads of City departments, charged with the daily responsibility of putting out fires, fighting crime, maintaining hospitals, parks, libraries and providing other essential services, we know from bitter experience about shortcomings of the existing Civil Service System.

Enacted with the City Charter in 1932, the system is foundering in red tape. Outdated rules are the subject of endless challenges. Tests are put off; vacancies go unfilled; promotions delayed; any appeal, however groundless, stops the process in its tracks.

Proposition D would take old procedures out of the Charter so they could be changed in an orderly process by the Civil Service Commission, which also would hear appeals.

Day-to-day administration of the tests—the content, scoring, all the myriad details of managing a complex system, would be put into a modern, highly professional personnel office. Tests would be speeded' up. Hiring would keep pace with need. Promotions would be on the basis of competence. High performance would be the standard. Discipline could be imposed with working rights fully protected, and women and minorities would be assured equal opportunity.

Proposition D will help improve management and the quality of City services. Vote Yes on D.

Frank Jordan, Chief of Police
Emmet Condon, Fire Chief
Don Birrer, Director, Public Works
Mary Burns, General Manager, Recreation & Park
John Franz, City Librarian
Eugene Garland, Director, Port
Marvin Geistlinger, Purchaser
Wilbur Hamilton, Executive Director, Redevelopment Agency
Claire Isaac, Director, Arts Commission
Ray King, Director, Parking Authority
Dean Macris, Director, City Planning
Graun Mickins, Director, Human Rights Commission
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, PUC
Joyce Ream, Director, Aging
Ed Sarsfield, General Manager, Social Services
Thelma Shelley, Managing Director, War Memorial
Moina So, Executive Director, Community Development
Louis Tarpen, Director of Airport
Dr. David Westerberg, Director, Health Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The hiring practices outlined in San Francisco City Charter have been virtually unchanged since 1931, a severe handicap in running a modern city. Proposition D is designed to streamline the charter and ensure that the rights of present city employees and candidates for city jobs are protected, while improving the hiring process itself. The initiative also builds management accountability in the city system.

Proposition D Is More Fair, More Efficient, More Economical

The day-to-day personnel functions, including hiring, will be consolidated under a Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. Decisions of the Director of Personnel on examination content and administration are final, unless a decision is stayed during the appeal process by a unanimous vote of the Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D will make it easier to modernize the many archaic Civil Service rules and procedures now included in the Charter, while maintaining a strong and independent Civil Service Commission to safeguard the merit system and protect the rights of city employees. Many detailed rules will come out of the Charter and will become personnel regulations. These regulations can then be modernized, but only through a process which includes public hearings and meet and confer sessions with the union involved. In addition, the Civil Service Commission must approve any changes or new regulations governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfer, resignation and terminations.

Proposition D Will Improve Performance And Public Confidence

The openness and fairness of the proposition will benefit everyone. Well-qualified job candidates will have a better chance of being hired, and well-qualified job holders will have a better chance of being promoted. This means generally better job performance in all departments, resulting in higher employee morale and more public confidence in city government.

Submitted by
Louis Hop Lee, President
Civil Service Commission
Lee Munson, Member Civil Service Commission and Treasurer, San Franciscans for Fair and Efficient Government
VOTE YES ON D

Cities can survive only with strong management. The greatest budgetary restraint must be exercised to assure that full value is received for each tax dollar spent.

With firm limits on what it can spend and faced with a possible loss of Federal funds next year, the City must be managed with the greatest possible efficiency.

Essential to greater efficiency is the need for Civil Service reform. As members of City Commissions, we constantly confront the torturous delays and confused rules that gridlock the present system. The present system simply can't respond to the City's personnel needs.

Qualified applicants become frustrated and seek employment elsewhere. Promotions are blocked. Morale suffers. Temporaries fill in; overtime mounts. The ability to plan is crippled; management is weakened.

Proposition D would put the system on a business-like basis. A personnel department would handle day-to-day administration. The Civil Service Commission would be the watchdog to assure the integrity of the merit system.

This streamlined system would replace what is now inflexible and cumbersome. Testing could be accelerated; hiring made more efficient and promotions made on time. The result would be greater efficiency and elimination of costly waste.

Vote Yes on D.

Jerry E. Berg, President, Board of Permit Appeals
Henry Berman, President, Fire Commission
Mo Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Hector Chinchilla, Rent Board
Rev. Harry Chuck, Housing Authority
Dr. Arthur Coleman, President, Port Commission
Owen Davit, Police Commission
J. Edward Fleisch, Airports Commission
H. Welton Flynn, President, Public Utilities Commission
James Foster, Health Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation & Park Commission
James Fussell, President, Housing Authority
Anne Halsted, Port Commission
Tommy Harris, Recreation & Park Commission
Tom Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Walter Joe, Public Library Commission
Jeffrey Lee, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Philip Lee, President, Health Commission
Bruce W. Lilenthal, Small Business Advisory Commission
Jacqueline Nemirovski, President, Arts Commission
Toby Rosenblatt, President, Planning Commission
Dr. David Sanchez, President, Police Commission
Joan San Jule, Housing Authority
John Patrick Short, President, Parking Authority
Marjorie G. Stern, President, Public Library Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D contains civil service reform measures urged by the League of Women Voters since 1969.

Proposition D will:
— Modernize the City's outdated personnel system by creating a Director of Personnel, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors
— Preserve the principles of merit through policies set by the Civil Service Commission
— Create a more responsive Civil Service system at no additional cost to the taxpayer

EFFICIENCY AND FLEXIBILITY

Proposition D transfers authority for day-to-day management of the City's personnel system from the Civil Service Commission to the Director of Personnel. This will:
— Prevent hiring delays
— Ensure only the most qualified individuals are hired and promoted
— Provide City managers with more administrative flexibility

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote Yes on Proposition D the Civil Service Modernization Initiative.

Prevent abuse of a system that was intended to serve the public and protect against favoritism. Prevent situations like this: an employee failed to report to work for a week without explanation; he was telephoned, notified by certified mail and a message left under his door; he was terminated 13 days later; he did not appeal the termination and the civil service commission up-

---
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Civil Service

Argумент in Favor of Proposition D

San Francisco government is huge, with a budget of more than $1 billion per year and 25,000 employees. It is expected to solve serious problems. This requires that the City have the ability to hire and promote talented people to do the job.

The present civil service system is so tied up in red tape that jobs remain vacant for six months to a year, and all too often someone who is not capable of doing a good job is hired. Your tax dollars are being wasted, and you are not receiving the quality of services you need and deserve.

Proposition D will modernize San Francisco's civil service system. It separates the personnel department from the Civil Service Commission, and puts the department under the Mayor where it belongs. The Mayor is responsible for balancing the budget and delivering city services as efficiently as possible. She cannot do this unless she can find capable people to do the job. That is the task of the personnel department in any organization.

Proposition D will also insure that the independent Civil Service Commission has sufficient authority to require the personnel system to be fair in its treatment of City employees. The Commission will be able to issue subpoenas and require testimony of witnesses on investigations it conducts. Should it find that discrimination has occurred, it can issue orders that must be obeyed.

Most major American cities, and virtually all cities and counties in California, have the kind of civil service system that will be established by Proposition D. San Francisco's present system is still mired in the past. It hobbles the ability of the City to deliver services and spend your tax dollars as efficiently as possible.

SPUR has not placed a statement in the Voter's Handbook for any other issue over the past 15 years. We feel that Proposition D is so vital for San Francisco's future that we are making this appeal for your support.

Vote "YES" on Proposition D.

SPUR — The San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Reform Initiative, will give San Francisco citizens the HIGH PERFORMANCE GOVERNMENT necessary to meet the many challenges of the future. Proposition D corrects the outdated and inflexible requirements originally written in San Francisco's City Charter in 1931. It will eliminate the problems which prevent San Francisco's personnel system from operating with efficiency the City's voters and taxpayers deserve:

- Proposition D insures City jobs will be filled from current lists of the most qualified employees.

Proposition D prevents ungrounded appeals from delaying for years the appointment or promotion of qualified employees.

Proposition D eliminates the repetitive tasks currently monopolizing the Civil Service Commission meetings and directs the Commission to serve as an appellate body to protect the City's good employees.

Proposition D centralizes the day-to-day operation of the civil service system and makes the Director of Personnel responsible to the Mayor.

Proposition D simplifies the budgetary process by making the Mayor the City's chief labor negotiator, responsible for setting favoritism and must assure that everyone has an equal and fair chance at employment.

The present system does not do that. We feel this initiative will make the system work better, for the managers, for the employees and for the public.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Submitted by,
The Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee

| David Anacher | Robert Hayden |
| Jerome Anderson | Walter Hoadley |
| Richard Blum | John Jacobs |
| Charles Chapman | Michael McGill |
| Arthur Cooke, Jr. | Ellen Newman |
| Benton Dial | Roy Nordman |
| James Edgar | Frank Tatum |
| Ruben Garcia |  |
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PERSONNEL MANAGERS SAY YES ON PROPOSITION D

As the personnel managers for City Departments, we are charged with the responsibility of managing the City’s personnel system. The activities include examinations, hiring, training, discipline, union-management relations, affirmative action and compensation. No one knows better than we the frustrations experienced in attempting to monitor an unbelievable sequence of overlapping bureaucratic activities in attempting to get the job done.

Proposition D will bring our personnel system into line with most other public personnel systems. The improved system will create the potential for being more responsive to the needs of operating departments. It will improve labor relations by transferring this function to the executive branch of government where it belongs.

Proposition D will streamline certain routine procedures resulting in a reduction of cost and time. Under the current system delays are experienced due to lengthy appeals during which time the departments’ objectives are delayed.

Proposition D will create an atmosphere of increased accountability for department managers in the areas of affirmative action, discipline and job performance.

Proposition D has been endorsed by the San Francisco Council of Human Resource Managers, the association of over one hundred personnel managers in City government.

Proposition D strengthens merit system principles. Civil Service commissioners will have more time to enforce and protect these principles rather than being bogged down in the day-to-day activities of administration.

Proposition D will help bring about improved methods and practices in personnel administration and should result in a more competent and effective workforce which the citizens of San Francisco have a right to expect.

Alvin W. Schaaf
Personnel Director
Recreation and Park Department
Marsha Ramirez
Personnel Officer
San Francisco Port
Edward M. Gazzano
Personnel Director
Department of Health
James Horan
Senior Personnel Officer
Department of Social Services
James Innicky
Personnel Director
San Francisco International Airport

Andrea R. Gourdin
Manager, Bureau of Personnel & Training
Public Utilities Commission
Mori Noguchi
Senior Department Personnel Officer
Mary Smith
Senior Personnel Officer
Laguna Honda Hospital
Theoda Poteet
Senior Personnel Officer
San Francisco General Hospital
John Burke
Personnel Director
Controller’s Office

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will assist the Department of Public Works by streamlining the Civil Service process.

- The current system, the duration of eligible lists from 2 to 4 years hampers the Department from hiring graduates of colleges and universities on an annual basis. Consequently, many excellent candidates are not entered into the Civil Service System. Passage of the proposition will improve the quality of the pool of applicants and thereby the quality of public service given by the Department.

- The establishment of a Personnel Director to administer the day-to-day tasks of the system will speed up the decision making process to the advantage of employees and management alike.

The proposition still calls for checks and balances in that the Commission will continue to hear appeals on discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest. The Commission will act as a watchdog while leaving the general administration to the Personnel Director.

The initiative will make for an improved system for employees, management and the citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Donald Birrer
Director of Public Works

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

- Examinations for employees on military leave
- Certification of eligibles — Rule of three
- Duration of employment lists
- Temporary employee appointments
- (B) allows continuous up-dating of employment lists.
- (C) allows equitable treatment of job candidates with same test score.
- (D) realigns responsibilities: the Civil Service Commission dealing primarily with compliance and adjudication activities
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Initiative, is a long-overdue reform to streamline antiquated hiring practices in San Francisco's fifty-year-old charter. Proposition D will ensure that the best and brightest job candidates are chosen to serve our city, thus promoting excellence in job performance and helping to eliminate incompetence. This initiative builds management accountability in the city system, while giving the Civil Service Commission the independence to protect the rights of women and minorities.

A Better, More Efficient System at Less Cost

Proposition D consolidates personnel functions, including hiring, under a new Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. The Director has final authority over content of examinations given city job applicants, so more flexibility is possible in finding truly qualified candidates.

Proposition D redefines the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit systems appeals board and policy-setting body. The merit principles are spelled out in the Proposition. This allows the Commission to protect the rights of women and minorities at no cost to the public.

More Fair to Everyone

Proposition D greatly improves the city charter. Well-qualified job candidates have a better chance to be hired and well-qualified job holders have a better chance to be promoted. The public is rewarded with the better job performance, efficiency and friendliness one expects from good government employees. All of these improvements are at no additional cost to the taxpayer.

Submitted by

James W. Haas

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

For more than a half-century, San Francisco Mayors have abided by the employee examination, hiring and promotion policies administered by a strong and independent Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D is a deceptive and dangerous scheme that would give future Mayors and top-level bureaucrats the power to ignore competence and reward political loyalty.

Proposition D would take key Civil Service employment rules out of the City Charter and make them subject to wheeling and dealing by City Hall politicians.

There’s an old saying — “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.”

Civil Service has worked well for more than 50 years. Proposition D is unnecessary, ineffective and even counter-productive.

It's not just deceptive, it's dangerous.

Joseph L. Alioto
Former Mayor of San Francisco
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Time and time again, different groups have put various propositions on the ballot to weaken our Civil Service System and reintroduce political patronage into City employment practices. And every time the voters have wisely rejected these schemes, no matter how cleverly they have been disguised.

Proposition D is just another power grab by bureaucrats at the top in City Hall.

We’ve said NO! loud and clear in the past. Let’s say NO one more time.

Submitted by:
TAXPAYERS FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT
Thomas Scanlon
City Treasurer, Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “D”!!

During the eight years while a member of the Board of Supervisors, I fought hard to reform the Civil Service Commission and to bring working conditions and city workers’ pay equitable to both workers and taxpayers. I fought to insure an independent Civil Service Commission that would remain just that—indepen-dent and free from political influence and political patronage of particularly the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

I am truly saddened by the Mayor’s insistence in bringing this disastrous Proposition “D” before the voters. Some of the Supervisors rejected this misguided measure for what it is; an unwise consolidation of authority to hire, fire and promote city workers by the Mayor and newly created personnel officer.

My efforts to bring pay equity to both taxpayers and city workers were continually squashed by then Supervisor Feinstein and Supervisor Molinari. Finally, in 1975, shortly after a disastrous city strike, I was able to place on the ballot, for voter approval, a measure that almost eliminates the power of the Mayor and Supervisors to manipulate the pay of city workers. This measure was overwhelmingly passed by the voters that year and we have not had any labor unrest since that date.

Vote No on “D”!

“D” stands for disaster. It will undo many of these reforms. Also, right now, the City is almost broke, thanks to the manipulation of Mayor Feinstein and her chief ally Supervisor Molinari.

If “D” passes the cost of operating our city government will increase in the next 24 months by not less than $60,000,000.

Contrary to the provisions of Proposition 13, property taxes would be increased, thus forcing up rents.

Vote No on “D”.

Don’t weaken our Civil Service Commission, whereby least deserving city employees could be promoted because of connection or clout.

Vote No on “D”.

We now almost have more problems than we can handle. We don’t want our city turned into another Chicago, wherefor nearly half a century a corrupt political system flourished under Mayor Richard Daley.

John Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We join San Franciscans for Fair Employment in opposing the Civil Service Initiative, Proposition D.

This measure will severely hamper the well-being of the San Francisco Fire and Police Departments. These departments are two of the finest in the Country and have consistently protected life and property in a professional manner. They must continue that tradition with a civil service system based on MERIT and not political patronage.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.
Andrew C. Casper
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired
Thomas J. Cahill
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired
Keith P. Cullen
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired
Donald M. Scott
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired
William F. Murray
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Our present Civil Service system was designed to keep corruption out of government. It has generally served that purpose well. This proposition would dismantle that system and in my opinion open the doors to nepotism, favoritism, patronage and corruption. Better a city government that is bureaucratic than one that is corrupt. Vote NO on D.

 Supervisor Richard Hongisto
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is an attack on the merit system and an attempt to return patronage to the Mayor’s office by eliminating the authority of the Civil Service Commission and its built in checks and balances.

The present Civil Service system is not perfect, but corrections can be made within the Charter without destroying a system that has worked for over 50 years and has been free from fraud and corruption.

This proposition will do nothing to improve the caliber of police performance and could have the opposite effect. I urge you to vote NO on PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by
The San Francisco Police Supervisors and Investigators Association
Don Good, Captain SFPD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D could be a dangerous first step toward weakening the independent, impartial administration of our City government.

Proposition D would transfer power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor. The Director’s decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline and certification would be final. The Commission would have no right to hear examinations or disciplinary appeals.

With the transfer of duties and responsibilities from the Commission to the Mayor’s appointed Personnel Director, the Mayor would have control over personnel functions. Currently, commissioners have independent status and can be dismissed for cause. The Personnel Director could be dismissed at will.

The Merit System could be replaced by a patronage system. Proposition D could open the door to rules permitting the Personnel Director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his or her position on the list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Proposition D is NOT a reform package. The checks and balances for efficient City government would be lopsided, with too much power in the hands of unknown future Mayors.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
John L. Molinari, President
Harry G. Britt
Richard Horgisto
Willie B. Kennedy
Wendy Nelder
Nancy Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Beware of PROPOSITION D!

Powerful special interest groups are attempting to remove key City employees from the independent and impartial Civil Service system in the name of “reform”.

They want instead to make these employees answerable directly to future Mayors and politically-appointed Personnel Directors and department heads.

PROPOSITION D got on the ballot because the Chamber of Commerce and such companies as Pacific Bell and PG&E paid a professional southern California campaign firm, $70,000 to collect signatures.

They’re trying to destroy the merit system and replace it with an old-fashioned patronage system.

Department heads will be able to ignore examination scores and reward loyalty rather than competence in promotions and hiring.

Don’t let the Chamber of Commerce, big business and their allies in the City bureaucracy dictate who’s hired, fired and promoted among public employees.

PROPOSITION D is not just deceptive, it’s dangerous![
Vote NO on PROPOSITION D!

Libby Dennebom
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Ron Huberman
Vice-Chairman, Democratic Central Committee
Jim Wacob
Democratic Central Committee
Roberto Esteves
President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Rick Pucurar
President, Harvey Milk Lesbian Gay Democratic Club
Walter L. Johnson
Exec. Sec’y, S. F. Labor Council
Michael Bernick
Sal Roselli
Linda Post
Deborah Stein
John Mehring
Pat Norman
Nancy Walker
Gwen Craig
Harry Britt
Louise Minnick
Carole Migden
Agar Jacobs
Jack Morrison
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D places too much power in the hands of ONE.
Proposition D will provide for a personnel director to be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. The Mayor now appoints five members of the Civil Service Commission who also serve at her pleasure.

You work for years to climb the civil service ladder and then somebody comes along with an idea to cut you off at the pockets.

Proposition D will lock in all the employees employed in the Mayor's office and will control the appointments of any new staff by the next Mayor elect in 1987 and years thereafter.
Like controlling your estate from the grave.
Vote NO on D.

Marguerite Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service Merit System has served our City well, giving San Franciscans an equal opportunity. It has helped us obtain employment and earn promotions based on objective examinations.

The Civil Service Merit system replaced the old patronage system that rewarded political loyalty more than competence.

Now the supporters of PROPOSITION D want to create a new Personnel Director, accountable only to the Mayor, and give department heads the absolute power to decide who works for the City and who gets promoted.

If PROPOSITION D passes, equal opportunity would give way to opportunity based on membership in the bureaucratic "establishment".

Keep our Civil Service Merit System strong and free from the political abuses of the past.
Vote NO on D!

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly

Ben Tom
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board

JoAnne Miller
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board

A. Richard Cerbuto
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board

Dr. Sedonia Wilson
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board

Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, President
S. F. Community College Governing Board

Julie Tang
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board

Alan S. Wong
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board

Henry Der
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board

Robert "Bob" Morales

Yori Wada

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Can you imagine studying for a civil service examination, being rated at the top of the eligible list and never receiving the promotion? That's exactly what Proposition "D" will do should the electorate adopt this amendment.

The civil service merit system has defects, but to totally eliminate the system and replace it with a patronage system where promotions are based on who you know, rather than what you know is scandalous.

Civil service was put into place to prevent scandal and the "favor seeking" individual from getting a paid position because he/she happened to support the right elected official.

Proposition "D" will allow one person, chosen by the Mayor, to decide who will be promoted, hired and fired. This is awesome power for one single individual to have at any level of government.

Our current Mayor may choose a fair person for this position, but will future Mayors be as careful? As each new Mayor assumes office, the civil service system will again change. The potential to favor one individual or group over others is great.

Proposition "D" has a great potential to diminish the quality of services we now provide to our citizens, as the future of how people are hired and promoted in the San Francisco Police Department is completely unknown.

It's true our promotional system is fraught with delays and delays frustrate us all, but Proposition "D" is not the answer. Proposition "D" will only add to our existing problems. Several years ago, our citizens elected a Charter Commission to streamline city government and make civil service work more efficiently. The voters eventually rejected those proposals. The checks and balances that make our government stable were no longer present. It simply went too far.

Proposition "D" goes even further. It brings about a system of patronage and should be defeated lest we want to engage in "free-wheeling and dealing" of civil service jobs and promotions.

We urge a strong No vote against Proposition "D"!

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry, President
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The purpose of the Civil Service Commission is to ensure that the merit system would be the only criteria in any examination process.

If Proposition D passes, all authority concerning examinations would be taken from the Civil Service Commission and given to a Personnel Director, who is appointed by the Mayor. This Personnel Director would have the authority to hire and fire at his discretion, with no appeal available. This proposition is contrary to everything the Fire Department and all City employees have strived for over the years.

The Civil Service Commission in its present form was instituted to prevent any possibility of a patronage system, where one person has complete control.

This proposition would do nothing to improve your Fire Department. If you are satisfied with the work and make up of the San Francisco Fire Department in its present form, "Vote No On Proposition D". You will be doing a service for the San Francisco Fire Department, and the people of San Francisco.

Submitted by the San Francisco Fire Chiefs' Association
John Flaherty, Battalion Chief SFFD President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is bad government and bad politics, changing our independent civil service system into a system dominated by the Mayor:

. . . By shortening the six year terms of Civil Service Commission to conform to the Mayor's four year term of office.

. . . By transferring most of the Commission's powers to a Personnel Director who serves solely at the Mayor's pleasure.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D fails to offer enough new and improved procedures to cure the current defects in the civil service system. Charter sections and civil service rules are repealed without specific known replacements.

Proposition D transfers power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created personnel director appointed by, and to serve at the pleasure of, the Mayor. The director's decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline, and certification would be final. The commission would have no right to hear examination or disciplinary appeals.

There are hidden costs with Proposition D because the new Personnel Administration Department will employ a personnel director, and other employees "as may be necessary to carry out (its) functions and duties."

The Merit System could be replaced by an old style Patronage System. Proposition D could open the door to rules which permit the personnel director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his/her position on the civil service testing list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Police and Fire Commissions would lose functions as a result of the personnel director's new power. The director's unlawful employment discrimination policy would be binding upon department administrators. The director's procedure for employee dispute resolution must be used by all department heads and appointing officers.

Proposition D is not the answer. The checks and balances for efficient city government would be lopsided.

I urge a no vote on Proposition D.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, 17th Assembly District
Sula Burton
Congresswoman
Art Agnos
16th Assembly District
Milton Marks
State Senator

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

Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?

YES 292

NO 293

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission declared Balboa Reservoir South (located across Phelan Avenue from San Francisco City College) surplus in 1984 and made the site available for low, moderate and market rate housing. In July 1985, a City-community advisory committee chose a developer to build 203 single-family homes on the 13 acre site. Construction has not yet begun.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would prohibit granting new building permits and would revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site (Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1) between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit granting any new building permits and you want to revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to allow building permits to be granted for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

Controller's Statement on "E"

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

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

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

How "E" Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for a three-year ban on development of the Balboa Reservoir site had qualified for the June ballot. Sidney Kass and Jesse David Wall, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 12,430 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985. A random check of the petition showed that 10,012 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 77
Balboa Reservoir Development Ban

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Having been responsible for providing leadership at City College from 1947 to 1977, we cannot stand by and see this site converted to housing. We must speak out. Such a move would preclude forever the logical and much needed campus expansion to what was once our West Campus. We left that site reluctantly to make way for water storage. If it is no longer required for that purpose, let us return it to City College.

Thousands of San Franciscans—high school graduates, dropouts, veterans, re-entering women—representing all of the city’s diverse ethnic groups, have been prepared for transfer to four-year colleges, profitable careers, and have had their lives enriched at the City College of San Francisco. Without City College’s open door and easy access, many would have been deprived of these opportunities.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION ‘E’

We question:
1. Why no EIR was required when the proposed development could have a substantial impact.
2. Whether the future needs of City College for classrooms, housing, and parking have been considered.
3. What the impact on taxpayers is with below market land sale and construction financing by bonds.

This moratorium will permit adequate study of these issues. Vote YES on Proposition ‘E’.

Bruce Bonacker, President
Board of Directors, Glen Park Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don’t let a developer make a mint on land across from the most overcrowded college in the Bay Area! Parking is already an impossibility for residents near City College...adding 200 homes to this land would make the situation much worse.

It’s simple: a college which can’t find room for more students at a time when more people are returning to education doesn’t serve the community.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot.

The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot.

The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

You’d probably be upset. We certainly are. Please help us protect our neighborhood. Please vote YES on proposition E.

Westwood Park Residents:
Edna Tooke
Minnie Dorwin
Eugene Eden
Donna Nicolini
Robert Armstrong
Pauline Armstrong
Joel Martinez
Richard & Lisa Patterson
David Bean
H. Boozzel
William Burke
Richard Robel
Clyde Theriot
Dannie Manus
Esma Manus

Sunnyside Residents:
Ellen Wall
Melissa Voluntad
David Wall
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let the greedy developers take this potentially picturesque open space.
A yes vote means you want more time to consider its future use. All we ask is time to think and plan.

John Barbagelata
Former member, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Suppose there was a publicly owned open space across the street from the main U.C. Berkeley Campus.
Can you imagine for one moment that it would be passed into private ownership?
Vote Yes on E for Equality and Excellence in Education

City College Students:
William Lew, Student
Tim McGuire, Student Council Member
Joseph Goldstein, Student Council Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

In 1952, the "Experts" said we needed reservoirs. They felt so strongly that they condemned the City College West Campus, destroyed the buildings, and constructed the reservoirs—all at taxpayer's expense.

Now, in 1986 with more demand for water, the "Experts" say the reservoir is no longer needed. What is the concerned taxpayer to believe?
When in doubt, the city should hold on to the expensive things already paid for.

Stop the reservoir giveaway. Vote YES on E.

Taxpayers for Preserving the Reservoir.
Richard Patterson
Dorice Murphy
Lucille Caron
Daniel Gutierrez
Franz Witt
Bernhard Scholand
Ruth Hanson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This is a Planning issue.
We have been accused of trying to stop housing for poor people. Not true. In the first place, the price levels are certainly middle income and above, but our main objection is that this badly done plan is damaging to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as to the over-crowded community college across the street.

WHAT WE WANT
Even our critics point out that we originally SUGGESTED housing for that site, but they don't talk about what else we suggested. We want two levels of parking under a City College Library, Bookstore, and Auditorium, with housing on top. Furthermore, let the housing be TRULY affordable—for students and seniors. We are trying to stop the bureaucrats' subsidized middle income housing project because it makes our dream impossible.

We ask for three years to give the neighborhood and the college a chance to produce a better plan.

SNaP (Sensible Neighborhood Planning Committee)

Helen Crizer, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council, representing 17 neighborhood associations in the area of the surplus reservoir property in question has voted to endorse the three-year stop of private construction on the old West Campus of City College. Dr. Louis Batmale, Chancellor of City College from 1970-1977, has persuaded us that City College needs the lands.

Juanita Raven, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Be a sport.
Give City College a vote of support.
City has 23,000 students and badly needs a library. The only place to put it is in the reservoir site. City College has walked closely with San Francisco for five decades. The reservoir site has always been understood to be reserved for City College.
Until now when someone wants it for housing. Housing is important, but it can be anywhere in town. But a City College library can only be located at the College.
Vote yes to support a book—and a reader.
Reading, studying, writing and research make up our town also.
It is hard to understand criticism of City for wanting to keep this area for a library. Sure, housing sites are at a premium—but even more so a library site for City which is one of the largest schools in the Nation.
Some people blast City for wanting a library because of the need for housing. Housing is needed. But some of those very same people want a big battleship stationed here that will bring in 15,000 new family members.
The Educational and cultural growth of San Francisco mandates living space for the City College library.
If this measure gets a no vote, it means there will be no site for a Library. This is the last chance. Vote YES to help out a book—and a reader.
State financing, when approved, will construct this building.
It is the top building priority at City College.
A YES vote here means there will be time to think about the use of the site. During that three year period, cooler heads may realize this is the only site for a Library. If the housing goes in there will be no library there.
Vote yes for a book, for a good school and a better City.

John Riordan, Board of Governors
San Francisco Community College District.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Sunnyside Neighborhood Association is not against housing, but we are trying to stop a hasty and short-sighted plan. We are asking for this moratorium to get time for a better plan that will answer a variety of needs and benefit the entire city as well as our community.

This is a planning issue.
The release of the reservoir property as surplus by the water department came as a surprise to our neighborhood. The June 1984 “Residence Element” of the city’s Master Plan did not even list the land as surplus. By 1985 major decisions were being made for use of the land without adequate neighborhood input.

There were some meetings attended by a few people carefully selected for their zealous pro-housing views or potential financial gain. The resulting plan has gone out of control. Now it benefits only the developer and the lucky few who will get houses on free land.

Proposition E is not an attack on housing.
Please help us save our neighborhood against poor planning by voting YES on Proposition E.

Joe Mahoney, President
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Miraloma Improvement Club urges a YES vote on Proposition E.

Frank Mastro, President
Arnell Rodrigues
Maggie Kroll
Dorothy Evers

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

All the talk in the world can't change the fact that City College has fewer acres of land relative to its student population than any college in the Bay Area.
Enrollment at City College is INCREASING, as is the enrollment of the San Francisco public schools from which City College draws most of its students. It is obvious that City College needs and deserves the reservoir land. The three year moratorium will gave time to produce a better plan which will have in-put by faculty, students and alumni who know the college's needs and want to support it.

Sid Kass
Susie Langdon Kass
Phil Kass
City College Student
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The homeowners of Westwood Park, a neighborhood adjacent to the Balboa Reservoir, support the ballot initiative calling for a 3 year development moratorium. We believe that the City and City College should take additional time to determine their needs and how they might be met by using the Reservoir. In the event that City College does not need this property, we support its development as open space or as single family detached housing.

Westwood Park Association
Don C. Swander
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Let’s not aggregate the traffic problem around City College before we first develop solutions for the existing problems.
A three-year moratorium only buys our neighborhood and elected officials time to find solutions; it doesn’t say no to housing. A YES vote is a vote for prudent development. A YES vote helps to preserve the family character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ken Hoeger
Realtor and community Activist

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As representatives of the students of City College, we understand first-hand, the intense need to reserve a site for future school expansion.
Preservation of the Balboa Reservoir, a site directly adjacent to the campus, is particularly crucial. The facilities that CCSF requires, such as a library and an auditorium, are essential to the main structure of the campus. Unlike classrooms, it would be unreasonable to build an auditorium or a library on an off-campus site, since these facilities are integral to the main function of the school.

In short, opposition to the moratorium based on the notion that alternate sites could be secured, is misleading. Once a site near the college is taken, any hope of expansion would be eliminated.

Associated Student Council of City College
Jack Lee, Vice President of Associated Counsel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Local 2121 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, representing City College faculty, urges a yes vote on Proposition E.
While this project provides short-term employment for a few, we are more concerned about the thousands of students who would benefit from planning and development that would better serve the community and the college.

Yes on E for continued excellence in community college education.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is twice as crowded as any community college in northern California. It needs a much larger library, bookstore and auditorium, and more parking.
The college has always expected to use the empty SOUTH reservoir for educational needs. That land is finally surplus. Neither the college Governing Board nor the Chancellor attended the Mayor’s planning sessions for the property and the faculty was not informed. When the 12.3 acre site was offered to a developer for $36,900 for subsidized housing, the Chancellor said, “We are at a crossroad and the correct path is for the Board of Supervisors, with the Mayor’s support, to deed this surplus land to City College so that the college may continue to serve the city effectively for the next 50 years as it has for the past half century.” The Mayor refused. Now only Board member John Riordan supports the correct path.
The Water Department says it may need the NORTH reservoir now used for student parking. If that crisis occurs, the Chancellor says, “We’ll deal with the situation then.” How, if the south reservoir is gone?

(continued)
When land is available other community colleges finance large projects through alliances with civic, athletic and cultural organizations, and through property sales. New methods for public funding are being developed.

The faculty would like three years of careful study to unravel misunderstandings and poor management, and to find the best way to be a good neighbor.

Ken Crizer
Lene Johnson
Madeline Mueller
Julia Scholand
Steering Committee,
City College Faculty for Responsible Development

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College needs land now for desperately needed facilities, one of which is a library. City College has an enrollment of 23,000 students but our library has seating for 450. There are other possible locations for new housing, but City College can't be moved. Give us an opportunity to plan a development for the community and the college.

Annie M. Young
City College Library Faculty and Staff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty and staff members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Virgie Appling
Bill Carpenter

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Darlene Alioto
Mary Allen
Mary Ansler
Tom Angeloff
Robert Balesteri
Don Bateni
Diana Bernstein
Joe Berry
Anna Branton
Thomas Brendel
James Bristol
Richard Brogel
Laurent Brossard
Philip Brown
Barbara Cibral
John Callen
John Caris
Frank Cerrato
Rosemary Clark
Perry Close
Rut Common
Walter Cribs
George Crippen
Patricia Davis
Gay DePrimo
Edward Dierauer
Sharon Edwards
Larry Ernst
Mary Erwin
Kuey Fong
William Franke
Terry Greenfield
Robert Griffin
Michael Guthrie
Mary Hanna
Yen Kuang Ho
Peter Hoch
Ronald Hochede
Myrna Holden
Katherine Honidum
Michael Hulbert
Edward Hunt
Frank Ingersoll
Elaine Johnson
Wendy Kaufman
Jo Kennedy
Mercedes Kow
Rosalind Kwok
Don Laferty
James Lajous
Steve Levinson
Sue Light
Gary Ling
Amelia Lippi
Dave Liebert
Leon Lucy
Duane Macalos
Marion McManus
Patricia Madigan
Michael Malachowski
Mary Mari
Maria Marian
Sylvia Marshall
Valerie Mclean
Jose Mejia
Margit Michelmayr
Deanne Milan
Cindy Moody
Thomas Munro
David Mynhe
Deborah Nagele
Glen Nance
Herbert Naylor
William Neff
Dennis Pionkowski
Francine Podenski
Theresa Poydessus
Solomon Raaj
Mary Rochem
Barbara Thomas
Clare Thompson
Willie Thompson
Mary Thibeau
Robert Tricar
James Trulner
Joanne Tumminia
George VonBetz
Cherie Winters
Avery White
Joan Wilson
Rosalee Wolf
Christina Yee

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Water Department has begun a resource study of water use, due for completion in two or three years. The study may well indicate that one or both reservoirs will be needed. The American Water Works Association states that reservoirs should be used in pairs. This is particularly important because it is the only reservoir at an elevation of 305 feet.

The Mayor twisted the arm of the Water Department to declare one of these reservoirs surplus before the water resource study is completed. Don't let her get away with this kind of political manipulation.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Kurt Common
Ken Crizer
Ed Dierauf
Herb Naylor
CCSF Engineering Professors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The South Balboa Basin has been unused since college leased buildings, including a large auditorium, were torn down on that site thirty years ago. We hope that three years of thorough planning would explore the possibility of returning a part of that property to the college for the development of a multi-purpose medium-sized auditorium which could be shared with community groups.

Joseph Alessi
Mary Argenti
Neyde Azevedo
John Bischoff

Robert Bozina
Mack Crooks
Bob Davis
Helen Dilworth
Franz Enciso
Richard Esterman
Richard Fenner
Lawrence Ferrara
Ted Fleming
Peggy Gorbahn
William Grothkopf
David Hardiman
Judy Hubbell
Charles Hudspeth
Sinilinde Isham
Baruch Klein
John Kongsmark
Joshua Law
Steven Lopez
Jerry Mueller
Madeline Mueller
Marvin Barak
Frank Townsell
City College Music Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition E. This moratorium is necessary because there are too many worthy uses for this land to make a hasty and potentially very costly decision. Only through careful planning can the limited land available for development be best used.

Nicolos Alexander
Paul Hewitt

Jerome Hosken
Robert Knarr
James Kevick
Dach Lee
Chelcie Liu
William Maynez
Annette Rapleyea
Oleg Reout
David Will
City College Physics Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, as Physical Education Instructors, have always been committed to a diversified program for our students and community. The reservoir space is a natural land resource for a Multi Educational and Cultural Center.

Your YES vote on E will allow us the freedom to explore ways that this property could most constructively benefit all.

Gail Barton
Curtis Decker
Brad Deegan
Tatiana Doghroun
Johann Hahn
Daniel Hayes
Lene Johnson
Grover Klemmer
Paula McCallum
Art Octavio
Louise Scourkes

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, full-time faculty of the Computer and Information Science Department of City College, urge a YES vote to postpone the decision until additional planning and surveys can be conducted. The current proposal would negatively impact the College's enrollment.

William Beaver
Ronald Cerruti, Chairman
Kirk Gibson
Howard Grohrer
Frank Holden
Michael Kelly
George Lanyi
Norbert Lauckey
Charles Metzger
Charles Miller
Marilyn Schnake
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

A YES vote on Proposition E helps STOP a scheme to GIVE AWAY $12,300,000 worth of City land for $1,800,000 (or less) to a Redwood City real estate developer.

A YES vote will SAVE taxpayers $550,000 per year. The housing project will produce $240,000 in taxes, but supplying City services will cost $790,000 per year.

The Controller’s cost estimate does NOT account for the $12,300,000 land value, since land sale below value is NOT technically a cost of government. The Controller also is NOT permitted to assume that the housing project will be constructed, since construction has NOT yet been ordered by the Board of Supervisors.

The plan does NOT restrict housing sales to moderate-income first-time buyers. The plan only restricts use of tax-subsidized funds. Any person favored by the developer or politicians can buy these dwellings and get the benefits of the public land giveaway.

The houses are made “affordable” by giving away the land far below market value, by City-backed low interest, and by cutting construction corners.

The real beneficiaries of the subsidized housing project are the financiers (NOT the project dwellers). Bondholders receive 9.6% average tax-free interest, which is equivalent to 24.6% taxable interest at 61% maximum tax. The developer and bond establishment receive $5,340,000; this is $26,300 (or 22.40%) for each $117,400 unit.

The City loses $51,700 worth of land GIVEN AWAY for each unit.

Vote YES on Proposition E for good fiscal management.

William Marquardt
Financial Analyst, SNaP
Helen Crizer, Treasurer, SNaP

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of College</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Campus (acres)</th>
<th>Area/1000 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City College of SF</td>
<td>22,624</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laney College, Oakland</td>
<td>9,805</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot College, Hayward</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa College</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of San Mateo</td>
<td>13,820</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>11.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Marin</td>
<td>6,663</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given these facts, why does the Governing Board not try to get the old West Campus back? Why don’t they support this moratorium to delay the land grab?

The Governing Board is under political pressure from City Hall. They have been threatened with the loss of the north reservoir parking lot and funding for special projects. Forgive them. Vote Yes on E.

Friends of City College
David Newton
Glen Simpson
Jack Baker
Thomas Velasquez
Tillie McCullah

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The student population at City College is increasing. This semester’s enrollment is up 1,265 students over last semester.

The enrollment in the San Francisco public schools has been increasing by 1,218 per year for the last three years. City College draws most of its enrollment from public schools in San Francisco.

Obviously, City College will have a larger enrollment in the future years, and will be in desperate need of space if we do not give it back its old West Campus.

Please reserve this public land for the college. Please vote YES on E.

Barbara Holman

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON E

In 1980, I launched a six-point program to expand San Francisco's housing supply and the voters had approved a City policy to add 20,000 new housing units within five years. This Proposition would destroy a major portion of the effort to build affordable, single-family housing in our city.

The Balboa Reservoir Site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now a site for development of 203 new single-family homes, most with three bedrooms and two baths. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed as other homes built under the City's program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom could not afford homeownership. It is believed that these new homes will sell rapidly.

The Balboa Reservoir site is one of the few sites large enough to accommodate a substantial number of new homes. Please do not let a few people stop a major opportunity for new housing. Vote no on Prop E.

Not only would Proposition E halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site, but the 9.8% fixed-rate, 30-year mortgage money set aside for the housing would also be lost.

Nothing constructive is accomplished by this measure—it does not provide additional land or facilities for City College. As a matter of fact, City College has neither plans nor money to use the property. Further, the Community College Board of Directors, the governing body for City College, has voted overwhelmingly to oppose the initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting "No on E."

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the site of the unused Balboa Reservoir and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost.

These homes are desperately needed for San Franciscans who can't afford to buy in the city where the average house is selling for over $160,000. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

The houses would be built on land that belongs to the City. Over two years ago, it was declared surplus and available for housing. It is not part of City College, and City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

We urge you to vote no on Proposition E if you want more affordable housing for San Franciscans.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

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

The 203 affordable owner occupied single family units slated for the southern portion of Balboa Reservoir are part of the 1988 total. Our progress in addressing the City's housing shortage will be curtailed if this ill-advised initiative is approved. SUPPORT OWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Housing production is essential to check rising prices and to maintain our social, economic, and ethnic population diversity. AS A SAN FRANCISCO VOTER, YOU CAN BE PART OF OUR HOUSING PROGRESS BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

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

WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT THE CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY HOUSING BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPPOSITION E

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

Doris M. Ward, Member
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPPOSITION E

A critical issue facing San Francisco today is the lack of housing middle class San Franciscans can afford.

That is why I have joined these neighborhood associations to support the Balboa Reservoir neighborhood housing proposal. Those participating in the development of the proposal includes:

O.M.I. Community Association
Dorado Terrace Association
Outer Mission-Ingleside
Political Action Committee
Greater Ingleside Community
Mount Davidson Manor
Ocean Avenue Merchants Association
Ingleside Terrace Association
The San Francisco Open Space Committee
City College of San Francisco

From early in 1985 I worked closely with these neighborhood groups in the discussions between city government and community leaders concerning the development plans for this desperately needed new housing at the unused Balboa reservoir site.

THESE ARE THE REASONS YOU SHOULD VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

1. The neighborhood housing proposal that this initiative seeks to stop is the result of months of hard work by the largest coalition of neighborhood associations ever to join together to plan a housing development in San Francisco.

2. The housing at the Balboa Reservoir site was designed, with the involvement of the coalition of neighborhood associations to enhance the surrounding community.

3. The governing Board of the Community College District has made clear that they have no plans for the site and no ownership rights to it. City College does not oppose the construction of this development and opposes this initiative.

4. Self-proclaimed “Friends” of City College want to stop the proposal in order to preserve the site for future faculty parking. A clique of City College staffers involved in a neighborhood association pose as community opposition to this development even though a representative from this organization, the Sunnyridge Neighborhood Association, had helped plan and support the proposal.

5. By masquerading as concerned neighbors these self-appointed “friends” of City College hope to prevent the construction of 204 critically needed units of housing and pull off one of the biggest land grabs in San Francisco’s history.

DON’T BE FooLED. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPPOSITION E

The Residence Element of the Comprehensive Plan of the City and County of San Francisco assesses the City’s housing needs and lays out specific steps to meet those needs. This document was adopted by the City Planning Commission in 1984 after extensive public review at neighborhood meetings and public hearings, and consideration of the detailed Environmental Impact Report.

The first objective of the Housing Element is “to provide new Housing for all income groups” in locations appropriate for residential development. To meet this goal, development of housing is to be aggressively pursued and encouraged on surplus, underused and vacant public land.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Susan J. Bierman, City Planning Commissioner
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on E.

Proposition E deprives San Franciscans of one of their last real chances to become homeowners at an affordable price. At the South Balboa Reservoir we have City-owned land on which 203 units of three-bedroom, two-bath homes can be built at low prices which average San Franciscans can afford to pay. These homes need to be built now, not in three years. In three years the low interest rates on mortgages and the bond financing will be gone. Two hundred families will have lost the opportunity to become homeowners, and the City will have lost the opportunity to ease the tight market in rental housing.

Nor does this ill-conceived initiative help City College in any way. City College does not need this land. Speculation that the College may at some future date find a use for the land is not founded on fact. The College may never be able to build on the reservoir. Their enrollment has dropped by over 4000 students in the last few years.

This initiative is designed to confuse you. It will make our housing shortage worse for three long years. If you support affordable housing in our City, Vote NO on Proposition E.

Bill Maher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Balboa Reservoir site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now planned for development of 203 new single family homes. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed—other homes built under this program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom would not otherwise be able to afford home ownership.

San Francisco has the most expensive housing in the nation where last year the average home sold for over $160,000. Housing is difficult to produce because the obstacles are great—little land on which to build, high construction costs and uncertain interest rates.

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost. The initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional land or facilities for City College. The Community College Board, the governing body of City College, in fact recently voted to oppose this initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No” on Proposition E.

John L. Molinari

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

In 1980, the voters of the City and County of San Francisco approved a measure making it City policy to add 20,000 new units of housing within five years. In 1984 in an effort to satisfy this objective, the Board of Supervisors adopted a policy encouraging the expansion of the City’s housing supply. Making surplus City-owned land, such as the site at Balboa Reservoir, available for affordable housing was an important part of that policy. A proposal to build 203 homes on the unused Balboa Reservoir site was advanced to help implement the pro-housing policy.

Approval of Proposition E would HALT construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.

The Balboa Reservoir homes would be built on land currently belonging to the City and County of San Francisco. The property IS NOT part of the City College, and City College has neither plans or money to buy the property and convert it for City College use.

The only debatable issue is the future of affordable housing on the Balboa Reservoir site.

As we are all aware, San Francisco has the most expensive homes in the United States. The average cost of a home is $152,000. Not many can afford such prices. However, the housing proposed for the Balboa Reservoir will give many more citizens the opportunity to become homeowners. The homes to be built will be sold to first-time buyers at prices ranging from $83,000 to $145,000.

Other homes built in San Francisco under the direction of similar affordable housing programs have been snapped up quickly by San Franciscans. Without the program, most would not have been able to purchase the home and become homeowners.

Again, if you desire to preserve the construction of more affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site, vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Willie B. Kennedy
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Additional single family housing is undeniably San Francisco's most acute social need. When some vacant surplus City land (12 acres) finally becomes available for 203 additional new private homes there will always be some selfish individuals who are in favor of new housing "just so long as it is not built across the street from me!" This unused, vacant City reservoir land hasn't generated a dime of taxes for over thirty years! Let's add 203 NEW home-owner taxpayers to the City's rolls as quickly as possible. Stop these self-serving no-growth obstructionists! Please vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Prop E would halt affordable housing construction at the Balboa Reservoir site. Many gay people need affordable housing, too, and we join with other community groups urging you to vote NO on Prop E.

Alice Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Robert Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E, if approved, would block the construction of 203 badly needed single-family homes on the south portion of the Balboa Reservoir in San Francisco. Sixty percent of these homes would be available for purchase by moderate and middle income families at purchase prices between $80,000 and $120,000. They would be constructed on surplus public land and financed by the sale of mortgage revenue bonds to enable the developer to sell the homes at below market prices.

A neighborhood group headed by two city college faculty members is responsible for placing Proposition E on the ballot. The group contends that the land which is intended to be used for the project should be made available instead to City College for the construction of new teaching facilities even though enrollment at City College is declining and the City College Board has voted 6 to 1 to oppose the initiative.

Like many other areas of the country, San Francisco suffers from a shortage of housing. Purchase prices here are among the highest in the nation. The use of surplus public lands and revenue bond financing provide a means for making single family homes available to a broad spectrum of families at affordable prices.

The Balboa Reservoir project is supported by the leaders of 8 neighborhood groups in the area surrounding the location of the proposed project and by a majority of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, as well as by Mayor Dianne Feinstein. We urge you to encourage the construction of this type of housing in San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition E.

San Francisco Board of Realtors
William L. Jansen, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

SAVE OUR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS!
BERNAL HEIGHTS SAYS, "VOTE NO ON PROP E!"

We are residents of Bernal Heights in San Francisco. We've worked hard to build affordable family and senior citizen homes in our neighborhood.

We need more affordable housing in our City to survive. The real issue in Prop E is affordable family housing—a "yes" vote prevents the construction of 203 family homes. That's crazy!

Join us in preserving what's best in our City.

Vote "no" on Prop E!

Sylvia M. Yee, Bernal Heights Community Foundation Board of Directors*
Frank Hutchins, BHCF Board*
Mary Lou Berroletti, BHCF Board*
Lela Havener, BHCF Board*
Elizabeth Egger, BHCF Board*
Sister Janet Simonis, BHCF Board*
Stephen Antoszczuk, BHCF Board*
Lorenzo B. Dill, BHCF Board*
Barbara Bagot, BHCF Board*
Margaret C. Randolph, Northwest Bernal Block Club*
Maureen Lamb, NWBBC*
Tim Molinare, BHCF Planning & Dev't Committee*
Buck Bagot, BHCF P & D Committee*
***Organization for identification purposes only.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco Needs Affordable Housing—
Vote No on Proposition E

Everyone agrees that San Francisco needs affordable housing. The questions are how and where that affordable housing can be built.

The Balboa Reservoir housing development, to be built on the site of a reservoir built thirty years ago and unused since that time, answers those important questions for more than 200 San Francisco first-time homebuying families by providing:
- 203 new affordable three-bedroom, single family homes
- 9.8% fixed-rate financing
- A mix of 30% low-income, 30% moderate-income and 40% market-rate first time buyers
- A convenient site that has been declared “surplus” by the City and “available for development of affordable housing”

The Balboa Reservoir housing development is a small but significant step in the effort to generate affordable housing in our City.

Thousands of San Franciscans from every community, neighborhood group and viewpoint agree that the Balboa Reservoir development is good for San Francisco. Virtually every elected official, including the Governing Board of City College also agree.

All these San Franciscans ask you to say “yes” to affordable housing and “NO” to Proposition E.

San Francisco Coalition for Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar, Executive Director

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The viable plan for affordable single family housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site is being threatened by Proposition E. If Proposition E passes, 203 single family homes will be lost to the citizenry of San Francisco at a time when they are greatly needed.

The facts about the proposed housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site argue strongly against Proposition E. All 203 homes will be for first time home buyers. One-third of the homes will be available to households earning $27,000. Another third of the homes will be available to households earning $36,000. Adequate parking will be provided within the development itself, thus answering any concerns that traffic in the area will be congested.

City College has no need or plan to use South Balboa Reservoir for its facilities. City College’s priority is to develop its existing campus. South Balboa Reservoir should therefore be used for one of the City’s greatest needs: increased and affordable housing which is available to lower and middle income families.

As homeowners who live in the vicinity of South Balboa Reservoir, we welcome its planned use for single family housing and feel it will become an integral and contributing part of the community. We therefore urge you to vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Submitted by:
Stephen Graham, Chairman of the Housing Sub-committee of the Citizen’s Committee for Community Development
Roderick A. McLeod, Vice-Chairman of the Citizen’s Committee on Community Development

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing is a group of neighbors which consists of many of the renters of Westwood Park and Sunnyside neighborhoods as well as owners and renters of Ingleside which are the closest neighbors to the Balboa Reservoir along with some of the students and teachers of City College.

We strongly support the Balboa Reservoir for housing. We believe that the Balboa Reservoir is an ideal spot for housing.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Our neighborhood wants homes in the South Balboa Reservoir.
Vote No On Prop. E.

Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughney
Submitted by Patricia Vaughney

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

As Merchants as well as residents of Ocean Avenue, Greater Ingleside and San Francisco, we support the Development of the Balboa Reservoir as housing.

A Traffic Survey has stated that there will be minimal impact on the existing patterns of traffic by this development.

Additional City College Parking is being considered on another location off I-280 to keep the college congestion away from the neighborhood’s streets.

City College has 44 more acres in which to expand and existing buildings at City College have viable means to expand.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
We believe that housing on the Balboa Reservoir is the most viable solution to develop a vacant piece of property that is directly adjacent to our stores on a Transpreferential Street.

Affordable housing is in great need in San Francisco and is as much needed here as anywhere. We want to help provide this need. Vote No on Prop. E.

Ocean Avenue Merchants Assoc.
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughney
Submitted by Patricia Vaughney

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction on much-needed affordable, single-family housing at the long vacant south Balboa Reservoir site. This proposition would also block a major housing development that would bring jobs into an area of the city that has little industry or private business.

Sale prices for these units are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the San Francisco housing market, where the average home is selling for $160,000. Construction of these homes will help all young, first-time home buyers and will require only 5% down, instead of the 20% down payment on houses bought with conventional home mortgages.

This plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by nine nearby neighborhood organizations. If Proposition E is approved and this project is blocked, more young adults will purchase their first home in Vallecito or some other outlying area, further draining San Francisco of the young families that everyone growing community needs.

San Francisco residents will gain apprenticeships, jobs, contracts and subcontracts from this development.

This plan calls for 2 and 3 bedroom, family-sized houses, with space for another bedroom which can be finished when needed.

Each house will have 2½ parking spaces in front and would not cause parking problems in the area. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

City College of San Francisco has no plans to buy the property, has no money for institutional expansion, nor any mention of this land in any master plan. Some supporters of this proposition are motivated by racist notions and have said they fear that this development will become another "Geneva Towers." This type of thinking is similar to support for apartheid practiced in South Africa and must be defeated by progressive San Francisco voters. Property values will increase, instead of a decrease as a result of this project.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition E.

Larry Ukali Johnson-Redd — President, O.M.I. Pilgrim Community Center Inc.
Maria Campbell-Casey — Program Director, Bay Area Engineering Societies Committee for Manpower Training, Inc.
Cora Mills-Bradford — Program Director, O.M.I. Senior Center
John C. Jackson
Linda Rose-Gipson
Jon Still — Secretary, Young Adult Committee
Kenneth Butler

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote "No" on Proposition E.

Affordable Housing Alliance — Mitchell Omerberg, Director
Bay Area Urban League — Gregory Rent, Field Representative
Bernal Heights Community Foundation — Andre Lennell Daye
Community Educational Services — Dorothy Chen, Executive Director
Japanese Community Youth Council St. Francis Square Apartments, Inc. — Sandra Mayor-Jenkins, Secretary
Minority Contractors Association of Northern California — James Haugboeck, Secretary, Board of Directors
National Community Congress — Dr. Eddie C. Welch
Parkmerced Residents Organization, Inc. — Ricardo A. Callejo, Esq.
Potrero Hill Neighborhood House — Enola Maxwell
San Francisco Building Trades Council — Stan Smith
San Francisco Housing & Tenants Council — Joseph Lacey
San Francisco Tenants Union — Jim Fay
Rev. Amon C. Brown — Local Pastor & Community Servant
Greg Day — Chairman, Citizens Committee on Community Development
Polly V. Marshall — Commissioner, San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
Regina A. Snider
Jim Wechob — San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Michael E. Willis, AIA — Fleming Corporation
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote "No" on Proposition E.

S.N.I.G.

Will H. Reno
Larry Daniels
Ted McKeithan

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote "No" on Proposition E.

Bayview Baptist Minister Fellowship — Rev. N. B. Mills, President
Bread of Life Missionary Baptist Church — Rev. S. A. Bailey
Cosmopolitan Baptist Church — Rev. A. Ray Gentle
Inglewood District Pastors — Rev. Raymond M. Howard Sr.
Inglewood District Pastors — Rev. Carole Nelson
Inglewood District Pastors — Rev. Cornelius P. O’Reilly
Inglewood District Pastors — Rev. Paul G. Theiss
Old St. Mary's Housing Committee — Charles Gale, Chairman
St. Peters Housing Committee — Tessa Rouwerol

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

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

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: With certain exceptions, City officers, including elected officials and commission members, may represent clients before City boards and commissions other than their own, and be paid for their services. State legislators may represent clients before City boards and commissions, and be paid for their services. Any person may contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would prohibit City officers from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay. This proposition would prohibit State legislators from appearing before City boards, commissions and departments on behalf of clients for pay. City officers would be prohibited from discussing with these officers and legislators matters that the City is deciding. Proposition F would also prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit City officers and State legislators from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to allow City officers and State legislators to represent clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to allow any person to contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

Controller's Statement on “F”

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

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 77

How “F” Got on Ballot

On February 26 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for limitations on compensated advocacy and campaign contributions had qualified for the June ballot.

Quentin Kopp, Marth Gillham and Cheryl Arenson, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 9,400 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,986 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The purpose of Proposition F is to cut campaign contributions by large contributors (and thus reduce campaign spending) and eliminate undue influence by officeholders retained as paid lobbyists for projects requiring City approval.

Let's take a minute to analyze the untrue arguments against Proposition F.

- The opponents claim that Proposition F will force half the City's Commissioners to resign. In fact, Proposition F does not force any Commissioners to resign. It simply says they can't be a paid lobbyist and a City Commissioner at the same time. Does a commissioner value making money by lobbying more than public service?

- Some have also alleged that Proposition F will prevent duly-elected union leaders from serving as City Commissioners. No it won't. Proposition F prohibits "compensated advocacy" — that means lobbyists hired by an organization, not members of the organization itself. Proposition F does not apply to salaried employees of labor unions, corporations, or non-profit agencies. Moreover, Section 8.105 of the Charter precludes it specifically from applying to any member serving as a representative of any profession, trade, business, union or association on any board or commission which requires membership of representatives of specific professions, trades, businesses, unions or associations.

- Another untrue argument against Proposition F is that it prohibits City officials only from discussing pending issues with other City officers or State Legislators who are also acting as paid lobbyists in a matter and doesn't stop those officeholding lobbyists from writing City officials about their clients' objectives. That's not so. Proposition F applies to all such lobbying, written or oral. (The dictionary defines "discuss" as "to examine by means of speech or writing.")

End government decision-making by "insiders" and reduce the influence of money on local campaigns.

VOTE YES ON F.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
San Franciscans for Good Government

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

In all our years of observing San Francisco City government, we have found one maxim to be true time after time: a good idea gets copied, especially among politicians.

For no sooner did Quentin Kopp promise to bring Proposition F to the voters than did Mayor Feinstein come up with an informal, administrative version of her own. Fine, you say (and the Mayor says), then why vote Yes on Proposition F?

1. The Mayor's remedy of asking City Commissioners who also act as lobbyists before City agencies to resign is nothing more than a hand slap, and is good only as long as she is mayor. It's not binding on future mayors and could be changed without any vote of the Board of Supervisors, let alone the people of San Francisco. Proposition F prohibits this kind of conflict-of-interest, and it will be the law, no matter who is mayor.

2. The Mayor's action did nothing to state legislators who can also act as lobbyists before City Boards and Commissions, nor did her action stop the law or business partners of City Commissioners from picking up the slack in big-money lobbying. Proposition F will stop these practices in their tracks.

What about the other half of Proposition F, which reduced the campaign contribution limit to $500 so that all San Franciscans can enjoy equal access to City officials, not just the ones with the big bucks? The Mayor can't do anything about this, and she hasn't. Only a Yes vote on Proposition F will reduce the weight of big money and ensure our full voice in City elections and City government.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F. If it's important enough for the Mayor to copy part of it administratively, it's important enough to do the job right and make it a law.

John J. Barbagelata
Harry Aleo
June Cahn
Dorothy Partridge

Robert Arneson
Rudolph Lohnes
Janet Wenteworth

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The worst and most persistent problem in American politics is that politicians and political races can be "bought". Reducing the size of campaign contributions will be a step forward in reducing the role of money in elections. Vote yes for more honest government.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

RESTORE to the people their rightful and equal power as individual voters by reducing the monetary clout and influence of private interests who make the laws and the policies as City officials and Commissioners or State legislators.

TELL the special interests that their money and influence can no longer interfere with representative government.

TELL the special interests that the voters will no longer tolerate the influence-buying which comes with large campaign contributions.

TELL the special interests that this measure will encourage highly talented citizens to serve San Francisco honestly and responsibly.

VOTE YES ON F.

Cheryl Arenson
Anne Renfrew
David Pacheco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

"Government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

These noble words from Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, cast in bronze at the entrance to City Hall, seem to have escaped the attention of some City officials who pass by them every day. For in San Francisco City government, Lincoln’s simple formula for representative government would read quite differently: "Government of the powerful, by the lobbyists, and for the wealthy."

Government of, by, and for the privileged few is bad government. Government of, by, and for all the people is good government. It's as simple as that—as simple as Lincoln first put it.

Proposition F, the Good Government Initiative, will help San Franciscans maintain control of their government and will prevent undue influence by City officeholders.

To reduce undue influence, Proposition F outlaws the practice of City Commissioners and State Legislators representing special interests for pay before City Commissions and Boards. City Commissions should render their decisions deliberately and impartially, not be swayed by the political clout of the lobbyists appearing before them, or by any political favors those lobbyist/politicians might promise. "I'll scratch your back if you scratch my back" bargains do not belong in government. And until such backroom bargains are made illegal, City government will not belong to the rest of us either.

Proposition F also reduces the maximum amount that anyone can give to a local candidate from $1,000 to $500. If large contributors and other special interests can't give as much money, they can't buy as much influence with elected officials. And the lower the contribution limit, the less campaign spending and the more City government will be responsive to all San Franciscans.

You can "buy back" City government from the privileged and powerful with the most precious of all political commodities: your vote.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Mary Lohnes
Peter Fatouh
Judith Thorson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F, an initiative of the people, is needed to protect the voters and the integrity of the legislative process from being corrupted by the power of money and influence. It prevents City officials and State Legislators from lobbying the City on behalf of high-powered special interests. It also lowers the campaign contribution limit from $1,000 to $500, thus reducing the influence of those same special interests over our elections and elected officials.

The bogus argument that the Mayor won't be able to find qualified people to serve on City commissions if Proposition F is adopted ignores the plain fact that there are 700,000 people in San Francisco, a pool of civic-minded citizens more than large enough to accommodate the 250 commission appointments available in our City government. For example, there are plenty of architects to fill the one architectural appointment on the Art Commission, just as there are plenty of non-lobbyist business people and lawyers available to serve on other commissions.

Thousands of San Franciscans, not just the "insiders", are ready, willing, and able to serve the public.

Proposition F deserves your vote. Restore integrity to City government. Restore the confidence of the citizens of San Francisco in that government. Let's have no more Wilkes Bashford situations.

VOTE YES ON F.

Oscar Sutro
Martha Gillham
Marguerite Warren

Argument printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE "NO" ON F

This proposition disguises itself as "good government" but, in reality, would drive good people out of government. It is so crudely drawn — so sweeping in its implications — that it would bar from government almost anyone with even a remote business or community tie to government.

It would purge from City commissions anyone who "directly or indirectly" receives compensation from any "interests" with an issue before any City agency. Effectively, this could discriminate against employees from community and neighborhood groups, civil rights organizations, non-profit corporations, labor unions, merchant and business groups, as well as architects, lawyers and other professionals.

Actually, there currently are no commissioners who represent any clients before any City agency. All who are appointed in my administration sign a statement saying they will not advocate for any paying client before any official body of the City while they are commissioners. This proposition simply is not necessary.

Proposition F also would lower the limit for any individual campaign contribution from $1000 to $500. Although this sounds good, it would permit a wealthy person with various businesses and numerous family members to contribute many thousands of dollars through different sources. This would encourage "hidden" contributions. We must strive for disclosure of contributions, not a system which drives contributions underground. Candidates must be able to raise funds enough to put their message before the voters. Reducing the contribution limit can be a tactic to discourage persons from challenging incumbents.

Vote no on Proposition F.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition F purports to achieve a noble objective: The removal of "influence peddling" from City Hall. In fact, Proposition F is so poorly-crafted it may have exactly the opposite effect on City government. It is not a "good government" initiative. It is bad legislation.

Proposition F provides no definitions and no standards for the public to judge whether City officials comply with its restrictions. Its uncertainties will be chaotic and lead to endless, needless lawsuits.

A measure similar to Proposition F was rejected by the Board of Supervisors because no public hearings were ever held on the legislation. If the public had had a chance to comment on this initiative, it might not have the critical shortcomings, deficiencies and uncertainties that now warrant its rejection by responsible San Franciscans.

In the coming months, the Board will review good government measures that are comprehensible, effective and, most important, certain. Proposition F is a misguided disaster.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

This should properly have been titled the "SINK WILLIE BROWN ORDINANCE"! The "meat of the coconuts" is in Section 4.

Supervisor Kopp's intentions are good, however this sloppily drafted and incomprehensible measure succeeds in "burning down the barn" to eliminate a couple of rats!

Under this proposal, to avoid any potential INDIRECT conflict of interest, (which is undefined), one would have to be a destitute, unemployed welfare recipient to qualify for service on any City Board or Commission! The Mayor has already solved this "hired advocacy" problem with the "conflict of interest" affidavits she demands IN ADVANCE from any prospective appointee.

Quentin's proposed $500.00 campaign contribution limit is an "inside joke" and he, of all people, knows it! It merely obliges a heavy contributor to have his wife, children, business associates, or friends send in SEPARATE $500.00 checks if he wants to contribute more than $500.00 to a politician's campaign.

These proposals require additional City employees for enforcement and wind up doing far more harm than good. Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

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

Union members and labor officials have legitimate reasons for meeting with City officers. It is unfair and wrong to lump them in the same category as special interest lobbyists, yet that's exactly what Proposition F does. Working people deserve representation on City boards and commissions. VOTE NO!

Walter Johnson  
Secretary-Treasurer  
San Francisco Labor Council  
LeRoy King  
James Elliot  
Keith Eickman  
Reeva Olson

Jeff Greendorfer  
Stan Smilk  
Larry Griffin  
Steve Biskissa  
Terrence Ryan  
Jack Beggs  
Tony Marovich

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

If you want to ban business owners and executives from serving on City boards and commissions, then vote for Proposition F.

If you think board members of non-profit corporations and employees of community agencies have nothing to contribute to City government, then vote for Proposition F.

If you believe union members and labor officials should not have a voice at City Hall, then vote for Proposition F.

But if you share our belief that these individuals have legitimate concerns and expertise that is valuable in running major City departments, then join us in voting NO on Proposition F.

Proposition F is a simplistic, sloppily-drafted, meat axe approach to a problem already resolved by Mayor Feinstein's ban on commissioners lobbying on behalf of private clients.

Proposition F is not good government and it is not reform. Proposition F is bad legislation. VOTE NO.

Hon. Amy Meyer  
Hon. Susan Bierman  
Hon. Walter Jebe  
Hon. Bruce Lilienthal  
Hon. Doris Kahn  
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima  
Hon. Jean Korutun  
Hon. Thomas Horn  
Hon. Henry Berman  
Hon. Robert Mccarthy  
Hon. Richard Guggenheim  
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt  
Hon. Patrick McGrew  
Hon. Kirk Miller  
Hon. Melvin Lee  
Hon. Jerry Berg  
Hon. Bonnie Gibson  
Hon. Mary Noel Pepys  
Hon. Mark Buel  
Hon. Tim Carrico  
Hon. Jo Hanson  
Hon. Kevin Malone  
John Sanger  
Tom Moore

Hon. Eugene Friend  
Hon. Phyllis Lyon

Donald Disier  
Jim Wachob  
Anne Daley  
Linda Post  
Lynne Williams  
Todd Dickinson  
Peter Hanson  
Herbert Karlan  
William Scouris  
Van Hart  
Iris Flewellen  
Noam Rand  
John Schmidt  
James Mock  
Thomas Karwaki  
Wendy Goldberg  
Joseph Schwartz  
Belle Lazarus  
Antonio Barrias  
Bruce Barrett  
Charles Howell  
Walter McGuire  
Sharon Duvall  
Joyce Mauriello

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

We're sympathetic to the need for political reform. But it's a complicated problem, and Proposition F just isn't the way to go.

Frankly, we can't tell who is and isn't affected by this measure. While a handful of people sometimes might abuse their positions, that's no reason to question the integrity of so many solid citizens who give tirelessly to public service. Proposition F is simply the wrong approach. Please join us in voting NO.

William E. McDonnell  
Frances May McAteer  
N. A. Sapunar  
Caroline and Michael Figoni

Hon. Douglas Engmann  
Hon. Charlotte Berk

Hon. Eugene Friend  
Hon. Phyllis Lyon

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Concerned about elected officials spending $400,000 to run for supervisor and $1 million on a mayor's race? Then vote NO on Proposition F.

That's right. NO.

Proposition F isn't going to do anything about campaign spending. Prop F simply limits the size of contributions, reducing the current limit from $1,000 to $500. Supervisors can and will continue spending outrageous sums on their re-election campaigns. With Proposition F they'll just spend twice as much time raising money from twice as many sources, and that makes special interests even more powerful. They can always find ways around campaign limits.

We need campaign spending reform, but Proposition F doesn't provide it. Please join us in voting No on F.

District 8 Democratic Club  
Stephen L. Tiber  
Ruth Gravanis  
Alan Raznick  
Miriam Blaustein

Linda Chapman  
Dale Carnin  
James Firth  
Debra Barnes  
Lew Serbin  
Debra Stein

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

When campaign contributions are limited, political freedom suffers. Your right to free speech includes not only your right to express your views, but also your right to support as much as you want, any candidate who speaks for you.

Minority viewpoints depend heavily on the contribution of a few dedicated supporters to get your message out. To limit your financial support of your beliefs is to silence your political voice.

Only incumbents, who have many opportunities for free media exposure benefit from this assault on free speech. The dangers of a campaign contribution limit far outweigh any possible benefit from this proposition. **Defeat Proposition F!**

San Francisco Libertarian Party
Michael R. Fowler, Secretary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

You may think Prop F only applies to big-time lawyers and a few legislators who represent developers. Think again!

Prop F would prohibit many community leaders from public service. If it passes, board members and employees of community and charitable organizations could be **banned** from serving on City boards and commissions.

We appreciate the public need for a government free of "influencing peddling." But restrictions on "compensated advocacy" ought to be clearly and carefully crafted to protect the voices of community leaders who argue on behalf of the public interest, not private special interests.

**Vote No.**

Hon. Jeffrey Ken Mori
Japanese Community Youth Council, Inc.
Bill O'Callahan
American Red Cross
Hon. George Suncin
Horizons Unlimited
Hon. Jean Rita Alviar
Mission Education Project
Hon. Greg Day
Pek Street Town Hall
Hon. Naomi Gray
Hon. James Foster
Carol Wong
Marlena Marselle
Lee Woods
Jo Daly
Dennis Collins
Hon. H. Welton Flynn
(Organizations listed only for purposes of identification.)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will have **no effect** on developers' lawyers.

None.

It won't make any difference to state legislators either.

Don't kid yourself. This is not "reform" and it isn't "good government." Proposition F will allow the special interests and influence peddlers to continue exercising influence over our elected officials. It has so many loopholes, lobbying will actively continue, untouched, in the back rooms of City Hall.

And developers will always find ways around campaign contribution limits. As Common Cause has noted, Prop F simply makes tracing their dollars more difficult for the public.

**Real reform would directly attack the source of huge contributions—the developers and other special interests that employ the lobbyists to peddle their influence. VOTE NO.**

Sue Henor          Rich Walier
Calvin Welch       Susan Klugerman
David Looman       Rene Cazenave
Michael Mason      Margie O'Driscoll

---

**NEXT TIME YOU MOVE... DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!**

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

---
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South Africa Boycott

PROPOSITION G
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?  
YES 300  NO 301

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has adopted an ordinance prohibiting the City, with certain exceptions, from purchasing goods or services from companies doing business with South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a declaration of policy that says the City must try to avoid doing business with companies that significantly profit from or help maintain the Apartheid system in South Africa. It calls on other public bodies and private groups to adopt similar policies. It directs the Board of Supervisors to identify the companies which have the greatest ties to Apartheid so that the public can also boycott those companies.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to avoid doing business with companies that help maintain Apartheid, and you want a public boycott of those companies.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

“The proposed Declaration of Policy be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “G” Got on Ballot

On November 6, 1985 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for the City to boycott businesses with significant ties to South Africa had qualified for the June ballot.

Arlo Hale Smith, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,546 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on October 11.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,941 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:
It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Exception for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This measure calls for a public boycott of companies that aid apartheid.

Any claim of "conflict" between Proposition G and existing anti-apartheid legislation is imaginary: It is the legislative intent of supporters of this measure that it can be construed as a directive for making existing law tougher.

Personal attacks have no legitimate place in a ballot measure campaign. As proponent of this measure, I repudiate all such tactics.

Vote NO on apartheid. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Arlo Hale Smith

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Boycotts are grassroots politics. They've helped the farmworkers, they've helped win integration, and they can help end the legal racism called "Apartheid".

A Gallup poll found 77% of South Africa's black majority favoring international economic boycotts to force the Apartheid regime to accept reform peacefully.

After the Boycott Initiative made the ballot, the San Francisco Supervisors unanimously passed a similar city purchasing policy. The issue that remains is whether to call on the general public to join in, boycotting companies identified by the Supervisors as the worst offenders in each industry.

The companies that would be targeted consider profits to be the "bottom line". Economic pressure is all they understand.

The AFL-CIO, NAACP, and NOW have called a boycott of Shell Oil because of its profiteering from South Africa's oppressive economic conditions. Proposition G supports that and would put the same pressure on other industries as well.

This proposition is supported by the elected county central committee of the Democratic Party, the Peace-and-Freedom Party and the Humanist Party, and by leading attorneys, such as Terry Francois, Terence Hallinan, Tony Serra, Lewis Hope Lee, Marc Van Der Hout, Abby Ginsberg and Terence Redmond.

If South Africa were a democracy, its majority would long ago have voted to end Apartheid. We need to vote Yes — because they can't.

Atty. Arlo Hale Smith, Democratic Party County Central Committee
Paul Kangas, Peace and Freedom Party
Lois Saltzbury, Public Advocates*
Dr. Kevin Danaher, Food First*
Jesse James, Mission Rebels
Terry Collins, Community Activist
Stony Geber, Election Action
Robert McCull, Hotel & Restaurant Employees
Executive Board Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Attorneys speak out against Apartheid:

South African police can arrest anyone without charge. They can hold you incommunicado — no contacts with family, lawyers or press.

They regularly censor news, books, music. They have banned Christmas caroling, funerals and other peaceful gatherings. Groups which criticize the government are forbidden to hold meetings.

Blacks are subject to legal segregation; their property and employment rights are greatly restricted; often, they are simply murdered.

As attorneys, we help people who have legal rights that are being violated. But what can we do for those who have no legal rights?

Boycotts and other economic sanctions are the only way to make the Apartheid government accept reform peacefully.

In the Court of World Public Opinion, Apartheid has been convicted of crimes against humanity. By imposing a sentence of economic isolation, we can end Apartheid.

Vote Yes — take a stand for justice.

Terence Hallinan
Arlo Hale Smith
Terry Francois
Karen Anderson Ryer
Robert R. Bryan

Ann Menasche
Rachel Ginsburg
Leo Poll
Gabriel Gesmer
Ora Prouchovick
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is a moderate, responsible but effective proposal to bring economic pressure on the South African government to establish constitutional rights for all of its citizens.

Terence Faulkner, Republican
Mike Garza, Republican

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

All decent Americans abhor apartheid. However, boycotting U.S. investment in South Africa is counterproductive; it only penalizes the actual victims of apartheid.

U.S. international firms have acted as progressive agents for change through the Sullivan principles. Their investments have improved the social and economic condition of the labor force. It is improper to penalize their positive contributions.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

We are individuals and organizations working actively to end the racist system of apartheid in South Africa. And we are voting NO on Proposition G.

Why?
(1) Because Proposition G will weaken San Francisco’s present divestment law. This law requires companies doing business with the city to sign affidavits that they will make no new contracts with South Africa.
Proposition G has no such provision.
(2) Proposition G provides no mechanism or funding to carry out its declared purpose of “boycotting” South Africa.
Proposition G will not stop South African products from entering the Port of San Francisco.
Vote against this useless, confusing, and deceptive initiative.

Preserve the stronger divestment law San Francisco already has.
Vote NO on Proposition G!

Yvonne Golden
Geraldine Johnson
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
AFT 2121 Anti-Apartheid Committee
Artists Against Apartheid
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition of Black Trade Unions
Coalition of Conscience
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club Executive Committee
ILWU 10 and SEIU 250 Southern Africa Liberation Support Committees
National Conference of Black Lawyers
San Francisco Anti-Apartheid Committee
Southern Africa Freedom Committee/All Peoples Congress

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.
The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.
The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.
Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1983 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!

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

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?

YES 303  ➡️  NO 304  ➡️

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Several city and private agencies conduct various programs related to AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a declaration of policy that says San Francisco should support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council, consisting of a Committee on Education and a Fund-Raising Committee. The Research Committee would make recommendations on the most useful AIDS research projects and try to prevent duplication of efforts. The Education Committee would inform the public about the latest research and about ways to prevent AIDS. The Fund-Raising Committee would seek donations and grants for AIDS research and education projects.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

“The proposed Declaration of Policy for an AIDS research and education council and the formation of advisory committees of civic leaders would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, additional expenditure of public funds for AIDS research may result, the amount of which cannot be determined.”

How “H” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for AIDS research had qualified for the June ballot.

Stony Gebert, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 10,540 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on December 6, 1985.

A check of each signature on the petition showed that 7,564 of the signatures were valid. This is more than 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We need a council to expose and address major AIDS issues without the impasse of present medical/political bias.

As taxpayers, we are subsidizing a treadmill of continual AIDS casualties. There are major oversights where AIDS is concerned. Only recently was it learned that CDC statistics suggest 79% of early AIDS cases appear drug-related. We hear AIDS is 100% fatal. Perhaps that is because death may also be drug-related in the way of immuno-suppressive antibiotic and radiation overloads to already compromised immunity systems. Prevailing medicine is both tunnel-visioned and high-profit motivated. Also well-funded. This solution may be part of the problem. Some physicians are beginning to feel where AIDS is concerned many current practices are ethically, medically bankrupt.

Remissions occur. Largely through immunity-enhancing, holistic medicine. Significantly, only 1% of AIDS cases occur among people at risk in the Asian community. Perhaps this is due to less drug abuse or use of an unfunded, ignored resource: herbology as part of diet. More options: homeopathy, acupuncture, etc.

If, as anticipated, upwards of 40% of those testing positive come down with AIDS, we may become overburdened. To ignore all of the above becomes part of the problem. Vote Yes on Proposition H.

Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Rich McKirkey, Former Orderly, Marketing Associate, Pacific Bell
Joseph P. Clady, AIDS Hospice, Shanti Counselor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There is great need for research and education about AIDS and related conditions.

We need to attack the disease, not its victims.

Knowledge is the only vaccine available today.

Vote Yes.

John Lorenzini, President,
People With AIDS Alliance
Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Jan Beck, Steven Russell, Eugene Ewins, ARC/AIDS Vigil

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There are many possible treatments for AIDS and related conditions which are not being examined by the federal government, especially therapies based on natural substances and processes.

Vote Yes for an AIDS Research Council open to all viewpoints.

Scott Gregory, M.D.
Paul Kangas

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

A tape recording (Talking Book) of the San Francisco Voter Information pamphlet is available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land now under the Broadway ramps is put back on the tax rolls, with low-rise buildings limited by restrictive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when united with Proposition J, recognizes these facts:

1) The Embarcadero Freeway is what is left of a never-completed elevated freeway that would have ringed the City through North Beach and Marina neighborhoods to the Golden Gate Bridge.

2) Today this massive freeway, which separates us from our waterfront, would never be built.

3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.

4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman’s Wharf will be preserved.

5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked for this new system.

6) Only that portion of the Embarcadero Freeway east and north of the Main and Beale Street ramps — basically the portion directly on the waterfront — will be removed to make way for the new system. The removal cost, approximately $10 million to be paid for with privately-generated new revenues, is a relatively small part of the overall new system.

As for Proposition I, vote “YES, let’s tear down the Embarcadero Freeway”? Then turn to Proposition J and support the plan for a beautiful waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Removing the Embarcadero Freeway will allow San Francisco to:

- Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero.

- Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway.

- Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula.

- Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero.

- Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.

- Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won’t benefit San Francisco. Don’t let outsiders determine our future. Vote YES on I.

Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Chuck Forester
Jack Woolley
Fritz Arko
Roger Boyer
James T. Chappell, AICP
A. Lee Knight
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Bradford
Robert Berner
Edward A. Green
H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AICP
Gail Bloom
Bonnie B. Jones
Donald A. Crosby, AIA
Randall Rossi
Raf Y. Okamoto
Karl Limbach
Robert Meyers
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Ralph Hurstada
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. James Bronkema
Hon. Douglas G. Wright
Jon Tischell
Anita Sanchez
Jane Winslow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK — VOTE YES ON I

This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY — VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds — without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city’s fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
port of the city shows that
—By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will in-
greater under the City’s plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Judith Tornese

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Tear it down? The concept is preposterous! There are 70,000 cars a day whizzing by on this high speed downtown elevated waterfront freeway! Where will they all go?
Aside from the outrageous demolition costs involved, (some engineers estimate $40,000,000 of taxpayer money!), eyeball observation, logic, and just plain “common sense” dictates that ground level “total gridlock” will result if this expensive freeway is now destroyed.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled.
Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

FROM:

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?

(UFIRMO SU APLICACION?)

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY—VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds—without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city’s fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.
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Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities. DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT—VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to $15.7 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown, Fisherman's Wharf and the financial district would be reduced.

Travel within the city would be slowed down at all hours. Vote no to the destruction of the freeway.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
- Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
- Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
- If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
  - By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
  - Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
  - MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
  - Personal hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Judith Torness

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Tear it down? The concept is preposterous! There are 70,000 cars a day whizzing by on this high speed downtown elevated waterfront freeway! Where will they all go?

Aside from the outrageous demolition costs involved, (some engineers estimate $40,000,000 of taxpayer money!), eyeball observation, logic, and just plain "common sense" dictates that ground level "total gridlock" will result if this expensive freeway is now destroyed.

Nostalgic individuals must realize that the times have changed! We can't bring the Bay back up to Montgomery Street! On behalf of San Francisco's overburdened taxpayers, we urge a NO vote!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled. Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY
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Embarcadero Freeway Policy

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a policy statement that says that the City would replace the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt a policy statement which says that the Embarcadero Freeway would be torn down if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt a policy statement to replace the Embarcadero Freeway under these conditions.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

"The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway replaced with a tree-lined six lane boulevard and other traffic and transit improvements, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by approximately $27.5 million. This includes a one-time freeway demolition cost of $10.2 million plus $17.3 million required to match potential federally-funded transit improvements. Potential financing by the State and private sector and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost."

How “J” Got on Ballot

On March 5 a declaration of policy regarding the future of the Embarcadero Freeway was delivered to the Registrar from the Mayor and several supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows the Mayor or four or more supervisors to submit a declaration of policy to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

In addition to Mayor Feinstein, the March 5 document was signed by Supervisors Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker, Molinari, Kennedy and Nelder.

PARKS ARE OPEN
FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans now have a chance to remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with an at-grade, six-lane parkway, which will open our waterfront and restore views blocked for years by this large freeway.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for traffic and transit improvements:

• New, shorter freeway ramps connecting directly with The Embarcadero;
• A tree-lined, at-grade, 6-lane Embarcadero Boulevard, with a new waterfront Muni line, a jogging and bicycle path from Fisherman’s Wharf to Mission Bay;
• Extension of Muni Metro south to the Caltrain station at 4th and Townsend;
• New ramps connecting I-280 with The Embarcadero;
• Changes in traffic flow and improvements to existing freeway ramps.

Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman’s Wharf will be preserved and enhanced.

The Board of Supervisors has specified that the Embarcadero Freeway will be torn down only if preliminary engineering during the next two years confirms—as traffic and environmental studies already have—that removal of the freeway will not result in more problems than it solves.

San Francisco became eligible for $88 million in federal highway funds for this new system when the Supervisors approved the plan in 1980. The $10.2 million cost of freeway demolition itself can be paid from revenues from low-rise development of the parcels now under the Broadway ramps and the increased values of nearby properties. Strict waterfront zoning limits the size of any development.

Traffic and environmental studies by the California Department of Transportation since 1980 clearly indicate that the new waterfront transportation system will be vastly superior to the existing situation, and that traffic congestion levels will not be notably different with the elevated structure removed.

Vote Yes on J and let’s remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with a parkway and transit system—once again let us see our waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J gives the voters a chance to be heard on an important and timely issue. This issue is the replacement of a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway as one element of a comprehensive package of transportation improvements in the Waterfront area.

Last fall, the Board of Supervisors adopted for further study a set of traffic and transit improvements for the Waterfront. These improvements include:

• a new landscaped surface-level boulevard
• replacement of the Clay/Washington and Broadway on and off ramps with new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom
• removal of the unused stub of I-280 and construction of new ramps connecting the new waterfront boulevard to Route I-280
• a new light rail transit line linking Fort Mason with the Caltrain Depot
• extension of the Muni Metro to the train depot, improving the Peninsula Commute Service

A YES vote on Proposition J does not allocate funds for these projects. It does allow for further design and engineering studies, including cost analysis, assessment of impacts on traffic, and other matters. The studies will then be presented to the Supervisors so that they can make an informed decision on the plan. If the studies prove positive, San Francisco will be able to transform its Waterfront for the benefit of all.

Proposition J will insure that the City will not proceed with the removal of any of the Freeway until all the studies are completed and all potential consequences are assessed. This is the responsible approach. Vote YES on J.

SPUR
League of Women Voters
Embarcadero Citizens Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SAN FRANCISCO’S NEIGHBORHOODS ASK YOU TO VOTE YES ON J.

REDUCE TRAFFIC CONGESTION—YES ON J!

Traffic backed up by the Embarcadero Roadway slows travel and creates congestion in North Beach and other nearby neighborhoods. J will speed traffic flow.

IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION—YES ON J!

Proposition J will provide regular streetcar service along the Embarcadero and extend Muni Metro service to the south, ultimately extending to Bayview-Hunters Point.

PROMOTE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY—YES ON J!

If Proposition J does not pass, San Francisco could lose $88 million in federal funds for traffic improvements.

(continued)
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Embarcadero Freeway Policy

RESTORE THE WATERFRONT — YES ON J!

San Francisco's waterfront could become a focal point for the city, graced by a grand promenade, instead of the dismal, deteriorating eyesore it is now.

San Francisco's neighborhoods join together to ask your support for an improved Embarcadero. We guarantee the freeway will not be removed unless it is replaced by facilities that will assure a smoother, more efficient traffic flow. YES ON J!

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Robert Bradford  Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Ruth Gravanis  Anita Sanchez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SUPPORT PUBLIC TRANSIT — VOTE YES ON J!
SAVE SAN FRANCISCO FROM GRIDLOCK — VOTE YES ON J!

The revitalization of the Northeastern Waterfront...as included in San Francisco's Master Plan and transit plans, as overwhelmingly approved by the Board of Supervisors and as urged by Mayor Feinstein...will allow almost $90 million in unused federal highway funds to be used for vital downtown and waterfront transit and street improvements which will be a key to reducing needless auto congestion in San Francisco.

PROPOSITION J SUPPORTS IMPORTANT TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS TO THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT. It will:
— extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific/CalTrain depot
— create a new rail line (possibly using historic streetcars) to connect the entire waterfront from Mission Bay to the Ferry Building to Fisherman's Wharf and Fort Mason
— set the stage for a possible streetcar line along Third Street

Since the city of San Francisco adopted the Transit First policy in the early 1970's, transit investments in the Muni Metro, in new electric trolley an articulated bus service, and in BART and Golden Gate Transit, have saved downtown San Francisco from gridlock!

IF you are concerned about the future of transit in San Francisco, IF you are concerned about reducing needless auto congestion, THEN we urge you to join Mayor Feinstein and the majority of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in voting Yes on Proposition J.

Norman Rolfe
San Francisco Muni Coalition
California Transit League
Jack Wholey
Edward A. Green
Gary Bloom
Regina Steed
Tony Kilroy
Hon. Jack Morrison
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Bay Area Greensbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Hon. Amy Meyer, Recreation and Park Commissioner
Alain Lubliner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A SOUND BUSINESS PROPOSITION — YES ON J!

Common sense and good business demand we make the most of our resources. San Francisco's waterfront is an economic and civic asset unrivaled anywhere — yet much of it is cut off by an ugly, noisy, elevated roadway. The traffic improvements called for by Proposition J will benefit workers, tourists, property owners, neighborhoods, and business.

— Traffic flow and transit will move quickly on a realigned, reorganized Embarcadero Roadway, allowing easier, more pleasant access to waterfront businesses.
— An improved and beautified Embarcadero will create new commercial opportunities and increase the value of existing property and businesses.
— New jobs and an expanded tax base will generate increased revenue for the city as several lots now covered by freeway ramps return to productive private ownership. Though limited to low rise development (40 to 65 feet), tax revenues from development will more than make up the city's share of the project.

Robert Meyers  Randall Rossi
Deanna J. Potts  Karl A. Limbach
Kenneth R. Lorch  Hon. Charlotte Berk
M. Arthur Ginsler, Jr., FIAPA  Hon. Anne Halsted
James T. Chappell, AICP  Hon. Arthur Coleman
Robert Herman, AIA  Hon. James Bronkema
Robert Berner  Jon Twichell
H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AICP  Fritz Arko
Bonnie B. Jones  Michael J. O'Shea
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Embarcadero Freeway Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J OFFERS RESIDENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO A ONCE IN A LIFETIME OPPORTUNITY TO RECAPTURE THEIR WATERFRONT.

Converting the Embarcadero into a tree-lined boulevard and building a new streetcar line will make the waterfront more pedestrian and transit oriented, that is, more people oriented.

A freeway structure that is a source of objectionable noise and casts a pall over a large part of the waterfront will be removed. The waterfront will be opened up to sunlight and fresh air and made more inviting and cheerful to those who wish to walk on one of the world's outstanding waterfalls. Air pollution that is now retained by the existing elevated structure will be dissipated.

The transit orientation of the new waterfront will encourage energy conservation. Proposition J will:
— Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero
— Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway
— Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula

— Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero
— Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line
— Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won't benefit San Francisco. Don't let outsiders determine our future.

VOTE YES ON J FOR A BETTER SAN FRANCISCO.

Sierra Club
Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage
Willinda McCrea*
Bob Cramer*
Rebecca Evans*
Richard Livingstone*
Marilyn Clemens*
Jennie Lev*
Jeffrey Henne*
Jane Winslow*
Roger Boyer

A. Lee Knight
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Patrick S. Hobin
Monica Halloran
Walter K. Morris
Lisa Klairemont
Jeffrey Heller
Bob Inaean
George T. Rockrise, FAIA
Jon Twichell
Marc Kasky

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J GIVES US A CHANCE TO CORRECT A COLOSSAL MISTAKE!

The Embarcadero Freeway should never have been built. The original plan was to build a freeway from bridge to bridge, destroying the Northern Waterfront, Fisherman's Wharf, Fort Mason, and Marina Green in the process. When the people of San Francisco saw what was happening, they stopped it in mid-air—literally.

Walk under it. Hear the noise. Feel the gloom. See how it cuts out light.

It's time to remove this mistake.

The new waterfront plan will give us a tree-lined boulevard, a new streetcar line, and a Muni Metro extension to the Southern Pacific/Caltrain depot. It will give us a transit and pedestrian oriented waterfront that will give us pride and pleasure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J!

San Francisco Tomorrow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, with a membership of 1700 working architects in San Francisco, urges a "YES" vote on Proposition J. In 1968 the citizens of San Francisco stopped highway planners from ringing our waterfront with freeways. Today voters have another opportunity to return the waterfront to our citizens. Removal of the Embarcadero Freeway is one part of a carefully researched transit plan for San Francisco. This proposition supplies an unique opportunity to carry out a broad range of transportation improvements that will have many positive effects on the City of San Francisco.

Removal of the freeway will:
1. Return the waterfront to the people by removing this barrier to access and view.
2. Facilitate needed MUNI improvements.
3. Encourage development of the Embarcadero as a grand civic boulevard unifying the City of San Francisco.

The members of the American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, urge you to vote "YES" on Proposition I and "YES" on Proposition J.

Donald Kennedy, FAIA
President

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans love Their City, the ambiance, the Bay, waterfront, the views, the healthy neighborhoods.
Freeway builders did their damnedest to destroy the City and di-vide our neighborhoods.
Now we can remove that damned spot, the concrete dinosaur, the hideous barrier that destroys our scenic views, the fence that keeps us from the Bay, the concealer of the Ferry Building.
Correct a mistake.

VOTE YES ON J.

Miriam Blaustein
Charlene Clark
Marie Cleasby
Zach Cowan
Dick Grosboll
Rick Hauptman

Tony Kilroy
Jean Kortum
Ira Kurlander
Jack Morrison
Andy Nash
Norman Rolfe

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

NO ON PROPOSITION J.
"J" is for JOKE—a cruel joke on us. What will J really do?
Add traffic to every street east of Gough. Delay the construction of waterfront streetcar service. Cost millions in local dollars needed to improve MUNI. Create a ground-level freeway on the waterfront as big as Van Ness, with more cars.
I'm a private citizen who's concerned about traffic and what it's doing to our City. If you are too, vote NO on Proposition J.

Steve Colman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
• Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
• Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
• If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
  —By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will in-
crease from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersec-
tions—an increase of only 76%.
  —Queueing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
  —MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
  —Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Blair C. Pascoe

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

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:
1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absen-
tee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or cam-
paign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION A

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by boldface type.

3.202 Office of Risk Management
There is established under the chief administrative officer an office of risk management which shall review, analyze and report to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the finance committee of the board of supervisors the practices of the several departments, boards and commissions of the city and county regarding loss prevention and risk management, including the insurance requirements of the city and county. The office shall establish and assist in the implementation of planning and operational guidelines regarding risk management and loss prevention for each department, board or commission. The chief administrative officer may appoint, at his or her pleasure, or contract with, a qualified individual or organization for the operation of the office. The qualifications of the individual or organization operating the office shall include relevant education, training and experience in insurance and risk management.

3.401 City Attorney
(a) The city attorney shall be an elective officer. He shall furnish an official bond in the sum of ten thousand dollars ($10,000). He shall appoint, and at his pleasure may remove, all assistants and employees of his office. He shall devote his entire time and attention to the duties of his office. He must, at the time of his election, be an elective of the city and county, qualified to practice in all the courts of the state, and he must have been so qualified for at least 10 years next preceding his election.

The city attorney must represent the city and county in all actions and proceedings in which it may be legally interested, or, for or against the city and county, or, any officer of the city and county in any action or proceeding, when directed so to do by the supervisors, except where a cause of action exists in favor of the city and county against said officer. Whenever any cause of action exists in favor of the city and county, the city attorney shall commence the same when within his knowledge or when directed so to do by the supervisors. He shall give his advice or opinion in writing to any officer, board or commission of the city and county when requested. Except as otherwise provided in this charter, he shall not settle or dismiss any litigation for or against the city and county, unless, upon his written recommendation, he is ordered so to do by ordinance.

The city attorney shall prepare, or approve as to form, all ordinances before they are enacted by the supervisors. He shall approve, by endorsement in writing, the form of all official or other bonds required by this charter or by ordinance before the same are submitted to the proper commission, board or office for final approval, and no such bonds shall be finally approved without such approval as to form by the city attorney. Except as otherwise in this charter provided, he shall prepare in writing the draft or form of all contracts before the same are executed on behalf of the city and county. He shall examine and approve the title of all real property to be acquired by the city and county.

He shall keep on file in his office copies of all written communications and opinions, also all papers, briefs and transcripts used in matters wherein he appears; and books of record and registers of all actions or proceedings in his charge in which the city and county or any officer or board thereof, is a party or is interested.

(b) The duties of the city attorney in connection with the bureau of delinquent revenue collection shall be transferred to and performed by the attorney for said bureau who shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

(c) There is established in the office of the city attorney a bureau of claims investigation and administration which shall have the responsibility of investigating, evaluating and processing for the several boards, commissions and departments all claims for money or damages made upon the city and county pursuant to section 7.703 of this charter or the general law of the State of California. Claims investigation functions of the police department in existence on June 4, 1986, shall continue as an adjunct to the bureau established under this section. Claims functions of the public utilities commission shall remain under that commission unless transferred to the bureau of claims investigation and administration by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the bureau shall also have the power to investigate events and occurrences giving rise to potential civil liability against the city and county and adjust and settle demands, within dollar limits to be established by ordinance, prior to their presentation as claims. There shall be established by ordinance a revolving fund to satisfy such demands adjusted prior to their presentation as claims. The bureau shall be responsible for the investigation of all claims and the analysis of city policies and practices upon which the bureau shall report and advise the several departments.

The city attorney shall appoint a chief of the bureau who shall serve at his or her pleasure. The chief of the bureau may appoint, subject to confirmation by the city attorney, investigators who shall serve at the pleasure of the chief; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of civil claims investigator or any equivalent classification on the date of approval of this amendment by the electorate shall continue to have civil service status to said position under the civil service provisions of this charter.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by horizontal strikeout.

7.100 Materials, Supplies and Equipment
The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreements for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract. All purchases in excess of one thousand dollars ($1,000) shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases and a permanent record of all such quotations shall be kept. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifteen-thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifteen-thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amounts of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as those become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of materials, supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two or more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned and may advertise for
bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid for the same purpose to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall direct the rejection of all articles which may be below standards, specifications or samples furnished. He shall not approve any bill or voucher for articles not in conformity with specifications, or which are at variance with any contract.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall also have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county vehicles, etc. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, except the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telephone and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for and in use in all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.

5.03 Requisition, Contract and Payment

All purchase orders and contracts shall be based on written requisitions and vouchers. All materials, supplies or services in common use in the various departments, on the purchaser's records of average use by all departments. Purchase orders and contracts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) must be approved by the chief administrative officer. Initially, with fiscal year 1977-78, the amount of such purchase orders or contracts may be authorized by the department head. Subsequently, the controller may increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall approve all bids and vouchers for materials, supplies, equipment, and contractual services before the controller shall draw and approve warrants thereon. All contracts for the purchase of materials, supplies and equipment shall be made after inviting sealed bids by publication. All sealed bids received shall be kept on file. When an award of contract is made, notice that the same has been made shall be given by one publication, and any interested person may examine the bids and records at the purchaser's office.

The purchaser of supplies shall have rules and regulations, approved by the chief administrative officer and the controller, designating and authorizing appropriate personnel within the purchasing department to exercise the purchaser's signature powers for purchase orders and contracts approved as provided in this charter.

7.200 Public Works and Purchasing Contracts

The construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements, and the purchasing of supplies, materials and equipment, when the expenditure involved in each case shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), shall be done by contract, except as otherwise provided by this charter. It shall constitute official misconduct to split or divide any public work or improvement or purchase into two or more units for the purpose of evading the contract provisions of this section. In an emergency, provided an actual emergency be declared by the board of supervisors or to exist, and when authorized by resolution of said board, any public work or improvement may be executed in the most expeditious manner. Notwithstanding any other provision in this section or this charter contained, upon the approval of the chief administrative officer declaring the work to be emergency in character, there may be executed any work or improvement for which the sum not to exceed five hundred dollars ($500) for new construction of any type in or upon unimproved or unaccepted streets.

Any public work or improvement estimated to cost less than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) may be performed under contract or written order or by the employment of the necessary labor, materials and supplies directly by the city and county. Any public work or improvement executed by the city, other than routine repair work, shall be authorized by the chief administrative officer when the cost exceeds fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or by the heads of departments not under the chief administrative officer, only after detailed estimates have been prepared and submitted by the head of the department concerned. There shall be separate accounting for each work or improvement so executed, which accounting shall include all direct, indirect and supervisory elements of cost chargeable to such work or improvement, and each cost accounting shall be reported to the chief administrative officer, or to the mayor when such work shall have been performed by departments not under the chief administrative officer. Such reports shall be submitted to the controller. Any public work or improvement costing less than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) and not performed by the chief administrative officer, or by the heads of departments not under the chief administrative officer, may be performed under contract, be covered by written order or agreement and which shall be based on not less than three bids, notice of which shall be given by three days posting. Records of such bids shall be kept by the department.

When the expenditure for any public work or improvement shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), the same shall be done by contract, except as otherwise provided in this charter. The head of the department in charge of or responsible for the work for which a contract is to be let, or the purchaser of supplies in the case of purchases of materials, supplies and equipment, shall let such contract to the lowest reliable and responsible bidder not less than ten days after advertising by one publication for sealed proposals for the work, improvements or purchase contemplated. Each such advertisement shall contain the reservation of the right to reject any and all bids. The officer responsible for the awarding of any such contract shall require from all bidders information concerning their experience and financial qualifications, as provided by general law relating to such investigations authorized by department of public works.

The purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer for bids in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or the department head concerned, with the approval of the board or commission to which he is responsible, may reject any and all bids and readvertise for bids. The department head or the purchaser of supplies, as the case may be, shall have the power to sign such contract for the estimated expenditures thereunder in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000). Any contract involving the expenditure of more than fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), if for the purchase of materials, supplies or equipment, shall require the joint approval of the purchaser of supplies and the chief administrative officer. If such contract is for any public work or improvement, it shall require the joint approval of the department head and the chief administrative officer for amounts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), relative to departments under his jurisdiction, or the signature of the department head and the approval by resolution of the board or commission concerned for departments not under the chief administrative officer.

The board of supervisors, by ordinance, shall establish procedures whereby appropriate city and county departments may file sealed bids for the execution of any work to be performed under contract. If such bids is the lowest, the contract shall be awarded to the department. Accurate costs shall be kept of all direct and indirect charges incurred by the department under any such contract, which unit costs shall be published for publication and audit controller and to the audit controller monthly and on the completion of the work.

In any case where the lowest gross price or unit cost bid is not accepted, and a contract is entered into with another bidder, written report shall be made to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the controller by the officer authorized to execute the contract, stating the reasons for failure to accept such lowest bid.

If any provision of this section is in conflict with any provision of section 7.100 of the charter, the provision, contained in section 7.100 shall govern and control.

Beginning with fiscal year 1978-79, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.

7.201 Public Works Contract Procedure by Ordinance

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter and, in particular, the provisions of section 7.200, the board of supervisors shall by ordinance determine the monetary limits not to exceed fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), within which the construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements may be done by contract or by written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county, consistent, save as to monetary limits, with the manner provided for in section 7.200 and section 7.100.

Beginning with fiscal year 1978-79, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D, Continued from page 25

point two commissioners to terms of one year each, one commissioner to a term of two years, one commissioner to a term of three years and one commissioner to a term of four years. Thereafter, the terms of the commissioners shall be for four years from the commencement thereof. Not less than one-fourth of the members of said commission shall be of the same sex, and one member shall have prior experience representing labor and one member shall have prior experience representing management.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of one hundred dollars ($100).

Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of any examination or hearing shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission, other than the regularly-determined hours of 9am to 5pm. Such persons or persons believing they will be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

In accordance with section 3.500, the commission shall have the power and it shall be its duty to appoint an executive assistant to be the administrative head of the affairs under its control who shall serve at its pleasure; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status at the position of assistant secretary to the civil service commission on the effective date of this section as amended shall continue to have civil service status in the position of executive assistant under the civil service provisions of this charter.

3.661 General Powers and Duties
(a) The civil service commission shall be the employment and personnel department of the city and county and shall determine appointments on the basis of merit and fitness, as shown by appropriate tests.
(b) The commission shall classify and from time to time may reclassify, in accordance with duties and responsibilities of the employment and training and experience required, all places of employment in the departments and offices of the city and county not specifically exempted by this chapter from civil service provisions thereof or which may be created hereafter by general law and not specifically exempted from said civil service provisions. The commission shall likewise classify all other positions or other places of employment in the city and county service specifically exempted from the civil service provisions of this chapter, but which may be created by provisions of section 8.401, thereof, made subject to classification for salary standardization purposes on the basis of duties and responsibilities of the employment and training and experience required. The civil service commission shall be the judge of such classification.
(c) The civil service commission shall also, in accordance with duties and responsibilities, allocate, and from time to time may re-allocate, the positions to the various classes of the classification. The allocation or re-allocation of a position shall not adversely affect the civil service rights of an occupant regularly holding such position. No person shall hold a position outside of the classification to which he has been appointed; provided that an office or department of the city or county shall discharge any of the duties pertaining to such department or office to which his chief may temporarily assign him.
(d) The class titles and class names assigned to positions by the commission shall be used in all records of the commission; reports, which may include communications, including the compensation schedule, annual budget and salary ordinance, payrolls, and appropriation ordinances.
(e) The commission shall adopt rules to carry out the civil service provisions of this charter and, except as otherwise provided in this charter, such rules shall be uniform, applicable to examinations; eligibility, duration of eligibility lists, computation of eligibles; appointments; promotions; transfers; resignations; lay-offs or reduction in force, both permanent and temporary, due to lack of work or funds, reclassification, or completion of work; the filling of positions; temporary, seasonal, and permanent; classification; examinations, appointments, and qualifications as are necessary in conflict with this charter. The commission may, from time to time, make changes in the rules, which change shall then be printed and be in force; provided that no such changes in rules shall affect a case pending before the commission. The commission shall certify eligibles and payrolls and conduct examinations under the rules of the commission.
(f) The commissioners have power to institute and prosecute legal proceedings for violations of any of the civil service provisions of this charter.
(g) The civil service commission shall establish an inspection service for the purpose of investigating the conduct of and action of appointees in all positions and of securing records of service for promotion and other purposes. All departments shall cooperate with the commission in making its investigations and any person hindering the commission or its agents shall be subject to suspension.
(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this chapter, if the civil service commission shall by rule establish procedures to review and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors, the determination reached under civil service commission procedures shall be final and shall be enforced by every employee and officer.

3.661 General Powers and Duties
(a) The civil service commission shall have the power to inquire into the operation of the personnel system of the city and county and the compliance with the three principles set forth in section 3.830. After such inquiry, the commission may recommend to the personnel director, as established pursuant to section 3.663, the mayor or to any other officer of the city and county such action as the commission determines, such other officer or officers as the civil service provisions of this charter. In any hearing conducted by the civil service commission or by any hearing officer it appoints, the commission or the hearing officer shall have the power to subpoena and require the attendance of witnesses and the production of records as provided in section 3.701.
(b) The civil service commission may require periodic reports from the personnel director in a manner and form which it shall prescribe.

(c) The civil service commission may hear appeals from an action of the personnel director with respect to:
1. Allegations of discrimination. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this chapter or any fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the civil service commission regarding allegations of discrimination shall forthwith be enforced by every officer and employee;
2. Allegations of fraud; and
3. Allegations of conflict of interest, pursuant to section 8.105.
(d) No action by the personnel director which is the subject of any appeal shall be stayed during the appeal process except by the unanimous vote of the civil service commission.
(e) The commission shall be notified of the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal of personnel regulations and may comment on such proposals. The adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing fraud or allegations of discrimination shall be subject to ratification by the commission. In addition, the adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing merit system principles or classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfers, resignations and terminations shall be subject to ratification by the commission.
(f) The commission shall ratify or reject any such regulation within 60 days of receipt. The commission's failure to act shall be deemed approval.
3.663 Personnel Director
3.663 Personnel Director
(a) A personnel director shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the mayor; provided, that the personnel director shall be selected from candidates nominated by the city civil service commission and confirmed by vote of the board of supervisors. The nominee of the mayor may be appointed acting personnel director pending confirmation. The person so appointed shall, before taking office, make a written request to the civil service commission as provided in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of personnel director in the spirit of this declaration."
(b) The personnel director shall conduct all personnel administrative and personnel functions and keep eligible lists based on their results and provide for certification of eligibles. The action of the personnel director on examination matters including,
but not limited to, announcements, minimum qualifications, classes of applicants, components, construction, weighting, content, type, list length, duration, expiration dates, and any other conditions that may apply.

(c) The personnel director shall adopt personnel regulations which, except as otherwise provided in this charter, shall govern both the administrative matters within the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration and the exercise of the authority granted in this section, including, but not limited to, the following items: qualifications; eligibility; duration of eligible lists; certification of eligibles; permanent, temporary and provisional appointments; regular performance evaluations; promotions; transfers; resignations; layoffs or reduction in force due to lack of work or lack of funds, reorganization, retrenchment or completion of work; and classification. No personnel regulations shall establish procedures to review and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter or any other provision of the laws of the state, the personnel director shall forthwith be enforced by every employee and officer, unless the decision is appealed to the civil service commission in accordance with personnel regulations.

(f) The personnel director shall investigate all employee complaints concerning job related conduct, employee benefits and personnel procedures and promptly report to the source of the complaint.

(g) The personnel director by personnel regulations shall promote effective and efficient management through personnel programs that encourage high productivity and exemplary performance.

(h) The personnel director by personnel regulations shall maintain a positive working environment and take corrective action for resolution of employee disputes which shall be consistent with other provisions of this charter and shall be utilized by all department heads and appointing officers upon the expiration of the existing term of any otherwise binding agreements.

(i) Consistent with the foregoing and other applicable provisions of this charter, the personnel director shall delegate to the various appropriate officers appropriate personnel responsibilities, including but not limited to appropriate disciplinary procedures, and consult with appointing officers with respect to personnel regulations affecting their operations.

(j) Personal services contracts shall be reviewed and approved by the personnel director in accordance with the provisions of appropriate personnel regulations. Personal services contracts reasonably expected to involve payment by the city and county of more than twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000) shall also be reviewed and approved by the Commission. Failure of the Commission to act within thirty days of submission of the contract by the personnel director shall be deemed to constitute approval by the commission.

(k) The personnel director shall establish a system of job classification. The provisions of section 3.410 shall not apply to classified positions whose tasks are created or existing positions are reclassified. The personnel director shall be the judge of such classification determinations.

(l) From the regulation of the appointing officer or other, the department of personnel administration shall determine whether a position within a classification is, "in character," temporary or permanent. Appointment may be made on a permanent, temporary or, where confirmation is required, a provisional basis.

(m) Excepting sections 3.500, 3.660, 3.661, 3.105, 8.107, all but the second to the last paragraph of section 8.341, section 5.346, the last sentence of section 8.406, all but the last three words in the first sentence of the third paragraph of section 8.401, sections 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.406, 8.407 and this section, wherever the words "civil service commission" or "commission" appear in the personnel provisions of this charter, they shall be replaced by the words "department of personnel administration," "department," personnel director," or "personnel director." Use of the words "rule" or "rules" shall be replaced by the words "personnel regulation" or "regulations," the words "general manager, personnel" and "secretary of the civil service commission" shall be replaced by the words "personnel director" and the words "section 3.661" shall be replaced by the words "section 3.662" or "section 3.663," as appropriate.

The clerk of the board of supervisors, after consultation with the city attorney, is hereby directed to conform the language of the charter as herein amended when next the charter is submitted for republication.

8.322 Protest of Written Questions and Answers

The procedures for requesting civil service examination have been adopted; the questions and answers thereto shall be available for review by the participants. This review period shall not apply to questions and answers on any continuous or standardized examination and/or participate in a written test. During the review period, participants shall have an opportunity to protest questions and answers on practical examination and/or improper. After all protested items have been acted on and after the official rating key has been adopted and the identification sheets have been opened, further changes in the rating key shall not be made.

8.323 Protest of Tentative List of Eligibles

Following the completion of any examination, a tentative list of eligibles shall be posted for the inspection of the public and of the participants. The posting period shall be for a minimum of three (3) working days for the examination or five (5) working days for promotional or combined entrance and promotional examinations. During this period a fee of $50 shall be charged for the inspection of the papers of each eligible. The fee shall be charged by the civil service commission. The amount of the fee shall be established by order of the board of supervisors. The fee shall be waived for eligibles who wish to inspect their own papers. Inspection of papers shall include all documents supporting the eligibles rank and score except the identity of the examiner giving any mark or grade in an oral examination and the questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance and/or promotional written examination. Only participants in the examination may review the questions used in the examination. If no protests are received during the posting period the eligible list is automatically adopted. If protests are received during the posting period the examination and action of the general manager, personnel director, shall be expedited so that final adoption of the eligible list is not delayed beyond sixty (60) days after the date of posting. Eligibles who, as a result of their ranking, are not eligible for appointment, shall be notified of the outcome of the protest(s) and be offered employment from the selected list in the event of the resolution of any protest(s) and amendment to the adopted eligible list.

8.324 Promotions in General

Except as specifically provided for, in section 8.327, the civil service commission shall provide for examinations on an entrance, promotional or combined entrance and promotional examination for each position title which is open to competition for permanent, temporary, and/or probationary employees in separate, promotive examinations and in pre-promotional examinations which include, with entrance examinations for city and county service, when the passing mark has been attained and may include evaluation of work performance and other credits. When an examination announcement is issued for a class on a competitive, promotive and entrance basis, there shall be one resulting list of eligibles which shall include all successful candidates for competitive and promotive and entrance in order of relative performance.

8.325 Nothwithstanding any contrary to this or any other provision of the charter, an employee who has been certified from a regularly adopted eligible list or otherwise qualified is eligible to hold a position in the civil service classification shall be permitted to participate in competitive examination on the same terms and conditions as a person holding a permanent appointment to a position in the same classification, subject to a demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by the rules of the civil service commission.

8.326 Promotions in General

The provisions of this section, as herein amended, shall only be applicable to promotive examinations announced after its effective date.

8.327 Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave

Employees under permanent civil service appointment who, because of absence on duly authorized military leave as of June 27, 1950, did not participate in a promotional examination held after June 27, 1950, and during the terms of war as defined in section 8.324 of this charter, and in which examination the employee would have been otherwise eligible to compete, had the war not intervened; which examination is hereinafter referred to as the original promotional examination; shall, after the abridgment of the war, be eligible in the same manner as for other employees for a similar competitive examination. Provided, that persons and employees who were on entrance or eligible lists, shall, for the purpose of this amendment, be deemed to be appointed in their classifications from the time their names were reached for permanent certification while in the military service; in order to qualify for participation in a similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section, such employee who desires to participate therein must make application in writing to the civil service commission within thirty (30) days after the expiration of the appointment, and within thirty (30) days after the effective date of this amendment. Failure to file such application shall be construed as a waiver of all rights of the employee to participate in such similar promotional examination.

The civil service commission shall be held such similar promotional examination within a reasonable time after employees who were eligible to participate under this section have indicated their desire to participate, and employees shall be given priority to participate in such similar promotional examination.

The civil service commission shall be the sole judge of the adequacy of such similar promotional examination. If the employee obtains in the similar promotional examination a score rating equal to or
more than the minimum passing mark established by the civil service commission for inclusion on the list of eligibles resulting from the original promotional examination, his name shall thereupon be entered on the eligible list resulting from the original promotional examination, and his name shall remain on the eligible list until such time as he attains the age of sixty years, or until he shall have satisfied the requirements for permanent appointment, or until he shall have died, or until his name has been removed from the eligible list as provided for in Section 8.820, except that his name shall remain on the eligible list until the date on which his name is entered on the eligible list unless he is disqualified for permanent appointment.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this or any other provision of the charter, an employee who has been certified from a regularly-eligible list to a non-permanent position in a civil service classification shall be entitled to appointment to a permanent position within that same classification before that commission certifies to the appointing official the names and addresses of persons standing higher on the list of eligibles who are not then current employees, subject to a demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the commission. The provisions of this section as herein amended shall not be applicable to requirements for permanent positions filled from and after January 1, 1980.

8.330 Duration of Lists of Eligibles

The civil service commission may remove all names from the list of eligibles after they have remained thereon for more than two years and all names thereon shall be removed at the expiration of four years. The commission may, however, provide in the examination announcement for the list of eligibles that if a candidate's eligibility is secured by the central office, that he shall automatically expire at a date not less than two or more than four years after the adoption of such list.

8.331 Limited Tenure Appointments

When in time of war declared by the Congress of the United States eligible lists are not available for appointment from registers established through the regular examination procedures as provided under Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof, the civil service commission may make appointments for wartime appointments to positions through informal and non-competitive tests. Such tests and appointments resulting therefrom shall be governed solely by the provisions of this section and by rule of the civil service commission adopted pursuant thereto and the tests shall be adequate in the judgment of the civil service commission to determine the qualifications of applicants to perform the duties of the positions to be filled pending creation of lists of eligibles through the regular examination procedures as provided in Sections 8.520, 8.521, 8.524 and 8.530 hereof. Appointments made under the provisions of this section shall be designated by the term "limited tenure appointments" and shall continue only until registers of eligibles shall be established through the regular examination procedures provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof but in no event to exceed six months beyond the cessation of hostilities. Limited tenure appointments may be terminated by the appointing officer at any time. Limited tenure appointments may be terminated by the appointing officer for good cause at any time with the approval of the civil service commission without reference to the procedures governing removals set forth in Section 8.342 hereof. Persons serving under limited tenure appointments as in this section provided shall by reason of such service acquire no right or preference for permanent civil service status as defined elsewhere in this charter or by rule of the civil service commission which is conferred on persons completing probationary appointments made from lists of eligibles established through the regular examination procedures provided in Sections 8.520, 8.521, 8.524 and 8.530 hereof.

8.332 Limited Tenure Appointments

The provisions of this section as herein amended at the election of November 2, 1976, shall be applicable only to lists of eligibles finally adopted by the civil service commission pursuant to the provisions of Section 8.320 hereof and to the eligible list resulting from the eligible list resulting from the adoption of this amendment. In making such certification, sex shall be disregarded except when a statute, a rule of the commission, or the appointment officer specifies sex.

The appointment officer shall fill the position by the appointment of one of the persons certified. The provisions of this section as herein amended at the election of November 2, 1976, shall be applicable only to lists of eligibles finally adopted by the civil service commission pursuant to the provisions of Section 8.320 hereof and to the eligible list resulting from the adoption of this amendment. In making such certification, sex shall be disregarded except when a statute, a rule of the commission, or the appointment officer specifies sex.

From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the commission shall determine whether the position is, in character, temporary, seasonal or permanent, and shall notify the candidate in accordance therewith to the end that the candidate may have knowledge of the probable duration of employment. The commission shall provide for such waiver of temporary or seasonal employment as it may deem advisable.

Non-civil service appointments in the absence of civil service eligibles as provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 of this charter shall not be authorized if applicants qualified for limited tenure appointments are available. The civil service commission shall make every effort consistent with current conditions to maintain adequate registers of eligibles established through the regular examination procedures provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules to carry out the provisions of this section and to govern the administration of limited tenure appointments.

In time of national emergency declared by the President of the United States or by the Congress, or while any act authorizing compulsory military service or training is in effect, the provisions of this section may also be made operative upon emergency appointment or by endorsement of the board of supervisors by ordinance enacted by two-thirds vote of the board. Authority for limited tenure appointments, if established pursuant to the authority of this paragraph, shall cease six months after the board of supervisors of the ordinance which authorized such appointments.

8.352 Temporary and Emergency Appointments

If no eligible is available on an existing list for a position required by the appointing officer, and immediate service in the position is required by the appointing officer and another list exists which is deemed by the civil service commission to be suitable to provide temporarily the service desired, the commission shall certify to the civil service commission an eligible from such list; if no such other list deemed by the commission pursuant to its rules may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment therefor for a period not exceeding one hundred and thirty working days. Such non-civil service or emergency appointments extended beyond one hundred and thirty days must be approved by the civil service commission.

Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such one hundred and thirty working days at the time a civil service eligible report for duty as provided in Section 8.329 of this charter.

If no eligible is available for the position required, but immediate service is deemed necessary by the appointing officer pending the time an eligible from such list is certified and reports for duty as provided in Section 8.329 of the charter, the commission may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment therefor for a period not exceeding thirty working days. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such thirty working days at the time a civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in Section 8.329 of this charter.

If a person shall be compensated under any non-civil service or emergency appointment or appointments as authorized under the provisions of the foregoing paragraphs of this section for a period exceeding one hundred and thirty working days in any fiscal or calendar year, and no claim or warrant therefor shall be approved, allowed or paid for any compensation in excess of one hundred and thirty working days in any fiscal or calendar year.

If no eligibles are available for appointment to a permanent position in the class requested by the appointing officer, the commission shall immediately hold an examination and establish an eligible list for such position. If its annual appropriation is insufficient to meet the cost of said examination, it shall report to the mayor the estimated cost thereof; and the
8.340 Dismissal During Probation Period
Any person appointed to a permanent position shall serve a probationary period. The civil service commission personnel director shall by rule establish a probationary period of not less than six months’ service for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed rank of the police department, fire department, sheriff’s department, and San Francisco International Airport police force shall be for twelve months except that it may be extended up to a maximum of twelve months’ service for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed rank of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve months’ service from the day following completion of the prescribed department field training officer program, but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment, provided further that probationary members of the uniformed ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in section 8.343 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four months may be established for executive and management classifications. At any time during the probationary period the appointing officer may terminate the appointment upon giving written notice of such termination to the employee and to the civil service commission specifying the reasons for such termination. Except in the case of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments the civil service commission shall—review the termination. The civil service commission shall—by rule establish the procedures for such review. If the appointment resulted from an entrance examination the commission may declare such person dismissed or may return the name to the list of eligibles under such conditions of further appointment as the commission may deem just. If the appointment resulted from a promotional examination the employee shall have the right of appeal and hearing before the civil service commission. The commission shall render a decision within thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person dismissed; or (b) order such person reinstated to the position with or without promotion; or (c) order an order that the employee be paid salary from the time of the termination of the appointment; or (d) order the return of such person, to a position in the classification from which that person was promoted and may reestablish the employee’s eligibility to a list eligibles for the same promotive classification under such conditions as the commission shall deem just. The decision of the commission shall be final. Immediately prior to the expiration of the probationary period the appointing officer shall report to the civil service commission as to the competence of the probationer for the position; and if competent, shall recommend to the personnel director for reinstatement. If reinstatement is not made this decision shall preclude the civil service commission from reviewing terminations except as required to terminate the appointment by the personnel director. 8.407 Definition of Generally Prevailing Rates of Wage and Salary
Notwithstanding any provision of section 8.401 or any provision of any other section of this chapter to the contrary, generally prevailing rates of salaries and wages for those employees covered by section 8.401 of this chapter shall be determined by the civil service commission as set forth below. The civil service commission personnel director shall conduct a comprehensive investigation and survey of basic pay rates and wages and salaries in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment for like work and like service, based upon job classifications as provided in section 3565. 3662 of this charter and shall make its findings, based on facts and data collected, as to what are the generally prevailing basic pay rates for each benchmark class of employment solely in the manner hereinafter provided. A benchmark class is defined as a "key class" within an occupational grouping selected as the class for which a representative sample of data will be collected. Basic pay rate data for public and private employment shall be collected solely from the City of Alameda, Alameda County, San Mateo, San Francisco and Santa Clara; provided, however, that for any benchmark class of employment for which the civil service commission personnel director determines there is insufficient data from City of Alameda public jurisdictions the commission personnel director shall survey major public agencies in the state employing such class, major public agencies to be defined as these employing more than 3,000 persons.

The commission personnel director shall collect basic pay rate data for like work and like service from City of Alameda public jurisdictions as follows:

(a) The City of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara.

(b) The ten most populous cities in these five City of Alameda counties based on the latest federal decennial census.

(c) Agencies of the state and federal governments and from school districts and other special districts in the six City of Alameda counties as determined by the civil service commission personnel director. The commission personnel director shall collect private basic pay rate data from recognized governmental City of Alameda salary and wage surveys of private employers in the city and county of San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara. The data collected shall be limited to basic rates of pay and salaries actually being paid by public and private employers for like work and like service.

The term "prevailing rates of wages" for employers governed by charter section 8.401 and this section shall be defined as the rates ranges developed from the average basic pay rates, excluding fringe benefits, for surveyed public employments and the median of the pay rates for private employment to be determined as follows:

(1) multiply the medians from the private and the midpoint from public employments data by the number of employees in the given classification from each data base.

(2) add the products of (1);

(3) divide the sums in (2) by the total number of employees surveyed for that classification; and

(4) extend this figure by 10 percent to establish the maximum of the range and reduce this figure by 10 percent to establish the minimum.

When fixing rates of compensation the board of supervisors shall fix basic pay rates as close as reasonably possible to prevailing rates, provided, however, that the board of supervisors shall not set the maximum rate of pay for any class in excess of the maximum prevailing rate for that class; provided further, however, that no employee shall have his basic pay rate reduced to conform to prevailing rates except as provided for in section 8.406. For those classifications of employment in which the practice is customary, the schedules of compensation shall provide for minimum, not less than three intermediate, and maximum salary steps and for a method of advancing the salaries of employees from minimum to intermediate to maximum with due regard for seniority of service. The term "basic pay rate" as used in this section is hereby defined as applying only to the basic rate of wages, with included range scales, and does not include any other benefits of employment or working condition benefits. It is the declared intent of the qualified electors of the city and county that neither the board of supervisors nor the mayor have any power to provide any benefits of employment except those enumerated already provided for in this charter and. Any addition, deletion or modification of benefits of employment enumerated in the charter shall be submitted, as a charter amendment, to the qualified electors of the city and county. The qualified electors expressly state that they understand that benefits of employment are sometimes referred to as "fringe benefits" of employment and the qualified electors expressly reserve the right to either grant or deny such benefits except those conditions of employment commonly referred to as "working conditions. Any reference to "working conditions" shall mean those compensations which most necessarily be provided in order for the employees to perform his job description duties efficiently and safely, and shall include but not be limited to such working conditions and benefits as are typically included in the administrative provisions of the salary standardization ordinance and the salary ordinance and the salary ordinance and the salary ordinance.

The board of supervisors may, in its discretion, provide working condition benefits for employees covered under this section and section 8.401 of this charter only in accordance with the following provisions:

(a) The civil service commission personnel director. The civil service commission personnel director shall solicit and accept the comments of the board of supervisors, mayor that the working condition benefits are equitable or necessary for the efficient and safe performance of the employee’s duties as enumerated in his job description.

(b) The working condition benefits, as recommended by the civil service commission personnel director, shall be presented to the board of supervisors for adoption or rejection. The board of supervisors shall vote by a majority of the board of supervisors present and duly qualified to vote. The mayor shall have the right of approval or disapproval of the working condition benefits and like service to that provided for the job classification and is provided to not less than 50 percent of the employees of the class in the jurisdiction covered by the salary survey.

9.108 Initiative, Referendum, and Recall
(a) The registered voters shall have power to propose by petition, and to adopt or to reject at the polls, any ordinance, act or other measure which is within the competency of the board of supervisors to enact, or any legislative act which is within the power conferred upon any other board, commission or officer to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinance, act, charter amendment or other measure may be so proposed by filing with the registrar a petition setting forth said measure in full, signed by registered voters of the city and county as many in number as the percentages hereinafter required of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election.

Any declaration of policy may be submitted to the electors in the manner provided for the submission of any other ordinance or act and when approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting on said declaration, it shall thereupon be the duty of the board of supervisors to enact an ordinance or ordinances to carry such policies or principles into effect, subject to the referendum provisions of this charter.

Any ordinance which the supervisors are empowered to pass may be submitted to the electors by a majority of the board and at the special election called for the purpose, said election to be held not less than thirty days from the date of the call. Any such ordinance may be proposed by one-third of the supervisors, or by the mayor, and when so proposed shall be submitted to the electors at the next succeeding general election. No ordinance passed by the supervisors granting any public utility franchise
or privilege, shall go into effect until the expiration of sixty days from the date it becomes final. At the end of such sixty days such ordinance shall be in force and effect, unless within such period there shall be filed with the registrar a petition signed by registered voters in number to five percent of the entire vote cast for mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election, requesting that such ordinance be submitted to the electors. In case such petition is filed, such ordinance shall not go into effect until approved by a majority of the voters voting thereon at a general or special election.

If, before the close of any other ordinance involving legislative matters becomes effective, there shall be filed with the board of supervisors a petition signed by qualified electors of the city and county equal in number to at least ten percent of the entire vote cast for all candidates for mayor at the last preceding general municipal election at which a mayor was elected, protesting against the passage of such ordinance the same shall be suspended from going into operation, and it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to reconsider such ordinance, and if the same be not entirely repealed, said board shall submit the ordinance to the vote of said electors either at the next general municipal election or at a special election to be called for that purpose, and such ordinance shall not go into effect or become operative unless and until a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon shall vote in favor thereof. The provisions of section 9.109 and 9.110 of the charter shall apply to and govern the verification and certification of such petition.

Annual budget and appropriation ordinances, supplementary appropriation ordinances, the annual salary ordinance, or ordinances amending the same, the ordinances levying taxes, any ordinance appropriating money from the emergency reserve fund, ordinances authorizing the city attorney to compromise litigation, and ordinances necessary to enable the mayor to carry out the powers vested in him in the case of public emergency as defined in section 3.100 of the charter, ordinances enacted pursuant to section 8.410 of the charter, as well as ordinances relative to purely administrative matters, shall not be subject to referendum.

Any elective official, the chief administrative officer, the controller or any member of the board of education or public utilities commission may be recalled by the electors. The procedure to effect such recall shall be as follows: A petition demanding the recall from office of the person sought to be recalled shall be filed with the registrar. Said petition shall contain a statement of the grounds on which the recall is sought. Any insufficiency of form or substance in such statement shall in no way affect the validity of the election and proceedings held thereunder. No recall petition shall be filed against any officer until he has held his office for at least six months.

(b) In the event the representative of the board-of-supervisors mayor and the representatives of recognized employees do not reach an agreement through the meet-and-confer process on matters contained in the annual salary standardization ordinance by March 15 of any year, the mayor shall recommend and the board shall adopt or reject a schedule of compensation which reflects current-prevailing rates for the classifications covered by Section 8.450 of this charter. The last good faith offer presented by the mayor or his or her representative.

In any year when an agreement on matters contained in the salary standardization ordinance has not been achieved, the civil service commission personnel director, upon receipt of a written demand from the recognized employee organization made upon the mayor and the personnel director shall prepare, prior to April 1, a schedule of compensation and administrative provisions which reflect additional rates that would be payable, and working conditions, based upon the last demands made by the recognized employee organization(s) which participated in the meet-and-confer process.

Said schedule shall be transmitted to the registrar of voters for submission to the electors of the city and county at a general election or a special election called for the purpose, and said special election shall be held no less than sixty (60) days from the date of the call. No such schedule shall be withdrawn after it has been received by the registrar of voters. At said election, the ballot shall contain the following two alternatives:

(1) Approval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

(2) Disapproval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

If a majority of the valid votes cast in the election favor paying the additional rates set forth in the schedule of compensation based upon the last demands of the recognized employee organizations which engaged in the meet-and-confer process, it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to amend the salary standardization ordinance to reflect said increased
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TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION E

NOTE: All sections are new.

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

Section 1. This ordinance may be called the "City College Public Lands Preservation Ordinance."

Section 2. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall disapprove or deny, WITH NO EXEMPTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS, any building permit application for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, located across Phelan Avenue from the presently occupied campus of City College and consisting of Assessor's Block 3189, Lot 1 as presently constituted.

Section 4. The term "building permit" includes building permits, site permits and any other permits for the performance of construction work.

Section 5. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of the ordinance shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. No provision of this ordinance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent implementation of the policy stated above.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION F

NOTE: All sections are new.

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

Section 1. The People of the City and County of San Francisco desire and are entitled to a local government whose officers do not engage in, assist or promote compensated advocacy on behalf of private interests before City and County commissions and boards while also serving as City and County officers.

Section 2. No officer of the City and County may, during the term of office, engage in compensated advocacy before any City and County board or commission, or any member of the boards, in order to represent any private interest, for which representation the officer receives, directly or indirectly, any compensation, reward or gift.

Section 3. Officers of the City and County shall not discuss matters pending before their commission or department with other City and County officers or state legislators when those other officers or state legislators are acting as compensated advocates for a private interest.

Section 4. No member of the California State Legislature shall appear before any City and County board, department or commission as a compensated advocate representing a private interest.

Section 5. In the financing of city and county campaigns: (a) No person other than a candidate shall make, and no campaign treasurer shall solicit or accept, any contribution which will cause the total amount contributed by such person with respect to a single election in support of or opposition to such candidate to exceed $50,000.00. (b) Any person is found guilty of violating the terms of this section, each campaign treasurer who received part or all of the contributions or contributions which constitute the violation shall pay promptly, from available campaign funds, if any, the amount received from such person in excess of the amount permitted to this section to the City and County Treasurer for deposit in the General Fund of the City and County. (c) This section shall not apply to any in-kind contribution of television or radio airtime to any candidate or committee granted to said candidate or committee pursuant to the "Fairness Doctrine" articulated in Callman Broadcasting, 40 FCC 576 (1963).

Section 6. Any person violating the terms of this ordinance shall be subject to the penalties set forth in San Francisco Charter Section 5.105. Such penalties shall include, but not be limited to, removal from office.

Section 7. If any provision of this ordinance, or its application to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, it is the expressed intent of the people of the City and County of San Francisco that the remainder of the ordinance, or the application of such provision, or any other provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.
rates and the same shall be in lieu of said annual compensation, and notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, said rates shall become effective and be payable as if adopted prior to April 1, of any year.

The provisions of sections 3.100 and 3.100-1, relating to the emergency powers of the mayor, shall not be applicable to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

11.105 Effective Date of Amendments
The effective date of the amendments, additions and deletions to the civil service provisions of the charter shall be ninety (90) days after the acceptance and filing thereof with the Secretary of State.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION Q

We the people of San Francisco declare this to be our policy:
1) IT IS IMPROPER TO PROFIT FROM OR PROVIDE SUPPORT TO THE RACIST POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SYSTEM IN SOUTH AFRICA, KNOWN AS APARTHEID.
2) COMPANIES HAVING SUBSTANTIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH APARTHEID MUST BE CONSIDERED IRRESPONSIBLE.
   (a) The Board of Supervisors must determine which companies doing or seeking business with the City have the greatest ties to Apartheid. Companies that have a significant involvement in profiting from or maintaining the Apartheid system, may, on that basis, be deemed "irresponsible bidders."
   (b) In purchasing goods and services and awarding other contracts, the City must give priority to avoiding such companies; the degree of the preference must be in proportion to the company's complicity with Apartheid, according to the following criteria:
      - how much business the company does in or with South Africa;
      - how much the company profits from that business;
      - how much support the company provides the Apartheid government in taxes, loans, payments or other funding;
      - the nature of the company's South Africa business;
      - the degree of the company's cooperation with South African political censorship or secrecy agreements;
      - the degree to which the company provides the South African government with the technology, materials and other means to maintain and enforce Apartheid.
   (c) City funds must not be deposited or invested with any bank or other company which does business in or with, or makes loans to, South Africa.
(c) If any exception to the above policies is found to be necessary or appropriate, the responsible official must promptly and publicly report it to the Board of Supervisors, clearly describing the exception and the reasons for it.
(d) The term "city" includes all agencies, departments, officials, employees, units and subunits of the city and county of San Francisco, and all funds administered or on behalf of the city or county.
3) WE CALL ON ALL OTHER PUBLIC BODIES AND PRIVATE OR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS TO ADOPT SIMILAR POLICIES.
4) WE CALL A GENERAL PUBLIC BOYCOTT, FOCUSING ON THOSE COMPANIES HAVING THE GREATEST TIES TO APARTHEID.

The Board of Supervisors must determine and announce which company or companies are the worst offenders within each major industry, so that the public can focus its boycott on those companies.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION H

SUMMARY: THIS INITIATIVE STATES THAT THE AIDS EPIDEMIC IS A MAJOR PUBLIC HEALTH PROBLEM OF CONCERN TO EVERYONE, REQUIRING INCREASED SUPPORT FOR RELATED MEDICAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION. IT CALLS FOR A COUNCIL FOR AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION OR SIMILAR UNITED EFFORT TO STOP AIDS.

We the people of San Francisco hereby adopt the following policy:
The AIDS epidemic has rapidly become a major public health problem, costly both in human lives and in general community resources;
The first steps in dealing with such a crisis are:
   - the scientific research needed to discover and understand the nature, causes, co-factors, prevention, diagnosis and treatment of the disease, and the education of the public about the lessons of that research;
   - a proper program of research and education pays for itself in the long run;
Prompt action is urgent, because of the rapidly growing number of persons affected, increasing not only the suffering but also the difficulty of eradicating the disease;
The leadership and support of such an effort is everyone's responsibility;
While San Francisco's role in the overall effort against AIDS has been viewed as a positive example to other areas, the continued rapid increase in the spread of the disease means that we cannot afford to rest on our laurels or leave further responsibility to others.
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:
We call on all appropriate government bodies as well as medical, professional, charitable and community organizations and concerned individuals to join together in an all-out effort to stop AIDS;
We call for support to an organized united effort along the lines of an AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION COUNCIL, including, in some form:
   - A COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, to provide informed evaluations as to priorities among research projects and proposals, recommending those which are most cost-effective and most likely to produce early results useful in the prevention or treatment of the disease, to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts or neglect of promising approaches, and to provide the council with complete and up-to-date information regarding comparative results of experimental treatments, prevention programs and other existing research;
   - A COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, to inform the public regarding prevention and other research findings, and to inform relevant government officials and the general public, concerning the factual basis for a re-ordering of current public funding priorities toward an increased war against disease, including research and education against AIDS and related conditions;
   - A FUND-RAISING COMMITTEE, to solicit donations, lobby for grants, organize benefits and other fund-raising projects spreading the financial burden by appealing to many sources;
We ask the council and committees to be responsive and accessible to public input, to include representation of all interested groups, to consider all viewpoints, and to be capable of prompt action;
We ask appropriate city officials to determine whether a suitable form of such a council already exists; if it does, we wish the city to support it actively; if not, we wish the city to seek to encourage its formation by such means as may appear proper.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION I

SUMMARY: This initiative asks "Shall we tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?" The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated portion of Route 480 known as the Embarcadero Freeway. This initiative declaration of policy will give the voters the opportunity to establish the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco regarding the proposed teardown of the Embarcadero Freeway.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION J

Shall the City replace a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if such replacement would open up the Waterfront to its citizens, improve the tax base, and create a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic?
Candidates

FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER
JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: The Bill of Rights guarantees that every person accused of a crime shall have the effective assistance of counsel. Whether an individual is rich or poor, that person is entitled to a competent and dedicated attorney.

In San Francisco it is the duty of the Public Defender to uphold this sacred right. In every case, we provide the client with the best defense under the law.

In the last 7 years, my outstanding staff has done this work with the highest degree of professionalism. In the next 4 years, that same strong, professional, independent and ethical representation will continue.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John D. Bardis, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Ying Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative In Congress, 5th District
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Clerk
Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Artist/Community Organizer
Brian Getz, 55 22nd Ave., Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., International Vice President, ILGWU
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for Children & Youth
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070 26th Ave., Executive Assistant to Sala Burton M.C.
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Community Health Director
Linda Ann Post, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative
Jim Rivaldo, 430 Steiner St., Political Consultant
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Member, SF Community College District Governing Board
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel W. Walker, 562 Campbell Ave., President—Local 250-A Transport Workers Union of America
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hillitas Ave., Minister
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor
C. R. Zanca, 1966 Pacific Ave., Auto Repair Proprietor

FOR ASSESSOR
SAM DUCOA

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I was elected your Assessor in 1978 and re-elected in 1982. My years in the Assessor's Office were spent in a professional appraisal capacity and administration. I have two university degrees, the coveted MAI designation, and am the recipient of a special Congressional Advisory Board award from the United States Congress. I have served in an advisory capacity, both nationally and internationally, in property tax administration and will continue to serve the taxpayers of the City and County of San Francisco in dealing with Article XIII A of the State Constitution. My community involvement includes participation in cultural, civic business organizations.

Sam Duca

The sponsors for Sam Duca are:
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
Eugene L. Friend, 2910 Lake St., Investor
Nancy Pelosi, 40 Presidio Ter., Housewife and volunteer in politics
Walter H. Shorenstein, 740 El Camino del Mar, Chairman, Milton Meyer & Co.
Stanley Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Emma W. Louie, 1257 Jackson St., Housewife
Alfred S. Wilsey, 2590 Jackson St., Chr. of Exec. Comm. of Diversified Holding Co.
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arthur H. Coleman, II Hinckley Walk, Physician
Gerson Bakar, 2300 Hyde St., Investor
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired
Joseph C. Orego, Sr., 866 Faxon Ave., Publicity Dept.—S.F. Giants
James A. Scatena, 101 St. Elmo Way, Chairman of the Board, Scatena York Co.
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher
Frances May McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Recreation & Park Commissioner
Frederick F. Campagnoli, 2609 Larkin St., Attorney
Betty Brooks, 1738 26th St., Field Representative
Jess Teruel Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Businessman
Cyril I. Maginn, 994 California St., Merchant
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John H. Swanson, 145 Lake Merced Hill South, Bowling Alley Owner
Frances G. Goldman, 945 El Camino Del Mar, Child Guidance
Irina M. Bernardo, 2182 34th Ave., Housewife
Leo J. Murphy, 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Charles M. Cunningham, 475 Connecticut St., Self Employed
Lawrence V. Epiphane, 815 Fell St., Conf. Secretary
Mary M. O'Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Volunteer & Homemaker
Elizabeth R. Duca, 16 Wawona St., Homemaker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Application for Absentee Ballot is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

Name ____________________________________________________________

Residence Address ________________________________________________

Mailing Address _________________________________________________

Signature _________________________________________________________

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

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

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

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

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

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
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Vote for One
請選 1 人
赞成 反對
Vote par Uno
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YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by
May 5, 1986.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
• are a U.S. Citizen,
• are at least 18 years of age on election day,
• are a resident of California, and
• are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a
felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417. You will be sent
a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political
party you consider yours you can check the box on the form
saying that you “Decline to State.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of an-
other political party?
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote for any
candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary
election, such as this one, you can only choose among the
candidates of your party.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Con-
troller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of
Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State
Senator, State Assemblymember, County Central Com-
mittee, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assess-
or and Public Defender.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your polling place is printed above your name and address
sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place,
is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they
can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 3, 1986. Your polling
place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if
I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting
and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in”. If you want to and don’t
know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll
workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

Q—Can a worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote
on election day?
A—Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you
actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and
(2) that you inform your employer at least three working
days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on elec-
tion day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
• Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and
voting there, or
• mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook
(see enclosed card).

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

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
• your home address,
• the address where you want the ballot mailed,
• then sign your name, and also clearly print your name
underneath.

Q—When do I mail by absentee ballot back to the Registrar
of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar
of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absen-
tee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on elec-
tion day, June 3, 1986.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS CONCERNING VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

Note: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de voto y obtenga otra.

A 第一步
请双手持票向自动机将整枚选票插入。

B 第二步
确保两个插槽在您的卡片背面覆盖两枚红色别针。

C 第三步
请将票插入选票插孔内票尾之二孔，紧合于二红点之上。

D 第四步
请把票插进票孔机，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 1
USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de voto completamente dentro del “Votomatic.”

STEP 2
BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.
Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coincidan con los dos cabecitas rojas.

STEP 3
HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.
Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de voto y perfume con él la tarjeta de voto en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

STEP 4
AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.
Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del “Votomatic” y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出於外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO ÚNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perforé la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perforé la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perforé la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SI" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borraduras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precincto y obtenga otra.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>TOM BRADLEY</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HUGH G. BAGLEY</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRANK L. THOMAS</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EILEEN ANDERSON</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHARLES “CHUCK” PINEDA, JR.</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>LEO T. McCARTHY</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>MARCH FONG EU</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Controller**

GRAY DAVIS
Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature
Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Legislatura de California

JOHN GARAMENDI
State Senator, Businessman
Senador Estatal, Hombre de Negocios

ALISTER McALISTER
Assemblyman, 18th District, California Legislature
Asambleista, Distrito 18, Legislatura de California

*(WRITE-IN)* To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

**Treasurer**

JESSE M. UNRUH
California State Treasurer
Tesorero del Estado de California

*(WRITE-IN)* To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

**Attorney General**

JOHN VAN DE KAMP
Attorney General, California
Procurador General, California

*(WRITE-IN)* To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
### Member, State Board of Equalization

**CONWAY H. COLLIS**  
Member, State Board of Equalization, Second District  
Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento

**BERT DE LOTTO**  
Appraiser/Broker/Farmer  
Tesoror/Intermediario/Agricultor

*(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*

### United States Senator

**ROBERT J. BANUELOS**  
Communications Technician  
Técnico de Comunicación

**JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT**  
Political Scientist-Teacher  
Profesor-Especialista en Ciencias Políticas

**CHARLES GREENE**  
Member, Senior Legislature  
Miembro, Legislatura Superior

**BRIAN LANTZ**  
Business Consultant  
Consultor de Negocios

**ALAN CRANSTON**  
United States Senator  
Senador de Estados Unidos

*(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United States Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SALA BURTON</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress 5th District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANDREW KLEIN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MICHAEL MOBERG</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Public Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Representative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member of the State Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ART AGNOS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assemblyman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)
(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAL ROSELLI</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARY O'ROURKE</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REEVA OLSON</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNIE O'CONNOR</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUIDO E. NANNINI</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBRA A. BARNES</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEVE JONES</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMEON WHITE</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE WONG</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALICIA CHAO-WAH WANG</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM WACHOB</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JORGE A. PORTILLO</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINDA POST</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVEN M. KREFTING</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM LANSDOWNE</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISE A. MINNICK</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARILYN MILLER</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS MOORE</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEONEL MONTEREY</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN MALONE</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARY H. SUEN</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK C. FITZGERALD</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSS FIELDS</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DANIEL NUSBAUM</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEANNE BAIRD</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Educational Project Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ball, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>SAM DUCA</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $850,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td>YES 236</td>
<td>NO 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>COMMUNITY PARKLANDS ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for acquiring, developing, improving, rehabilitating, or restoring urgently needed local and regional parks, beaches, recreational areas and facilities, and historical resources.</td>
<td>YES 239</td>
<td>NO 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>WATER CONSERVATION AND WATER QUALITY BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $150,000,000 to provide funds for water conservation, groundwater recharge and drainage water management, and clarifies language in the Clean Water Bond Law of 1984.</td>
<td>YES 242</td>
<td>NO 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>DEPOSIT OF PUBLIC MONEYS IN CREDIT UNIONS. Authorizes Legislature to provide for deposit of public moneys in any credit union. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect. Legislation already approved implementing measure could result in greater interest income to state and local governments.</td>
<td>YES 246</td>
<td>NO 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. Provides exception to property tax limit when acquisition or improvement of real property approved by two-thirds of voters. Fiscal Impact: By itself, measure has no fiscal effect. No increase can occur in local property tax rate unless bond issue is approved by two-thirds vote. State costs for tax relief programs could increase. State income tax revenues could decline as taxpayers deduct greater amounts for property tax payments.</td>
<td>YES 249</td>
<td>NO 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>ALLOCATION OF VEHICLE LICENSE FEE TAXES TO COUNTIES AND CITIES. Requires allocation of Vehicle License Fee taxes to local governments. Fiscal Impact: Measure would have no direct fiscal effect. Prevents Legislature from changing the law to take vehicle license fees away from counties and cities. Measure would not prevent state reducing other forms of aid to local governments or changing existing formula for dividing vehicle license fee revenues between counties and cities.</td>
<td>YES 254</td>
<td>NO 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>LEGISLATORS’ AND JUDGES’ RETIREMENT SYSTEMS. Limits retirement allowances for persons entering Legislators’ and Judges’ Retirement Systems after January 1, 1987. Fiscal Impact: Minor savings to state in future years if rate of inflation exceeds increase in salaries paid to current officeholders.</td>
<td>YES 258</td>
<td>NO 259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATELES

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1988.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $300,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en la compra de granjas y casas para los veteranos de California.

**ACTA DE TERRENOS PARQUES DE LA COMUNIDAD DE 1988.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición, desarrollo, mejoramiento, rehabilitación o la restauración generalmente necesitada por parques, playas, áreas y instalaciones de recreación, y los recursos históricos locales y regionales.

**LEY DE BONOS PARA LA CONSERVACIÓN DE AGUA Y CONTROL DE LA CALIDAD DEL AGUA DE 1988.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la conservación del agua, rehabilitación de agua subterránea, manejo apropiado del agua de drenaje, y electrificación del lenguaje en la Ley de Bonos para Agua Limpia de 1984.

**DEPÓSITO DE FONDOS PÚBLICOS EN COOPERATIVAS DE CREDITO.** Autoriza a la Legislatura para que disponga el depósito de fondos públicos en cualquier cooperativa de crédito. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. La legislatura ya arribada que pone en efecto la medida podría reflejar en mayor interés de gastos para los gobiernos locales y estatales.

**FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD.** Dispone exenciones a los límites de impuestos a la propiedad en el caso de adquisición o mejoramiento de la propiedad inmobiliaria si se apropia por dos terceras partes de las del afectado. Impacto Fiscal: Por sí sola, no tiene ningún impacto fiscal. Ningún aumento en la base de los impuestos locales a la propiedad puede contar a menos que una medida de bonos sea aprobada por las dos terceras partes de los del afectado. Los costos estatales por programas de diseño y gestión de propiedades públicas no aumentan. Los rendimientos de los impuestos estatales a la renta podrían disminuir a medida que los contribuyentes de impuestos destruyan mayores cantidades de impuestos pagados por el impuesto a la propiedad.

**ASIGNACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS POR PAGOS DE LICENCIA DE VEHÍCULOS A LOS CONDADO Y CIUDADES.** Requiere la asignación a los gobiernos locales de los impuestos recaudados en pagos por Licencia de Vehículos. Impacto Fiscal: La medida no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo. Implica que la Legislatura pueda cambiar la ley para tomar los fondos provenientes de licencias de vehículos de los condados y ciudades. La medida no evitará que el estado pueda reducir otras formas de asistencia a los gobiernos locales o que puedan cambiar la fórmula actual de distribución de los fondos provenientes de pago por licencia de vehículos entre los condados y ciudades.

**SISTEMAS DE JUBILACIÓN DE LOS LEGISLADORES Y JUECES.** Limita las pensiones de jubilación para aquellos que se unen al Sistema de Jubilación de los Legisladores y Jueces después del 1 de enero de 1987. Impacto Fiscal: Ahora menores para el estado en años futuros si el promedio de inflación excede el aumento en los salarios que se pagan a los que actualmente ocupan cargos.

**SISTEMA DE DEUDA INMUEBLE.** Proporciona un sistema de deuda inmuable que se aplica a la emisión de bonos por $300,000,000,000, incluyendo el sistema de deuda inmuable para la adquisición, desarrollo, mejora, rehabilitación, de parques, playas, áreas y instalaciones de la comunidad, y los recursos históricos locales y regionales.
## MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

### STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>NONPARTISAN OFFICES. Prohibits a political party or party central committee from endorsing, supporting, or opposing a candidate for nonpartisan office. Fiscal Impact: No direct state or local government fiscal impact.</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. DISASTERS. Base-year value of property damaged or destroyed by disaster transferable to comparable replacement property in same county. Fiscal Impact: Local property tax revenues would decrease by an unknown amount. County assessor and tax collectors would have nonsignificant higher administrative costs. State would replace revenues lost by school and community college districts. State income tax revenues could increase due to lower property tax deductions on replacement properties. These state costs and revenues cannot be estimated.</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CUB & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgments against the City?</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>PROPOSITION C HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THE BALLOT BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>CARGOS NO PARTIDARIOS</td>
<td>Prohibe a un partido político a un comité central de un partido político patrocinado apoyar o oponerse a un candidato a un cargo no partidario. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo a los gobiernos estatales o locales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
<td>Información</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE DÉJATRÉS</td>
<td>El valor en el boleto de propiedad inmueble dañada o destruida por un desastre puede ser transfundido a propiedad inmueble o reemplazo comparable en un mismo condado. Impacto Fiscal: Los reemplazos de inmuebles a la propiedad inmueble que se va a reemplazar se han recomendado en una cantidad aproximada. Los daños y faltantes de reemplazo del condado tendrán un impacto significativo en los costos administrativos de los condados. El estado recomienda que los daños y faltantes del condado de educación superior dejen de percibir. Los reemplazos del impuesto estatal a la renta pueden aumentar debido a manchas deductivas en el impuesto a la propiedad en las propiedades de reemplazo. Estos costos y reemplazos de inmuebles no pueden ser calculados.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td></td>
<td>Información</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>RESPONSABILIDAD CIVIL DE MULTIPLES PARTES DEMANDADAS EN JUICIOS DE AGRARIOS INDEMNIZABLES</td>
<td>Limita la indemnización que puede recibir el demandante por daños no económicos a la responsabilidad del demandado basándose en el porcentaje de la culpabilidad del demandado. Impacto Fiscal: Ahorro sustancial de los gobiernos estatales y locales. Los daños en el caso presenta algunos millones de dólares al año que variarán de un año a otro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td></td>
<td>Información</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA DESEMBOLO DE CAPITAL PARA INSTALACIONES CORRECTIONALES DE CONDADOS DE 1996</td>
<td>Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelación, y reemplazo de instalaciones correccionales en los condados y la ejecución del mantenimiento diario en las mismas en conformidad con una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos noventa y cinco millones de dólares ($495,000,000).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
<td>Información</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD &amp; CONTADO</td>
<td>“¿Debe hacer la Ciudad establecer una oficina de administración del riesgo y un despacho de investigación y administración de demandas, para estudiar y reducir el riesgo de pláticas y sentencias contra la Ciudad?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td></td>
<td>Información</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

"¿Deberá la Ciudad transferir la administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil a un departamento de administración de personal que tenga poder para cambiar las normas del servicio civil que el presente consta en la Carta Constitucional?"

市政府應否將公共委員會整體轉移至公共行政部。而該部具有權力修改市政法案內現有有關公務員的規定。

"¿Deberá la Ciudad negar o revocar cualquier permiso de construcción para edificar en la Represa Beloza en las Avenidas"

市政府應否撤銷或終止在旁邊三年正在建設之水壩的許可。

VOTER SELECTION CARD

PRIMARY ELECTION
JUNE 3, 1986

POLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES  NO</td>
<td>YES  NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42  236 237</td>
<td>A  278 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43  239 240</td>
<td>B  281 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44  242 243</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45  246 247</td>
<td>D  288 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46  249 250</td>
<td>E  292 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47  254 255</td>
<td>F  296 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48  258 259</td>
<td>G  300 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49  262 263</td>
<td>H  303 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50  266 267</td>
<td>I  307 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51  270 271</td>
<td>J  310 311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR CANDIDATE SELECTION

"¿Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el responder parte de la Autopista Embarcadero, si esto aumentara el acceso al público a la zona de los muelles y mejorar el tráfico?"

"Debería existir un plan de acción de San Francisco como parte de la Autopista Embarcadero, si esto aumentara el acceso al público a la zona de los muelles y mejorar el tráfico?"
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

D
Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?  

YES 288  
NO 289

E
Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?  

YES 292  
NO 293

F
Shall the City prohibit compensation of a candidate for municipal office before any city commission, agency, board, or committee, or a candidate for a seat in the State Senate, State Assembly, U.S. Senate, or U.S. House of Representatives for any public office with a campaign fund?  

G
Shall it be the policy of the people to provide public and private organizations to exist forever?  

H
Shall it be the policy of the people to hold elections in small districts in the City and County of San Francisco?  

I
Shall it be the policy of the people to retain the present laws regulating the Freeway?  

J
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?  

YES 310  
NO 311

VOTER SELECTION CARD
Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>County Central Committee*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>5. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td>6. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>7. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>8. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate</td>
<td>9. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td>10. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suupt. Public Inst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to your sample ballot for the number of County Central Committee members to be elected. The number varies with each district.

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR PROPOSITIONS.
PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

288 SI 贷成
289 NO 反对

292 SI 贷成
293 NO 反对

296 SI 贷成
297 NO 反对

300 SI 贷成
301 NO 反对

303 SI 贷成
304 NO 反对

307 SI 贷成
308 NO 反对

310 SI 贷成
311 NO 反对

288 買成
289 反对

292 買成
293 反对

296 買成
297 反对

300 買成
301 反对

303 買成
304 反对

307 買成
308 反对

310 買成
311 反对

市政厅建议将公共事务委員会实行行政改
制，将行政工作转移给市民政府。该部著具行政权力的城市政府内现
有部分制度需进行改革。

市政府应禁止市政府以及市府委员会
内任何市政府职员进行利益活动，该规定不适用于市府官员和其直系
亲属及同乡。

旧金山市民可否设立政策帮助人们的
公共组织，以促进政策支持。

旧金山市民是否应建立政策研究及支持
委员会，并设立顾问委员会。

旧金山市民是否应建立政策帮助伊巴
卡德洛高速公路。

假如建立伊巴卡德洛高速公路的一部分
分歧，应增加公共利益与运输利益的均
衡，改善交通状况。
Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

**BALLOT** — An official list of candidates and propositions.

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

**VOTE BY MAIL** — See Absentee Ballot, above.

**POLLING PLACE** — The place where you go to vote.

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

**MEASURE** — Another name for proposition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**PERMIT** (noun) — A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building. Proposition E concerns the issuance of a permit.

**COMPENSATED ADVOCACY** — Compensated means being paid for doing something; Advocacy means speaking or writing on behalf of someone else. Proposition F concerns the issue of compensated advocacy.

**RISK MANAGEMENT** — This field covers two areas: (1) deciding on when it is better to buy insurance and when it is better to be self insured or uninsured, then shopping for the insurance; (2) identifying hazardous conditions on one’s property and seeing that they are corrected so that liability and damage claims will be avoided. Proposition A concerns risk management.

---

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

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

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

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

Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgements against the City?

YES 278

NO 279

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Consultants hired by the Chief Administrative Officer are available to City departments that have questions about “risk management”, such as how to keep damage claims to a minimum and how to find the best insurance rates. In some cases, the departments use these consultants. In other cases, the departments make their own decisions. When damage claims are filed, some are handled by the City Attorney’s Office and some are handled by City departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would amend the City Charter to create an Office of Risk Management, under the Chief Administrative Officer. The office would set risk management guidelines for all City departments, boards and commissions. Proposition A would also establish a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration in the City Attorney’s Office. The bureau would be responsible for investigating, evaluating and processing all damage claims made against the City, except those claims made against the Public Utilities Commission and the Police Department. The bureau would also have the power to investigate potential suits against the City and to make settlements within dollar limits to be set by ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer and a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want damage claims and risk management decisions to continue to be handled the way they are now.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

“Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not affect the cost of government. However as a result of its potential future application and the exemption of certain employees from the civil service provisions of the Charter, costs may be affected in an amount presently indeterminate.”

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 10 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 71
Argentina Treasurer; Claims Investigation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON A

Last fiscal year, over 6,400 claims and law suits were filed against the City, costing us more than $10 million in settlements. I believe that it is time to change the way we handle our claims, secure insurance, prevent risks and settle legitimate claims against the City.

Last summer, we appointed a task force of citizens, under San Francisco Bar President Jerry Falk, to make recommendations on how to streamline our procedures and save money at the same time. The present system is very slow, costly, and inefficient.

Currently, all claims are investigated by the department involved. The City Attorney cannot act on any claim until the department is ready. This results in delay and duplication of effort and increased costs. A centralized and accountable Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney would be more efficient, cost-effective, and professional.

It would enable the City to settle many claims quickly, before litigation is begun, saving the City the costs of defending itself in court and lowering the average cost of settling a case.

This can be accomplished without creating new jobs by simply moving into one office the city positions presently scattered throughout the government.

Vote "Yes" on A. Reduce the cost of City government. Adoption of this measure would also formally establish responsibility for Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer, where it has been unofficially since 1978. With this strengthened authority, the Risk Management Office would be responsible for the gathering of claims data on a City-wide basis, the creation of incentives for both reducing the possibility for injuries and damage and the number of claims for each department, the coordination of insurance purchasing and specific suggestions to avoid and reduce risk.

This amendment is presented with the recommendation of the Mayor's Task Force on Claims and Judgments, the Chief Administrative Officer, City Attorney, the President of the San Francisco Bar Association, and the President of the Lawyers' Club of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Each year the City spends almost $10 million to settle damage claims. It is estimated that the overall costs to the City for all risk-related activities exceeds $125 million a year. It is time for action to be taken to reduce these huge expenditures. This charter amendment is designed to do just that.

Claims Investigation and Adjustment

Right now, the City's claims investigation process is decentralized and largely unorganized. Each department investigates its own claims. Investigators may or may not be specially trained for their duties. There is no uniformity of investigation procedure or claims reporting. In only a few departments do investigators contact injured parties within days of an accident in order to settle the claim quickly and economically.

This amendment will create a claims investigation and adjustment bureau in the Office of the City Attorney. Claims investigation and adjustment activities will be centralized, cost-effectively and made much more efficient. The new bureau will be able to respond immediately to accidents and claims, providing quick compensation to deserving persons while at the same time producing a prompt, professional investigation. This reform is greatly needed.

Risk Management

Presently, there is no overall plan for the management of the City's risk exposure: insurance purchasing, avoidance of industrial accidents, gathering data on accident patterns, etc. Again, risk management as a function is fragmented among the various City departments. As a consequence, departments cannot develop the necessary expertise to manage themselves to reduce risk-related costs.

This measure will establish a risk manager under the Chief Administrative Officer. For the first time, overall City planning will be possible in order to control risk. Departments will be told what activities are producing injuries or damage and advised on corrective measures. Private industry has been utilizing risk managers of this type for years. It is time that the City did the same.

This amendment will reduce the cost of government and insure a more efficient delivery of City services to all San Franciscans. We urge you to give it your unqualified support.

Board of Supervisors

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This charter amendment was proposed by a citizens’ task force appointed by Mayor Feinstein. Its mission was to propose ways of reducing the number and financial costs of claims and lawsuits against the City.

The amendment has two principal features. The first is to centralize within the City Attorney’s office the investigation of claims filed against city departments. This will allow for improved training and supervision of the investigators, who presently are scattered throughout city government. The result will be more efficient, cost-effective and professional investigation of claims. By improving the quality of claims investigation, the City can identify those claims which have merit and attempt to reach early—and less costly—settlements. Meritless claims will be denied with greater confidence that if suit is filed it can be defended successfully.

The second major feature of the amendment will establish a Risk Management office under the Chief Administrative Officer. Risk management is a concept widely used in private business. Risk managers are professionals skilled in reducing the overall cost of claims. The Risk Manager would be responsible for coordinating the City’s insurance program, data collection, and correcting problems within the City which lead to claims. The Risk Manager would review those claims which have been filed against the City. Where it appears that an unsafe condition or practice has led to a claim, the Risk Manager would suggest to the affected department that corrective measures be taken. Reports to the Mayor and to the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors of the recommended corrections and the actions taken would ensure that the various departments will be responsive.

The City cannot eliminate claims and lawsuits against it. But it can limit its exposure by managing the claims process more effectively. This measure will reduce injuries and reduce claims, and that is good for everyone.

Jerome B. Falk, Jr.
Chair, Mayor’s Task Force on Claims and Judgments
Against the City

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, May 31, 1986
12 Noon State Senate, Assembly, Congress and State Propositions
1:00 Proposition A—Risk Management & Claims
1:15 Proposition B—Purchaser & Contracts
1:30 Proposition D—Civil Service
2:15 Proposition E—Balboa Reservoir
2:30 Proposition F—Compensated Advocacy
3:00 Proposition G—Apartheid
3:20 Proposition H—AIDS
3:30 Propositions I, J—Embarcadero Freeway
3:50 Statewide Candidates

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

PROPOSITION B

Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?

YES 281

NO 282

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchaser must get the approval of the Chief Administrative Officer before signing certain contracts for more than $15,000. Only the voters may change that dollar limit. The Purchaser must personally sign every contract that comes through his office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would raise the limit on contracts requiring the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval to $50,000. It would also allow the Board of Supervisors to change that limit by ordinance. Proposition B would also permit the Purchaser to name certain people in his office to sign contracts on his behalf.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval only on contracts for more than $50,000. You also want the Purchaser to be able to name certain people in his office to be able to sign contracts on his behalf.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to require the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval on contracts for more than $15,000. You also want him to sign all contracts himself.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 3 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON B!
The City's Charter requires that a permanent, non-elected City official, the Chief Administrative Officer, review all purchases and contracts above $15,000. Of course, CAO approval of major contracts is very important. But, due to inflation, the number of contracts that have to go to the CAO for approval is always increasing. Today there are too many documents requiring CAO approval. This slows down the purchasing process, occupies staff time—and ultimately costs the City money. Proposition B will raise the CAO approval level to $50,000, and help the City improve the efficiency of its purchasing operations.
The City's budget includes more than $250 million for purchases on tens of thousands of contracts. At the current $15,000 review limit, the CAO must approve thousands of documents every year—a costly, time-consuming process. In the long run the City loses money because of the inordinate length of time required to complete all the paperwork.
An adjustment must be made to remove the smaller contracts from this cumbersome process. Review and approval of contracts under $50,000 should be under the responsibility of the City Purchaser, a highly trained and experienced professional, who reports directly to the CAO. By changing the present $15,000 to $50,000, it will be possible for the CAO to give each document that comes to him the attention it requires. And, by placing its orders and paying its bills faster, both the City and businesses will benefit—especially small business and those owned by minorities and women.

Proposition B will allow future adjustments to the limit to be made by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility will ensure the City's ability to adjust to inflation and changes in the market.
This amendment comes to you with the recommendation of auditors, controllers, bankers, and others who exercise top fiduciary responsibility within their own organizations.

VOTE YES ON B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will make essential changes to update the purchasing and payment procedures under the Chief Administrative Officer. These measures are necessary and desirable because they will save the City money by significantly increasing our management efficiency.
Right now, the City loses because it takes too long for contracts to be reviewed and payments okayed, which means that early payment incentives go unutilized. The CAO has to approve every contract greater than $15,000—and with City purchases last year over $250 million, the paperwork logjam is vast and overwhelming.
An increase in the review limit from $15,000 to $50,000 will make an adequate adjustment for inflation—$50,000 now is only about $15,000 in 1967 dollars. Proposition B will also enable the City Purchaser, who reports to the CAO, to maximize potential savings through early payments by designating appro-

priate personnel to approve contracts up to $50,000. These “Good Business” amendments are consistent with private sector practices and should be incorporated by the CAO in the City's best interests.

Finally, Proposition B will give the City the ability to respond quickly to changes in the market place by allowing changes in the CAO review limit by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility is necessary to ensure that in the future we will not lose money because of institutional rigidity. Control is maintained with the necessity of Board action and Mayoral approval to adjust the review limit, and this same feature will allow for change when desired.

Vote yes on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
Civil Service

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?

YES 288
NO 289

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the civil service system of the City of San Francisco. The structure of the civil service system and certain rules governing its operation are written into the Charter and can only be changed by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would make major changes. A Department of Personnel Administration would run the Civil Service system and would be able to change rules with Commission approval. Major features of Proposition D are described below. The complete charter amendment is printed in this voters’ handbook.

Department of Personnel Administration

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Certain civil service rules governing the general operation of the system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs, are written into the Charter and carried out by the Civil Service Commission. Only the voters can change these rules.

THE PROPOSAL: A department of Personnel Administration would be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. A Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor would run the Department. Certain rules governing examination, selection and appointment would be taken out of the Charter. The Personnel Director would be able to change these rules with the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

Civil Service Commission

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the general operation of the civil service system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs. The Commission also hears and decides appeals on civil service matters.

THE PROPOSAL: The Civil Service Commission would no longer be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. The Commission could investigate the operation of the system, approve rule changes proposed by the Personnel Director, and hear and decide appeals only on claims of job discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest.

Employee Relations

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors appoints an Employee Relations Director to negotiate contracts with City employees; the Board approves all contracts.

THE PROPOSAL: The Mayor or his or her agent would negotiate with City employees; the Board of Supervisors would still approve all contracts.

What your vote means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing civil service system.

CONTROLLER’S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE
Controller's Statement on "D"

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not directly affect the cost of government, as it removes many civil service policy setting functions from the Charter and an independent Civil Service Commission and transfers responsibility for personnel matters, including labor negotiations, to the Mayor.

"As a product of its inherent flexibility and possible future application, costs could be affected or savings realized in amounts presently indeterminate but probably substantial."

How "D" Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative Charter amendment rewriting the civil service provisions of the Charter had qualified for the June ballot.

Robert Bradford, Jonathan Bulkley, Lee Munsen and Mary Hilton, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 36,049 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 25,027 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 p.m.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. Consistent with the City's and County's affirmative action goals, no applicant or employee shall be selected, appointed, reduced in rank, removed or in any way favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, union activities, political affiliation or sexual orientation.

(b) The purpose of the civil service system is to obtain for the city and county the best qualified persons to fill city and county positions in a timely and economical manner, using professional, fair and equitable personnel selection and personnel management practices with consideration of the following merit principles:

1. Recruiting, selecting and advancing employees on the basis of their ability, knowledge, skills and performance relative to the work to be performed.

2. Establishing equitable and adequate compensation, as provided elsewhere in this charter.

3. Training employees, as needed, to promote productivity and high quality performance and to facilitate career development.

4. Retaining employees during good service and separating employees for good cause.

5. Assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration, with proper regard for their privacy and constitutional rights; and assuring equal employment opportunity, based on the person's ability to do the job.

6. Assuring that employees are protected against coercion for political purposes and are prohibited from using their official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the outcome of an election or a nomination for office.

(c) This charter does not limit the power of departments, agencies, or other subdivisions of the city and county in their exercise of management prerogatives including but not limited to:

1. Directing employees in the performance of their duties;

2. Hiring, promoting, transferring and assigning employees from these qualified;

3. Classifying positions in accordance with Section 3.663 (k);

4. Disciplining employees;

5. Laying off employees because of lack of work, lack of funds or other reasonable causes; and

6. Determining the mission of its departments and divisions, and its budget, organization, the number of its employees, and the numbers, types, classifications and grades of positions or employees assigned to an organization unit, work project, shift or tour of duty, and the methods and technology of performing its work.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public-service shall be made-for-the-good-of-the-public-service-and-soley-upon-merit-and-fitness, as established by-appropriate-tests,-without-regard-to-partisan,-political,-social-or-other-considerations.-No-person-shall-in-any-way-be-favored-or-discriminated-against-in-employment-or-opportunity-for-employment-because-of-race,-color,-sex,-sexual-orientation,-political-affiliation,-age,-religion,-national-origin-or-other-non-merit-factors- .


2.203-2 Employee Relations-Director


3.102 Employee Relations

It shall be the duty of the mayor to meet and confer with employees representatives on behalf of the city and county and all its constituent boards, commissions, departments and agencies as required by applicable law. These duties may be performed by a designee of the mayor who shall serve at the pleasure of the mayor. Nothing herein shall limit the mayor from contracting for the performance of these duties.


1.600 Commission; Composition; Meetings


The civil service commission shall consist of five members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners shall hold office for a term of two years, or until their successors are elected. The terms of the commissioners shall begin on the first day of July of the year in which they are appointed. The terms of the commissioners shall be for a term of six years, beginning on the first day of January following the expiration of the terms of the first five members appointed. The terms of the commissioners shall be for a term of six years, beginning on the first day of January following the expiration of the terms of the first five members appointed. The terms of the commissioners shall be for a term of six years, beginning on the first day of January following the expiration of the terms of the first five members appointed. The terms of the commissioners shall be for a term of six years, beginning on the first day of January following the expiration of the terms of the first five members appointed. The terms of the commissioners shall be for a term of six years, beginning on the first day of January following the expiration of the terms of the first five members appointed. The terms of the commissioners shall be for a term of six years, beginning on the first day of January following the expiration of the terms of the first five members appointed.

The respective terms of the commissioners who shall hold office on the effective date of this section as amended shall expire on June 30, 1981 and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms of the commissioners who shall hold office on the effective date of this section as amended shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date. Thereupon, the mayor shall ap- continued on page 73
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Vote YES and join 34,000 San Franciscans who signed petitions to get this crucial reform on the ballot. "D" clears the way to modernize Civil Service so that it is fair and efficient. The present system is a 50-year conglomerate of rules that tie the City's hands—

- A protest by one applicant can hold up hiring for an entire job classification for months—even years.
- Often tests cannot be given frequently enough to maintain current appointments of qualified employees. This leads to delays and temporary appointments that make hiring top candidates all but impossible.
- Appointments to jobs are restricted to the top three names on a list even though more than three people have the same score.
- Many provisions are out of date. Some deal with hiring during the Korean War. Others limit our ability to carry out affirmative action.

"D" would remove archaic rules from the Charter so they could be changed as the times require—subject to meet and confer and public hearings. Job tests could be expedited; hiring and promotions speeded up; opportunities opened to women and minorities.

Specifically, Proposition D:

1) Creates a Department of Personnel Administration at no additional cost. Like other U.S. cities, day-to-day administration would be the responsibility of a director, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Supervisors.

2) Makes the Civil Service Commission the oversight body to set policy and hear appeals. Rulings would have to be within 60 days, eliminating endless delays.

3) Moves the office of labor relations from the Supervisors to the Mayor, who must make the tough-minded decisions to balance the budget. Never again could the Board give labor $27 million for "comparable worth."

This reform is the product of years of work with SPUR, League of Women Voters, Chamber of Commerce. Members of the Board of Supervisors could have put the reform on the ballot last year but bowed to some labor leaders, and 34,000 San Franciscans had to do the job for them.

Proposition D will enable City government to work better for you. Vote YES.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON 'D'

Proposition D is a complex proposition with a simple goal: remove the archaic restrictions on the hiring, promotion, or firing of city employees and bring San Francisco's personnel system into the modern age.

Archaic is the only way to describe a system that keeps equally qualified people from competing for a job, and that takes months—sometimes years—to fill vacancies.

For example, if 50 people score equally high on a competitive examination, shouldn't they all have a chance for any job for which they are eligible? Not under the current system, which requires complicated tie-breaking rules not at all related to a person's qualifications or abilities.

Or what about being able to hire the best person available for a given job? Currently, eligibility lists are frozen for two years and every person on each list, including the lowest-scoring, must be offered a job before the highest-scoring person on a more recent list. Private businesses couldn't function saddled with such absurdities.

Proposition D cuts through the red tape. It creates a modern personnel department, with a director responsible for carrying out rules to ensure fairness and efficiency. Accountable to the Mayor, the director would be selected from a list provided by the Civil Service Commission, and subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.

The Civil Service Commission remains an independent body, with the right to approve new personnel rules and hold hearings on abuses. Also under 'D', negotiations with employee unions would be under the Mayor, subject to approval by the Supervisors, providing checks and balances in balancing our budget.

With greater accountability and continued checks and balances, Proposition D will open the way to more efficient government in our City.

Bill Maher, Supervisor
Louise Renne, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON 'D'

Proposition D is a necessary reform to the City's Civil System. As the City's Chief Administrative Officer for almost ten years, I have found that quality employee hiring is difficult and the process causes long delays.

The current system is:

- inflexible. The City cannot hire and promote the most qualified persons.
- inefficiently administered by a commission. Other large
cities do not have such a bureaucratic process.
- antiquated. Civil service rules represent practices of the
1950s rather than the 1980s.

The new system:
- allows the Mayor to appoint an effective personnel director,
who controls administration and procedures.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

It's 1986 and we're still trying to manage City business as if it
were 1932. As heads of City departments, charged with the daily
responsibility of putting out fires, fighting crime, maintaining
hospitals, parks, libraries and providing other essential ser-
vice's, we know from bitter experience about shortcomings of the
existing Civil Service System.

Enacted with the City Charter in 1932, the system is foundering
in red tape. Outdated rules are the subject of endless
challenges. Tests are put off; vacancies go unfilled; promotions
delayed; any appeal, however groundless, stops the process in
its tracks.

Proposition D would take old procedures out of the Charter so
they could be changed in an orderly process by the Civil Service
Commission, which also would hear appeals.

Day-to-day administration of the tests — the content, scoring,
all the myriad details of managing a complex system, would be
put into a modern, highly professional personnel office. Tests
would be speeded up. Hiring would keep pace with need. Pro-
motions would be on the basis of competence. High perform-
ance would be the standard. Discipline could be imposed with
working rights fully protected, and women and minorities
would be assured equal opportunity.

Proposition D will help improve management and the quality
of City services. Vote Yes on D.

Frank Jordan, Chief of Police
Emmet Condon, Fire Chief
Don Birrer, Director, Public Works
Mary Burns, General Manager, Recreation & Park
John Franz, City Librarian
Bugene Gartland, Director, Port
Martin Geistlinger, Purchaser
Wilbur Hamilton, Executive Director, Redevelopment Agency
Claire Isaac, Director, Arts Commission
Ray King, Director, Parking Authority
Dean Macris, Director, City Planning
Grant Mickins, Director, Human Rights Commission
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, PUC
Joyce Beam, Director, Aging
Ed Sargfield, General Manager, Social Services
Thelma Shelley, Managing Director, War Memorial
Moiny So, Executive Director, Community Development
Louis Turpen, Director of Airport
Dr. David Werdegar, Director, Health Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The hiring practices outlined in San Francisco City Charter
have been virtually unchanged since 1931, a severe handicap in
running a modern city. Proposition D is designed to streamline
the charter and ensure that the rights of present city employees
and candidates for city jobs are protected, while improving the
hiring process itself. The initiative also builds management ac-
countability in the city system.

Properion D Is More Fair, More Efficient,
More Economical

The day-to-day personnel functions, including hiring, will be
consolidated under a Director of Personnel Administration, who
is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Super-
visors. Decisions of the Director of Personnel on examination
content and administration are final, unless a decision is stayed
during the appeal process by a unanimous vote of the Civil Ser-
vice Commission.

Proposition D will make it easier to modernize the many ar-
chaic Civil Service rules and procedures now included in the
Charters, while maintaining a strong and independent Civil Ser-
vice Commission to safeguard the merit system and protect the
rights of city employees. Many detailed rules will come out of
the Charter and will become personnel regulations. These regu-
lations can then be modernized, but only through a process
which includes public hearings and meet and confer sessions
with the union involved. In addition, the Civil Service Commis-
sion must approve any changes or new regulations governing
merit system principles on classification, examinations, ap-
pointments, promotions, transfer, resignation and terminations.

Proposition D Will Improve Performance And
Public Confidence

The openness and fairness of the proposition will benefit
everyone. Well-qualified job candidates will have a better
chance of being hired, and well-qualified job holders will have
a better chance of being promoted. This means generally better
job performance in all departments, resulting in higher em-
ployee morale and more public confidence in city government.

Submitted by
Louis Hop Lee, President
Civil Service Commission
Lee Munson, Member Civil Service Commission and
Treasurer, San Franciscans for Fair and Efficient Government

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Cities can survive only with strong management. The greatest budgetary restraint must be exercised to assure that full value is received for each tax dollar spent.

With firm limits on what it can spend and faced with a possible loss of Federal funds next year, the City must be managed with the greatest possible efficiency.

Essential to greater efficiency is the need for Civil Service reform. As members of City Commissions, we constantly confront the torturous delays and confused rules that gridlock the present system. The present system simply can't respond to the City's personnel needs.

Qualified applicants become frustrated and seek employment elsewhere. Promotions are blocked. Morale suffers. Temporaries fill in; overtime mounts. The ability to plan is crippled; management is weakened.

Proposition D would put the system on a business-like basis. A personnel department would handle day-to-day administration. The Civil Service Commission would be the watchdog to assure the integrity of the merit system.

This streamlined system would replace what is now inflexible and cumbersome. Testing could be accelerated; hiring made more efficient and promotions made on time. The result would be greater efficiency and elimination of costly waste.

Vote Yes on D.

Jerry E. Berg, President, Board of Permit Appeals
Henry Berman, President, Fire Commission
Mo Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Hector Chinchilla, Rent Board
Rev. Harry Chuck, Housing Authority
Dr. Arthur Coleman, President, Port Commission
Owen Davis, Police Commission
J. Edward Fieshler, Airports Commission
H. Welton Flynn, President, Public Utilities Commission
James Foster, Health Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation & Park Commission
James Fussell, President, Housing Authority
Anne Halsted, Port Commission
Tommy Harris, Recreation & Park Commission
Tom Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Walter Jabe, Public Library Commission
Jeffrey Lee, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Philip Lee, President, Health Commission
Bruce W. Lilienthal, Small Business Advisory Commission
Jacqueline Nemensky, President, Arts Commission
Toby Rosenblatt, President, Planning Commission
Dr. David Sanchez, President, Police Commission
Jean San Jule, Housing Authority
John Patrick Short, President, Parking Authority
Marjorie G. Stern, President, Public Library Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D contains civil service reform measures urged by the League of Women Voters since 1969.

Proposition D will:
— Modernize the City’s outdated personnel system by creating a Director of Personnel, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors
— Preserve the principles of merit through policies set by the Civil Service Commission
— Create a more responsive Civil Service system at no additional cost to the taxpayer

EFFICIENCY AND FLEXIBILITY

Proposition D transfers authority for day-to-day management of the City’s personnel system from the Civil Service Commission to the Director of Personnel. This will:
— Prevent hiring delays
— Ensure only the most qualified individuals are hired and promoted
— Provide City managers with more administrative flexibility

FAIRNESS FOR EMPLOYEES

Proposition D will:
— Safeguard the rights of City workers
— Protect gains made in hiring women and minorities
— Retain the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit appeals board
— Retain the ability of the City’s unions to negotiate working conditions
— Create a system that can respond quickly and fairly to the needs of City workers

Proposition D will bring the Civil Service system into the 20th century by making the Mayor accountable for the management of a system employing more than 25,000 people. Hiring by merit is still guaranteed by the Charter. Please join us in voting for this Reform!

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
Esther Marks, Past President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote Yes on Proposition D the Civil Service Modernization Initiative.

Prevent abuse of a system that was intended to serve the public and protect against favoritism. Prevent situations like this: an employee failed to report to work for a week without explanation; he was telephoned, notified by certified mail and a message left under his door; he was terminated 13 days later; he did not appeal the termination and the civil service commission up-

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

held the termination. **Two months** later, the employee petitioned the commission for reinstatement. The employee got his job back, not because the process of termination was wrong but because the commission had a long standing objection to using “absent without leave” as a reason for firing.

The quality of public services is dependent upon the effectiveness of the staff who deliver them. The primary role of the civil service commission should be to facilitate recruitment and retention of the best available personnel. It must protect against favoritism and must assure that everyone has an equal and fair chance at employment.

The present system does not do that. We feel this initiative will make the system work better, for the managers, for the employees and for the public.

**Vote Yes on Proposition D.**

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D**

San Francisco government is huge, with a budget of more than $1 billion per year and 25,000 employees. It is expected to solve serious problems. This requires that the City have the ability to hire and promote talented people to do the job.

The present civil service system is so tied up in red tape that jobs remain vacant for six months to a year, and all too often someone who is not capable of doing a good job is hired. Your tax dollars are being wasted, and you are not receiving the quality of services you need and deserve.

Proposition **D** will modernize San Francisco's civil service system. It separates the personnel department from the Civil Service Commission, and puts the department under the Mayor where it belongs. The Mayor is responsible for balancing the budget and delivering city services as efficiently as possible. She cannot do this unless she can find capable people to do the job. That is the task of the personnel department in any organization.

Proposition **D** will also ensure that the independent Civil Service Commission has sufficient authority to require the personnel system to be fair in its treatment of City employees. The Commission will be able to issue subpoenas and require testimony of witnesses on investigations it conducts. Should it find that discrimination has occurred, it can issue orders that must be obeyed.

Most major American cities, and virtually all cities and counties in California, have the kind of civil service system that will be established by Proposition **D**. San Francisco's present system is still mired in the past. It hobbles the ability of the City to deliver services and spend your tax dollars as efficiently as possible.

SPUR has not placed a statement in the Voter's Handbook for any other issue over the past 15 years. We feel that Proposition **D** is so vital for San Francisco's future that we are making this appeal for your support.

**Vote “YES” on Proposition D.**

SPUR—The San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D**

Proposition **D**, the Civil Service Reform Initiative, will give San Francisco citizens the HIGH PERFORMANCE GOVERNMENT necessary to meet the many challenges of the future. Proposition **D** corrects the outdated and inflexible requirements originally written in San Francisco's City Charter in 1931. It will eliminate the problems which prevent San Francisco's personnel system from operating with efficiency the City's voters and taxpayers deserve:

Proposition **D** insures City jobs will be filled from current lists of the most qualified employees.

Proposition **D** prevents ungrounded appeals from delaying for years the appointment or promotion of qualified employees.

Proposition **D** eliminates the repetitive tasks currently monopolizing the Civil Service Commission meetings and directs the Commission to serve as an appellate body to protect the City's good employees.

Proposition **D** centralizes the day-to-day operation of the civil service system and makes the Director of Personnel responsible to the Mayor.

Proposition **D** simplifies the budgetary process by making the Mayor the City's chief labor negotiator, responsible for setting working conditions within the City's financial capacity.

Proposition **D** is the result of years of painstaking review by the most experienced, able and respected management experts in San Francisco. It is a plan intended to move City government out of the 1930s and equip San Francisco to enter the twenty-first century without being burdened by the red tape of the past.

After ten years of commitment to improving our City, the Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee is convinced adoption of Proposition **D** is one of the most important issues facing the voters. CHANGE IS LONG OVERDUE. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION **D**.

Submitted by,
The Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee

David Anacher
Jerome Anderson
Richard Blum
Charles Chapman
Arthur Cooke, Jr.
Benton Dial
James Edgar
Ruben Garcia

Robert Hayden
Walter Hoadley
John Jacobs
Michael McGill
Ellen Newman
Roy Nordman
Frank Tatsum
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PERSONNEL MANAGERS SAY YES ON PROPOSITION D

As the personnel managers for City Departments, we are charged with the responsibility of managing the City's personnel system. The activities include examinations, hiring, training, discipline, union-management relations, affirmative action and compensation. No one knows better than we the frustrations experienced in attempting to monitor an unbelievable sequence of overlapping bureaucratic activities in attempting to get the job done.

Proposition D will bring our personnel system into line with most other public personnel systems. The improved system will create the potential for being more responsive to the needs of operating departments. It will improve labor relations by transferring this function to the executive branch of government where it belongs.

Proposition D will streamline certain routine procedures resulting in a reduction of cost and time. Under the current system delays are experienced due to lengthy appeals during which time the departments' objectives are delayed.

Proposition D will create an atmosphere of increased accountability for department managers in the areas of affirmative action, discipline and job performance.

Proposition D has been endorsed by the San Francisco Council of Human Resource Managers, the association of over one hundred personnel managers in City government.

Proposition D strengthens merit system principles. Civil Service commissioners will have more time to enforce and protect these principles rather than being bogged down in the day-to-day activities of administration.

Proposition D will help bring about improved methods and practices in personnel administration and should result in a more competent and effective workforce which the citizens of San Francisco have a right to expect.

Alvin W. Schaaf
Personnel Director
Recreation and Park Department

Marsha Ramirez
Personnel Officer
San Francisco Port

Edward M. Gezzano
Personnel Director
Department of Health

James Horan
Senior Personnel Officer
Department of Social Services

James Illicki
Personnel Director
San Francisco International Airport

Andrea R. Gourdine
Manager, Bureau of Personnel & Training
Public Utilities Commission

Mori Noguchi
Senior Department Personnel Officer

Mary Smith
Senior Personnel Officer
Laguna Honda Hospital

Thelma Postel
Senior Personnel Officer
San Francisco General Hospital

John Burke
Personnel Director
Controller's Office

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will assist the Department of Public Works by streamlining the Civil Service process.

• Under the current system, the duration of eligible lists from 2 to 4 years hampers the Department from hiring graduates of colleges and universities on an annual basis. Consequently, many excellent candidates are not entered into the Civil Service System. Passage of the proposition will improve the quality of the pool of applicants and thereby the quality of public service given by the Department.

• The establishment of a Personnel Director to administer the day-to-day tasks of the system will speed up the decision making process to the advantage of employees and management alike.

• The proposition still calls for checks and balances in that the Commission will continue to hear appeals on discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest. The Commission will act as a watchdog while leaving the general administration to the Personnel Director.

The initiative will make for an improved system for employees, management and the citizens of San Francisco. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Donald Birrer
Director of Public Works

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Passage of this amendment will update our civil service system. These changes will make it comparable to other merit system agencies. Some of these changes are
(A) removal of administrative details from the charter which inhibit timely and effective personnel actions.

The following subjects will be placed in personnel regulations:
• Protests of written questions and answers
• Protests of tentative employment lists
• Promotional examinations

• Examinations for employees on military leave
• Certification of eligibles—Rule of three
• Duration of employment lists
• Temporary employee appointments
(B) allows continuous updating of employment lists.
(C) allows equitable treatment of job candidates with same test score.

(D) realigns responsibilities: the Civil Service Commission dealing primarily with compliance and adjudication activities.

(continued)
while the Personnel Department administers the day-to-day operation of the merit system.

Equally important the amendment retains important merit system provisions dealing with:
- Employee salary setting procedures
- Positions subject to merit system examinations
- Public hearing and meet and confer requirements
- Penalties for examination fraud
- Seniority, meritorious service and applicable educational credits for promotional examinations in the Police/Fire De-

partsments
- Termination of unsatisfactory employees
- Disciplinary suspensions
- Conflict of interest
- Creation of positions
Proposition "D" merits a 'YES' vote.

John J. Walsh
General Manager Personnel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Initiative, is a long-overdue reform to streamline antiquated hiring practices in San Francisco's fifty-year-old charter. Proposition D will ensure that the best and brightest job candidates are chosen to serve our city, thus promoting excellence in job performance and helping to eliminate incompetence. This initiative builds management accountability in the city system, while giving the Civil Service Commission the independence to protect the rights of women and minorities.

A Better, More Efficient System at Less Cost

Proposition D consolidates personnel functions, including hiring, under a new Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. The Director has final authority over content of examinations given city job applicants, so more flexibility is possible in finding truly qualified candidates.

Proposition D redefines the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit systems appeals board and policy-setting body. The merit principles are spelled out in the Proposition. This allows the Commission to protect the rights of women and minorities at no cost to the public.

More Fair to Everyone

Proposition D greatly improves the city charter. Well-qualified job candidates have a better chance to be hired and well-qualified job holders have a better chance to be promoted. The public is rewarded with the better job performance, efficiency and friendliness one expects from good government employees. All of these improvements are at no additional cost to the taxpayer.

Submitted by
James W. Haas

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service System, as presently constituted, (vintage 1932!), is uncivil, and there is nothing "systematic" about it! It's pure, unadulterated municipal lunacy and chaos! Remarkably, BOTH Management and Labor despise it. It certainly is NOT producing the best qualified persons to fill City jobs!

Let's follow Mayor Feinstein's recommendations. If this operation doesn't dramatically improve, there are always FUTURE ELECTIONS where additional, more Draconian changes can be considered by the voters.

As matters now stand, it is far better to light a candle than just sit and curse the darkness! Any changes will be an improvement! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

For more than a half-century, San Francisco Mayors have abided by the employee examination, hiring and promotion policies administered by a strong and independent Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D is a deceptive and dangerous scheme that would give future Mayors and top-level bureaucrats the power to ignore competence and reward political loyalty.

Proposition D would take key Civil Service employment rules out of the City Charter and make them subject to wheeling and dealing by City Hall politicians.

There's an old saying — "if it ain't broke, don't fix it." Civil Service has worked well for more than 50 years. Proposition D is unnecessary, ineffective and even counter-productive.

It's not just deceptive, it's dangerous.

Joseph L. Alioto
Former Mayor of San Francisco

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

Time and time again, different groups have put various propositions on the ballot to weaken our Civil Service System and reintroduce political patronage into City employment practices.

And every time the voters have wisely rejected these schemes, no matter how cleverly they have been disguised.

Proposition D is just another power grab by bureaucrats at the top in City Hall.

We've said NO! loud and clear in the past. Let's say NO one more time.

Submitted by:
TAXPAYERS FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT
Thomas Scanlon
City Treasurer, Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “D”!!!!

During the eight years while a member of the Board of Supervisors, I fought hard to reform the Civil Service Commission and to bring working conditions and city workers’ pay equitable to both workers and taxpayers. I fought to insure an independent Civil Service Commission that would remain just that — independent and free from political influence and political patronage of particularly the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

I am truly saddened by the Mayor’s insistence in bringing this disastrous Proposition “D” before the voters. Some of the Supervisors rejected this misguided measure for what it is; an unwise consolidation of authority to hire, fire and promote city workers by the Mayor and newly created personnel officer.

My efforts to bring pay equity to both taxpayers and city workers were continually squashed by then Supervisor Feinstein and Supervisor Molinari. Finally, in 1975, shortly after a disastrous city strike, I was able to place on the ballot, for voter approval, a measure that almost eliminates the power of the Mayor and Supervisors to manipulate the pay of city workers. This measure was overwhelmingly passed by the voters that year and we have not had any labor unrest since that date.

Vote No on “D”!
“D” stands for disaster. It will undo many of these reforms. Also, right now, the City is almost broke, thanks to the manipulation of Mayor Feinstein and her chief ally Supervisor Molinari.

If “D” passes the cost of operating our city government will increase in the next 24 months by not less than $60,000,000. Contrary to the provisions of Proposition 13, property taxes would be increased, thus forcing up rents.

Vote No on “D”,
Don’t weaken our Civil Service Commission, whereby least deserving city employees could be promoted because of connection or clout.

Vote No on “D”,
We now almost have more problems than we can handle. We don’t want our city turned into another Chicago, wherefor for nearly half a century a corrupt political system flourished under Mayor Richard Daley.

John Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We join San Franciscans for Fair Employment in opposing the Civil Service Initiative, Proposition D.

This measure will severely hamper the well-being of the San Francisco Fire and Police Departments. These departments are two of the finest in the Country and have consistently protected life and property in a professional manner. They must continue that tradition with a civil service system based on MERIT and not political patronage.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.
Andrew C. Casper
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept. Retired
Keith P. Colden
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept. Retired
William F. Murray
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept. Retired

Thomas J. Cahill
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept. Retired
Donald M. Scott
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept. Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Our present Civil Service system was designed to keep corruption out of government. It has generally served that purpose well. This proposition would dismantle that system and in my opinion open the doors to nepotism, favoritism, patronage and corruption. Better a city government that is bureaucratic than one that is corrupt. Vote NO on D.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is an attack on the merit system and an attempt to return patronage to the Mayor’s office by eliminating the authority of the Civil Service Commission and its built-in checks and balances.

The present Civil Service system is not perfect, but corrections can be made within the Charter without destroying a system that has worked for over 50 years and has been free from fraud and corruption. This proposition will do nothing to improve the caliber of public performance and could have the opposite effect. I urge you to vote NO on PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by
The San Francisco Police Supervisors and Investigators Association
Don Goad, Captain SFPD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D could be a dangerous first step toward weakening the independent, impartial administration of our City government.

Proposition D would transfer power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor. The Director’s decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline and certification would be final. The Commission would have no right to hear examinations or disciplinary appeals.

With the transfer of duties and responsibilities from the Commission to the Mayor’s appointed Personnel Director, the Mayor would have control over personnel functions. Currently, commissioners have independent status and can be dismissed for cause. The Personnel Director could be dismissed at will.

The Merit System could be replaced by a patronage system. Proposition D could open the door to rules permitting the Personnel Director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his or her position on the list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Proposition D is NOT a reform package. The checks and balances for efficient City government would be lopsided, with too much power in the hands of unknown future Mayors.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
John L. Molinari, President
Harry G. Britt
Richard Hongisto
Willie B. Kennedy
Wendy Nettel
Nancy Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Beware of PROPOSITION D!

Powerful special interest groups are attempting to remove key City employees from the independent and impartial Civil Service system in the name of “reform.”

They want instead to make these employees answerable directly to future Mayors and politically-appointed Personnel Directors and department heads.

PROPOSITION D got on the ballot because the Chamber of Commerce and such companies as Pacific Bell and PG&E paid a professional southern California campaign firm, $70,000 to collect signatures.

They’re trying to destroy the merit system and replace it with an old-fashioned patronage system.

Department heads will be able to ignore examination scores and reward loyalty rather than competence in promotions and hiring.

Don’t let the Chamber of Commerce, big business and their allies in the City bureaucracy dictate who’s hired, fired and promoted among public employees.

PROPOSITION D is not just deceptive, it’s dangerous! Vote NO on PROPOSITION D!

Libby Denebeim
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Ron Halberman
Vice-Chairman, Democratic Central Committee
Jim Hecob
Democratic Central Committee
Roberto Esquivel
President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Rick Pacurar
President, Harvey Milk Lesbian Gay Democratic Club
Walter L. Johnson
Exec. Secy., S. F. Labor Council
Michael Benick
Linda Post
Sal Bonelli
Deborah Stein
John McMahon
Pat Norman
Nancy Walker
Gwen Craig
Harry Britt
Louise Minnick
Carole Migden
Agar Jaicks
Jack Morrison
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D places too much power in the hands of ONE. Proposition D will provide for a personnel director to be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. The Mayor now appoints five members of the Civil Service Commission who also serve at her pleasure.

You work for years to climb the civil service ladder and then somebody comes along with an idea to cut you off at the pockets.

Proposition D will lock in all the employees employed in the Mayor's office and will control the appointments of any new staff by the next Mayor elect in 1987 and years thereafter.

Like controlling your estate from the grave.

Vote NO on D.

Marguerite Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service Merit System has served our City well, giving San Franciscans an equal opportunity. It has helped us obtain employment and earn promotions based on objective examinations.

The Civil Service Merit system replaced the old patronage system that rewarded political loyalty more than competence.

Now the supporters of PROPOSITION D want to create a new Personnel Director, accountable only to the Mayor, and give department heads the absolute power to decide who works for the City and who gets promoted.

If PROPOSITION D passes, equal opportunity would give way to opportunity based on membership in the bureaucratic "establishment".

Keep our Civil Service Merit System strong and free from the political abuses of the past.

Vote NO on D!

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly
Ben Tom
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Jo-Anne Miller
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
A. Richard Cerbatos
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Sedonia Wilson
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, President
S. F. Community College Governing Board
Julie Tang
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Alan S. Wong
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Henry Der
Albert Chang
Rudy Meraz
Robert "Bob" Morales
Yori Wada

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Can you imagine studying for a civil service examination, being rated at the top of the eligible list and never receiving the promotion? That's exactly what Proposition "D" will do should the electorate adopt this amendment.

The civil service merit system has defects, but to totally eliminate the system and replace it with a patronage system where promotions are based on who you know, rather than what you know is scandalous.

Civil service was put into place to prevent scandal and the "favor seeking" individual from getting a paid position because he/she happened to support the right elected official.

Proposition "D" will allow one person, chosen by the Mayor, to decide who will be promoted, hired and fired. This is awesome power for one single individual to have at any level of government.

Our current Mayor may choose a fair person for this position, but will future Mayors be as careful? As each new Mayor assumes office, the civil service system will again change. The potential to favor one individual or group over others is great.

Proposition "D" has a great potential to diminish the quality of services we now provide to our citizens, as the future of how people are hired and promoted in the San Francisco Police Department is completely unknown.

It's true our promotional system is fraught with delays and delays frustrate us all, but Proposition "D" is not the answer. Proposition "D" will only add to our existing problems. Several years ago, our citizens elected a Charter Commission to streamline city government and make civil service work more efficiently. The voters eventually rejected those proposals. The checks and balances that make our government stable were no longer present. It simply went too far.

Proposition "D" goes even further. It brings about a system of patronage and should be defeated lest we want to engage in "free-wheeling and dealing" of civil service jobs and promotions.

We urge a strong No vote against Proposition "D"!

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry, President
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The purpose of the Civil Service Commission is to ensure that the merit system would be the only criteria in any examination process.

If Proposition D passes, all authority concerning examinations would be taken from the Civil Service Commission and given to a Personnel Director, who is appointed by the Mayor. This Personnel Director would have the authority to hire and fire at his discretion, with no appeal available. This proposition is contrary to everything the Fire Department and all City employees have strived for over the years.

The Civil Service Commission in its present form was instituted to prevent any possibility of a patronage system, where one person has complete control.

This proposition would do nothing to improve your Fire Department. If you are satisfied with the work and make up of the San Francisco Fire Department in its present form, ‘Vote No On Proposition D’. You will be doing a service for the San Francisco Fire Department, and the people of San Francisco.

Submitted by the San Francisco Fire Chiefs’ Association
John Flaherty, Battalion Chief SFFD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is bad government and bad politics, changing our independent civil service system into a system dominated by the Mayor:

... By shortening the six year terms of Civil Service Commission to conform to the Mayor’s four year term of office.

... By transferring most of the Commission’s powers to a Personnel Director who serves solely at the Mayor’s pleasure.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D fails to offer enough new and improved procedures to cure the current defects in the civil service system. Charter sections and civil service rules are repealed without specific known replacements.

Proposition D transfers power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created personnel director appointed by, and to serve at the pleasure of, the Mayor. The director’s decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline, and certification would be final. The commission would have no right to hear examination or disciplinary appeals.

There are hidden costs with Proposition D because the new Personnel Administration Department will employ a personnel director, and other employees “as may be necessary to carry out (its) functions and duties.”

The Merit System could be replaced by an old style Patronage System. Proposition D could open the door to rules which permit the personnel director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his/her position on the civil service testing list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Police and Fire Commissions would lose functions as a result of the personnel director’s new power. The director’s unlawful employment discrimination policy would be binding upon department administrators. The director’s procedure for employee dispute resolution must be used by all department heads and appointing officers.

Proposition D is not the answer. The checks and balances for efficient city government would be lopsided.

I urge a no vote on Proposition D.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, 17th Assembly District
Sala Burton
Congresswoman
Art Agnos
16th Assembly District
Milton Marks
State Senator

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
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Balboa Reservoir Development Ban

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?

YES 292        NO 293

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission declared Balboa Reservoir South (located across Phelan Avenue from San Francisco City College) surplus in 1984 and made the site available for low, moderate and market rate housing. In July 1985, a City-community advisory committee chose a developer to build 203 single-family homes on the 13 acre site. Construction has not yet begun.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would prohibit granting new building permits and would revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site (Assessor’s Block 3180, Lot 1) between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit granting any new building permits and you want to revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to allow building permits to be granted for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “E” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for a three-year ban on development of the Balboa Reservoir site had qualified for the June ballot. Sidney Kass and Jesse David Wall, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 12,430 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 10,012 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 77
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Having been responsible for providing leadership at City College from 1947 to 1977, we cannot stand by and see this site converted to housing. We must speak out. Such a move would preclude forever the logical and much needed campus expansion to what was once our West Campus. We left that site reluctantly to make way for water storage. If it is no longer required for that purpose, let us return it to City College.

Thousands of San Franciscans—high school graduates, dropouts, veterans, re-entering women—representing all of the city’s diverse ethnic groups, have been prepared for transfer to four-year colleges, profitable careers, and have had their lives enriched at the City College of San Francisco. Without City College’s open door and easy access, many would have been deprived of these opportunities.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION ‘E’

We question:
1. Why no EIR was required when the proposed development could have a substantial impact.
2. Whether the future needs of City College for classrooms, housing, and parking have been considered.
3. What the impact on taxpayers is with below market land sale and construction financing by bonds.
This moratorium will permit adequate study of these issues. Vote YES on Proposition ‘E’.

Bruce Bonacker, President
Board of Directors, Glen Park Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don’t let a developer make a mint on land across from the most overcrowded college in the Bay Area! Parking is already an impossibility for residents near City College...adding 200 homes to this land would make the situation much worse.

It’s simple: a college which can’t find room for more students at a time when more people are returning to education doesn’t serve the community.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

You’d probably be upset. We certainly are. Please help us protect our neighborhood. Please vote YES on proposition E.


Sunnyside Residents: Ellen Wall Melissa Volmutad David Wall
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let the greedy developers take this potentially picturesque open space.
A yes vote means you want more time to consider its future use. All we ask is time to think and plan.

John Barbagelata
Former member, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Suppose there was a publicly owned open space across the street from the main U.C. Berkeley Campus.
Can you imagine for one moment that it would be passed into private ownership?
Vote Yes on E for Equality and Excellence in Education

City College Students:
William Lew, Student
Tim McGuire, Student Council Member
Joseph Goldstein, Student Council Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

In 1952, the "Experts" said we needed reservoirs. They felt so strongly that they condemned the City College West Campus, destroyed the buildings, and constructed the reservoirs—all at taxpayer's expense.
Now, in 1986 with more demand for water, the "Experts" say the reservoir is no longer needed. What is the concerned taxpayer to believe?
When in doubt, the city should hold on to the expensive things already paid for.

Stop the reservoir giveaway. Vote YES on E.

Taxpayers for Preserving the Reservoir.
Richard Patterson
Dorice Murphy
Lucille Carson
Daniel Gutierrez
Franz Wise
Bernhard Scholand
Ruth Hanson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This is a Planning issue
We have been accused of trying to stop housing for poor people. Not true. In the first place, the price levels are certainly middle income and above, but our main objection is that this badly done plan is damaging to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as to the over-crowded community college across the street.

WHAT WE WANT
Even our critics point out that we originally SUGGESTED housing for that site, but they don't talk about what else we suggested. We want two levels of parking under a City College Library, Bookstore, and Auditorium, with housing on top. Furthermore, let the housing be TRULY affordable—for students and seniors. We are trying to stop the bureaucrats' subsidized middle income housing project because it makes our dream impossible.
We ask for three years to give the neighborhood and the college a chance to produce a better plan.
SNAP (Sensible Neighborhood Planning Committee)

Helen Crizer, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council, representing 17 neighborhood associations in the area of the surplus reservoir property in question has voted to endorse the three-year stop of private construction on the old West Campus of City College. Dr. Louis Batsmale, Chancellor of City College from 1970-1977, has persuaded us that City College needs the lands.

Juanita Raven, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Be a sport.
Give City College a vote of support.
City has 23,000 students and badly needs a library. The only place to put it is in the reservoir site. City College has walked closely with San Francisco for five decades. The reservoir site has always been understood to be reserved for City College.

Until now when someone wants it for housing. Housing is important, but it can be anywhere in town. But a City College library can only be located at the College.

Vote yes to support a book—and a reader.
Reading, studying, writing and research make up our town also.

It is hard to understand criticism of City for wanting to keep this area for a library. Sure, housing sites are at a premium—but even more so a library site for City which is one of the largest schools in the Nation.

Some people blast City for wanting a library because of the need for housing. Housing is needed. But some of those very same people want a big battleship stationed here that will bring in 15,000 new family members.

The Educational and cultural growth of San Francisco mandates living space for the City College library.

If this measure gets a no vote, it means there will be no site for a Library. This is the last chance. Vote YES to help out a book—and a reader.

State financing, when approved, will construct this building.
It is the top building priority at City College.

A YES vote here means there will be time to think about the use of the site. During that three year period, cooler heads may realize this is the only site for a Library. If the housing goes in there will be no library there.

Vote yes for a book, for a good school and a better City.

John Riordan, Board of Governors
San Francisco Community College District.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Sunnyside Neighborhood Association is not against housing, but we are trying to stop a hasty and short-sighted plan. We are asking for this moratorium to get time for a better plan that will answer a variety of needs and benefit the entire city as well as our community.

This is a planning issue.

The release of the reservoir property as surplus by the water department came as a surprise to our neighborhood. The June 1984 “Residence Element” of the city’s Master Plan did not even list the land as surplus. By 1985 major decisions were being made for use of the land without adequate neighborhood input.

There were some meetings attended by a few people carefully selected for their zealous pro-housing views or potential financial gain. The resulting plan has gone out of control. Now it benefits only the developer and the lucky few who will get houses on free land.

Proposition E is not an attack on housing.
Please help us save our neighborhood against poor planning by voting YES on Proposition E.

Joe Mahoney, President
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Miraloma Improvement Club urges a YES vote on Proposition E.

Frank Mastro, President
Arnell Rodrigues
Maggie Kroll
Dorothy Evers

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION E

All the talk in the world can’t change the fact that City College has fewer acres of land relative to its student population than any college in the Bay Area.

Enrollment at City College is INCREASING, as is the enrollment of the San Francisco public schools from which City College draws most of its students. It is obvious that City College needs and deserves the reservoir land. The three year moratorium will give time to produce a better plan which will have in-

put by faculty, students and alumni who know the college’s needs and want to support it.

Sid Kass
Susie Langdon Kass
Phil Kass
City College Student

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The homeowners of Westwood Park, a neighborhood adjacent to the Balboa Reservoir, support the ballot initiative calling for a 3 year development moratorium. We believe that the City and City College should take additional time to determine their needs and how they might be met by using the Reservoir. In the event that City College does not need this property, we support its development as open space, or as single family detached housing.

Westwood Park Association
Don C. Swander
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Let's not aggregate the traffic problem around City College before we first develop solutions for the existing problems. A three-year moratorium only buys our neighborhood and elected officials time to find solutions; it doesn't say no to housing. A YES vote is a vote for prudent development. A YES vote helps to preserve the family character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ken Hoegger
Realtor and community Activist

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As representatives of the students of City College, we understand first-hand, the intense need to reserve a site for future school expansion. Preservation of the Balboa Reservoir, a site directly adjacent to the campus, is particularly crucial. The facilities that CCSF requires, such as a library and an auditorium, are essential to the main structure of the campus. Unlike classrooms, it would be unreasonable to build an auditorium or a library on an off-campus site, since these facilities are integral to the main function of the school.

In short, opposition to the moratorium based on the notion that alternate sites could be secured, is misleading. Once a site near the college is taken, any hope of expansion would be eliminated.

Associated Student Council of City College
Jack Lee, Vice President of Associated Counsel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Yes on E for continued excellence in community college education.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is twice as crowded as any community college in northern California. It needs a much larger library, bookstore and auditorium, and more parking.

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

Mayor's support, to deed this surplus land to City College so that the college may continue to serve the city effectively for the next 50 years as it has for the past half century. The Mayor refused. Now only Board member John Riordan supports the correct path.

The Water Department says it may need the NORTH reservoir now used for student parking. If that crisis occurs, the Chancellor says, "We'll deal with the situation then." How, if the south reservoir is gone?

(continued)
When land is available other community colleges finance large projects through alliances with civic, athletic and cultural organizations, and through property sales. New methods for public funding are being developed.

The faculty would like three years of careful study to unravel misunderstandings and poor management, and to find the best way to be a good neighbor.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College needs land now for desperately needed facilities, one of which is a library. City College has an enrollment of 23,000 students but our library has seating for 450. There are other possible locations for new housing, but City College can't be moved. Give us an opportunity to plan a development for the community and the college.

Annie M. Young
City College Library Faculty and Staff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty and staff members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Water Department has begun a resource study of water use, due for completion in two or three years. The study may well indicate that one or both reservoirs will be needed. The American Water Works Association states that reservoirs should be used in pairs. This is particularly important because it is the only reservoir at an elevation of 305 feet.

The Mayor twisted the arm of the Water Department to declare one of these reservoirs surplus before the water resource study is completed. Don't let her get away with this kind of political manipulation.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Kurt Common
Ken Crizer
Ed Dierauf
Herb Naylor
CCSF Engineering Professors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The South Balboa Basin has been unused since college leased buildings, including a large auditorium, were torn down on that site thirty years ago. We hope that three years of thorough planning would explore the possibility of returning a part of that property to the college for the development of a multi-purpose medium-sized auditorium which could be shared with community groups.

Robert Bozina
Mack Crooks
Bob Davis
Helen Dilworth
Franz Enciso
Richard Esterman
Richard Fennler
Lawrence Ferrara
Ted Fleming
Peggy Gorham
William Grothkopf
David Hardiman

Joseph Alessi
Mary Argenti
Neyda Azevedo
John Bischoff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition E. This moratorium is necessary because there are too many worthy uses for this land to make a hasty and potentially very costly decision. Only through careful planning can the limited land available for development be best used.

Jerome Hosken
Robert Kaar
James Kurck
Dack Lee
Chelsie Liu
William Maynez
Annette Rappeleyea
Oleg Reutitz
David Wall
City College Physics Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, as Physical Education Instructors, have always been committed to a diversified program for our students and community. The reservoir space is a natural land resource for a Multi Educational and Cultural Center. Your YES vote on E will allow us the freedom to explore ways that this property could most constructively benefit all.

Gail Barton
Curtis Decker
Brud Duggan
Takako Hagiwara
John Hahn
Daniel Hayes

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, full-time faculty of the Computer and Information Science Department of City College, urge a YES vote to postpone the decision until additional planning and surveys can be conducted. The current proposal would negatively impact the College's enrollment.

William Beaver
Ronald Cerruel, Chairman
Kirk Gibson
Howard Granger
Frank Holden
Michael Kelly

George Lanyi
Norbert Ludkey
Charles Metzler
Charles Miller
Marilyn Schneke

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

A YES vote on Proposition E helps STOP a scheme to GIVE AWAY $12,300,000 worth of City land for $1,800,000 (or less) to a Redwood City real estate developer.

A YES vote will SAVE taxpayers $550,000 per year. The housing project will produce $240,000 in taxes, but supplying City services will cost $790,000 per year.

The Controller's cost estimate does NOT account for the $12,300,000 land value, since land sale below value is NOT technicall a cost of government. The Controller also is NOT permitted to assume that the housing project will be constructed, since construction has NOT yet been ordered by the Board of Supervisors.

The plan does NOT restrict housing sales to moderate-income first-time buyers. The plan only restricts use of tax-subsidized funds. Any person favored by the developer or politicians can buy these dwellings and get the benefits of the public land giveaway.

The houses are made "affordable" by giving away the land far below market value, by City-backed low interest, and by cutting construction corners.

The real beneficiaries of the subsidized housing project are the financiers (NOT the project dwellers). Bondholders receive 9.6% average tax-free interest, which is equivalent to 24.6% taxable interest at 61% maximum tax. The developer and bond establishment receive $5,340,000; this is $26,300 (or 22.40%) for each $117,400 unit.

The City loses $51,700 worth of land GIVEN AWAY for each unit. Vote YES on Proposition E for good fiscal management.

William Marquardt
Financial Analyst, SNaP
Helen Crizer, Treasurer, SNaP

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of College</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Campus (acres)</th>
<th>Area/1000 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City College of SF</td>
<td>22,624</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laney College, Oakland</td>
<td>9,805</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot College, Hayward</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa College</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of San Mateo</td>
<td>13,820</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>11.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Marin</td>
<td>6,663</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given these facts, why does the Governing Board not try to get the old West Campus back? Why don't they support this moratorium to delay the land grab?

The Governing Board is under political pressure from City Hall. They have been threatened with the loss of the north reservoir parking lot and funding for special projects. Forgive them.

Vote Yes on E.

Friends of City College
David Newton
Glen Simpson
Jack Baker
Thomas Velasquez
Tillie McCullough

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The student population at City College is increasing. This semester's enrollment is up 1,265 students over last semester.

The enrollment in the San Francisco public schools has been increasing by 1,218 per year for the last three years. City College draws most of its enrollment from public schools in San Francisco.

Obviously, City College will have a larger enrollment in the future years, and will be in desperate need of space if we do not give it back its old West Campus.

Please reserve this public land for the college.
Please vote YES on E.

Barbara Holman

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON E

In 1981, I launched a six-point program to expand San Francisco's housing supply and the voters had approved a City policy to add 20,000 new housing units within five years. This Proposition would destroy a major portion of the effort to build affordable, single-family housing in our city.

The Balboa Reservoir Site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now a site for development of 203 new single-family homes, most with three bedrooms and two baths. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed as other homes built under the City's program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom could not afford homeownership. It is believed that these new homes will sell rapidly.

The Balboa Reservoir site is one of the few sites large enough to accommodate a substantial number of new homes. Please do not let a few people stop a major opportunity for new housing. Vote no on Prop E.

Not only would Proposition E halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site, but the 98% fixed-rate, 30-year mortgage money set aside for the housing would also be lost.

Nothing constructive is accomplished by this measure—it does not provide additional land or facilities for City College. As a matter of fact, City College has neither plans nor money to use the property. Further, the Community College Board of Directors, the governing body for City College, has voted overwhelmingly to oppose the initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting "No on E."

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the site of the unused Balboa Reservoir and the 98% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost.

These homes are desperately needed for San Franciscans who can't afford to buy in the city where the average house is selling for over $160,000. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

The homes would be built on land that belongs to the City. Over two years ago, it was declared surplus and available for housing. It is not part of City College, and City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

We urge you to vote no on Proposition E if you want more affordable housing for San Franciscans.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

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

The 203 affordable owner occupied single family units slated for the southern portion of Balboa Reservoir are part of the 1988 total. Our progress in addressing the City's housing shortage will be curtailed if this ill-advised initiative is approved. SUPPORT OWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Housing production is essential to check rising prices and to maintain our social, economic, and ethnic population diversity. AS A SAN FRANCISCO VOTER, YOU CAN BE PART OF OUR HOUSING PROGRESS BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

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

WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT THE CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY HOUSING BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

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

A critical issue facing San Francisco today is the lack of housing middle class San Franciscans can afford.

That is why I have joined these neighborhood associations to support the Balboa Reservoir neighborhood housing proposal. Those participating in the development of the proposal includes:

OMI Community Association
Dorado Terrace Association
Outer Mission-Ingleside
Political Action Committee
Greater Ingleside Community
Mount Davidson Manor
Ocean Avenue Merchants Association
Ingleside Terrace Association
The San Francisco Open Space Committee
City College of San Francisco

From early in 1985 I worked closely with these neighborhood groups in the discussions between city government and community leaders concerning the development plans for this desperately needed new housing at the unused Balboa reservoir site.

THESE ARE THE REASONS YOU SHOULD VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

1. The neighborhood housing proposal that this initiative seeks to stop is the result of months of hard work by the largest coalition of neighborhood associations ever to join together to plan a housing development in San Francisco.

2. The housing at the Balboa Reservoir site was designed with the involvement of the coalition of neighborhood associations to enhance the surrounding community.

3. The governing Board of the Community College District has made clear that they have no plans for the site and no ownership rights to it. City College does not oppose the construction of this development and opposes this initiative.

4. Self-proclaimed “Friends” of City College want to stop the proposal in order to preserve the site for future faculty parking. A clique of City College staffers involved in a neighborhood association pose as community opposition to this development even though a representative from this organization, the Sunny-side Neighborhood Association, had helped plan and support the proposal.

5. By masquerading as concerned neighbors these self-appointed “friends” of City College hope to prevent the construction of 204 critically needed units of housing and pull off one of the biggest land grabs in San Francisco’s history.

DON’T BE FooLED. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Residence Element of the Comprehensive Plan of the City and County of San Francisco assesses the City’s housing needs and lays out specific steps to meet those needs. This document was adopted by the City Planning Commission in 1984 after extensive public review at neighborhood meetings and public hearings, and consideration of the detailed Environmental Impact Report.

The first objective of the Housing Element is “to provide new Housing for all income groups” in locations appropriate for residential development. To meet this goal, development of housing is to be aggressively pursued and encouraged on surplus, underused and vacant public land.

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

If you want more affordable housing in San Francisco vote no on Proposition E.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Susan J. Bierman, City Planning Commissioner
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on E.

Proposition E deprives San Franciscans of one of their last real chances to become homeowners at an affordable price. At the South Balboa Reservoir we have City-owned land on which 203 units of three-bedroom, two-bath homes can be built at low prices which average San Franciscans can afford to pay. These homes need to be built now, not in three years. In three years the low interest rates on mortgages and the bond financing will be gone. Two hundred families will have lost the opportunity to become homeowners, and the City will have lost the opportunity to ease the tight market in rental housing.

Nor does this ill-conceived initiative help City College in any way. City College does not need this land. Speculation that the College may at some future date find a use for the land is not founded on fact. The College may never be able to build on the reservoir. Their enrollment has dropped by over 4000 students in the last few years.

This initiative is designed to confuse you. It will make our housing shortage worse for three long years. If you support affordable housing in our City, Vote NO on Proposition E.

Bill Maher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Balboa Reservoir site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now planned for development of 203 new single family homes. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed—other homes built under this program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom would not otherwise be able to afford home ownership.

San Francisco has the most expensive housing in the nation where last year the average home sold for over $160,000. Housing is difficult to produce because the obstacles are great—little land on which to build, high construction costs and uncertain interest rates.

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost. The initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional land or facilities for City College. The Community College Board, the governing body of City College, in fact recently voted to oppose this initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No” on Proposition E.

John L. Molinari

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

In 1980, the voters of the City and County of San Francisco approved a measure making it City policy to add 20,000 new units of housing within five years. In 1984 in an effort to satisfy this objective, the Board of Supervisors adopted a policy encouraging the expansion of the City’s housing supply. Making surplus City-owned land, such as the site at Balboa Reservoir, available for affordable housing was an important part of that policy. A proposal to build 203 homes on the unused Balboa Reservoir site was advanced to help implement the pro-housing policy.

Approval of Proposition E would HALT construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.

The Balboa Reservoir homes would be built on land currently belonging to the City and County of San Francisco. The property IS NOT part of the City College, and City College has neither plans or money to buy the property and convert it for City College use.

The only debatable issue is the future of affordable housing on the Balboa Reservoir site.

As we are all aware, San Francisco has the most expensive homes in the United States. The average cost of a home is $152,000. Not many can afford such prices. However, the housing proposed for the Balboa Reservoir will give many more citizens the opportunity to become homeowners. The homes to be built will be sold to first-time buyers at prices ranging from $83,000 to $145,000.

Other homes built in San Francisco under the direction of similar affordable housing programs have been snapped up quickly by San Franciscans. Without the program, most would not have been able to purchase the home and become homeowners.

Again, if you desire to preserve the construction of more affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site, vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Willie B. Kennedy

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

Additional single family housing is undeniably San Francisco's most acute social need. When some vacant surplus City land (12 acres) finally becomes available for 203 additional new private homes there will always be some selfish individuals who are in favor of new housing "just so long as it is not built across the street from me!" This unused, vacant City reservoir land hasn't generated a dime of taxes for over thirty years! Let's add 203 NEW homeowner taxpayers to the City's rolls as quickly as possible.

Stop these self-serving no-growth obstructionists! Please vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Prop E would halt affordable housing construction at the Balboa Reservoir site. Many gay people need affordable housing, too, and we join with other community groups urging you to vote NO on Prop E.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Robert Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E, if approved, would block the construction of 203 badly needed single-family homes on the south portion of the Balboa Reservoir in San Francisco. Sixty percent of these homes would be available for purchase by moderate and middle income families at purchase prices between $80,000 and $120,000. They would be constructed on surplus public land and financed by the sale of mortgage revenue bonds to enable the developer to sell the homes at below market prices.

A neighborhood group headed by two city college faculty members is responsible for placing Proposition E on the ballot. The group contends that the land which is intended to be used for the project should be made available instead to City College for the construction of new teaching facilities even though enrollment at City College is declining and the City College Board has voted 6 to 1 to oppose the initiative.

Like many other areas of the country, San Francisco suffers from a shortage of housing. Purchase prices here are among the highest in the nation. The use of surplus public lands and revenue bond financing provide a means for making single family homes available to a broad spectrum of families at affordable prices.

The Balboa Reservoir project is supported by the leaders of 8 neighborhood groups in the area surrounding the location of the proposed project and by a majority of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, as well as by Mayor Dianne Feinstein. We urge you to encourage the construction of this type of housing in San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition E.

San Francisco Board of Realtors
William L. Jansen, President

SAVE OUR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS!

BERNAL HEIGHTS SAYS, "VOTE NO ON PROP E!"

We are residents of Bernal Heights in San Francisco. We've worked hard to build affordable family and senior citizen homes in our neighborhood.

We need more affordable housing in our City to survive. The real issue in Prop E is affordable family housing — a "yes" vote prevents the construction of 203 family homes. That's crazy!

Join us in preserving what's best in our City. Vote "no" on Prop E!

Sylvia M. Yee, Bernal Heights Community Foundation Board of Directors***
Frank Hutchins, BHCF Board*
Mary Lou Bertolotti, BHCF Board*
Lela Havener, BHCF Board*
Elizabeth Egger, BHCF Board*
Sister Janet Simon, BHCF Board*
Stephen Antonaras, BHCF Board*
Lorenzo R. Dill, BHCF Board*
Barbara Bagot, BHCF Board*
Margaret C. Randolph, Northwest Bernal Block Club*
Maureen Lamb, NWBBC*
Tim Molinari, BHCF Planning & Dev't Committee*
Buck Bagot, BHCF P & D Committee*
***Organization for identification purposes only.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco Needs Affordable Housing—
Vote No on Proposition E
Everyone agrees that San Francisco needs affordable housing. The questions are how and where that affordable housing can be built.

The Balboa Reservoir housing development, to be built on the site of a reservoir built thirty years ago and unused since that time, answers those important questions for more than 200 San Francisco first-time homebuying families by providing:
— 203 new affordable three-bedroom, single family homes
— 9.8% fixed-rate financing
— A mix of 30% low-income, 30% moderate-income and 40% market-rate first time buyers
— A convenient site that has been declared “surplus” by the City and “available for development of affordable housing”

The Balboa Reservoir housing development is a small but significant step in the effort to generate affordable housing in our City.

Thousands of San Franciscans from every community, neighborhood group and viewpoint agree that the Balboa Reservoir development is good for San Francisco. Virtually every elected official, including the Governing Board of City College also agree.

All these San Franciscans ask you to say “yes” to affordable housing and “NO” to Proposition E.

San Francisco Coalition for Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar, Executive Director

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The viable plan for affordable single family housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site is being threatened by Proposition E. If Proposition E passes, 203 single family homes will be lost to the citizenry of San Francisco at a time when they are greatly needed.

The facts about the proposed housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site argue strongly against Proposition E. All 203 homes will be for first time home buyers. One-third of the homes will be available to households earning $27,000. Another third of the homes will be available to households earning $36,000. Adequate parking will be provided within the development itself, thus answering any concerns that traffic in the area will be congested.

City College has no need or plan to use South Balboa Reservoir for its facilities. City College’s priority is to develop its existing campus. South Balboa Reservoir should therefore be used for one of the City’s greatest needs: increased and affordable housing which is available to lower and middle income families.

As homeowners who live in the vicinity of South Balboa Reservoir, we welcome its planned use for single family housing and feel it will become an integral and contributing part of the community. We therefore urge you to vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Submitted by:
Stephen Graham, Chairman of the Housing Sub-committee of the Citizen’s Committee for Community Development
Roderick A. McLeod, Vice-Chairman of the Citizen’s Committee on Community Development

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing is a group of neighbors which consists of many of the renters of Westwood Park and Sunnyside neighborhoods as well as owners and renters of Ingleside which are the closest neighbors to the Balboa Reservoir along with some of the students and teachers of City College.

We strongly support the Balboa Reservoir for housing. We believe that the Balboa Reservoir is an ideal spot for housing.

Our neighborhood wants homes in the South Balboa Reservoir.
Vote No On Prop. E.

Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughy
Submitted by Patricia Vaughy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

As Merchants as well as residents of Ocean Avenue, Greater Ingleside and San Francisco, we support the Development of the Balboa Reservoir as housing.

A Traffic Survey has stated that there will be minimal impact on the existing patterns of traffic by this development.

Additional City College Parking is being considered on another location off I-80 to keep the college congestion away from the neighborhood’s streets.

City College has 44 more acres in which to expand and existing buildings at City College have viable means to expand.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
We believe that housing on the Balboa Reservoir is the most viable solution to develop a vacant piece of property that is directly adjacent to our stores on a Transfairential Street.
Affordable housing is in great need in San Francisco and is as much needed here as anywhere. We want to help provide this need. Vote No on Prop. E.

Ocean Avenue Merchants Assoc.
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughey
Submitted by Patricia Vaughey

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction on much-needed affordable, single-family housing at the long vacant south Balboa Reservoir site. This proposition would also block a major housing development that would bring jobs into an area of the city that has little industry or private business.
Sale prices for these units are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the San Francisco housing market, where the average home is selling for $160,000. Construction of these homes will help all young, first-time home buyers and will require only 5% down, instead of the 20% down payment on houses bought with conventional home mortgages.
This plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by nine nearby neighborhood organizations. If Proposition E is approved and this project is blocked, more young adults will purchase their first home in Vallejo or some other outlying area, further draining San Francisco of the young families that every growing community needs.
San Francisco residents will gain apprenticeships, jobs, contracts and subcontracts from this development.
This plan calls for 2 and 3 bedroom, family-sized houses, with space for another bedroom which can be finished when needed.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.
The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided — 2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.
The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.
If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote "No" on Proposition E.

Affordable Housing Alliance — Mitchell Omerberg, Director
Bay Area Urban League — Gregory Bes, Field Representative
Bernal Heights Community Foundation — Andre Lennell Daye
Community Educational Services — Dorothy Chen, Executive Director
Japanese Community Youth Council St. Francis Square Apartments, Inc. —
Sandra Major-Jenkins, Secretary
Minority Contractors Association of Northern California — James
Huagakoo, Secretary, Board of Directors
National Community Congress — Dr. Eddie C. Welban
Parksmerced Residents Organization, Inc. — Ricardo A. Callejo, Esq.
Potrero Hill Neighborhood House — Enola Maxwell
San Francisco Building Trades Council — San Smith
San Francisco Housing & Tenants Council — Joseph Lacey
San Francisco Tenants Union — Jim Pyne
Rev. Amos C. Brown — Local Pastor & Community Servant
Greg Day — Chairman, Citizens Committee on Community Development
Polly V. Marshall — Commissioner, San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
Regina A. Steed
Jim Wachob — San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Michael E. Willis, AIA — Fleming Corporation
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

S.N.I.G.
Will H. Reno
Larry Daniels
Ted McKethan

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Bayview Baptist Minister Fellowship—Rev. N. B. Mills, President
Broad of Life Missionary Baptist Church—Rev. S. A. Bailey
Cosmopolitan Baptist Church—Rev. A. Ray Gentile
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Raymond M. Howard Sr.
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Carole Nelson
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Cornelius P. O’Reilly
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Paul G. Theiss
Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee—Charley Gale, Chairman
St. Peters Housing Committee—Tessa Rouverol
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: With certain exceptions, City officers, including elected officials and commission members, may represent clients before City boards and commissions other than their own, and be paid for their services. State legislators may represent clients before City boards and commissions, and be paid for their services. Any person may contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would prohibit City officers from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay. This proposition would prohibit State legislators from appearing before City boards, commissions and departments on behalf of clients for pay. City officers would be prohibited from discussing with these officers and legislators matters that the City is deciding. Proposition F would also prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit City officers and State legislators from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to allow City officers and State legislators to represent clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to allow any person to contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

Controller's Statement on "F"

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

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

How "F" Got on Ballot

On February 26 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for limitations on compensated advocacy and campaign contributions had qualified for the June ballot.

Quentin Kopp, Marth Gillham and Cheryl Arenson, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 9,400 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,986 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The purpose of Proposition F is to cut campaign contributions by large contributors (and thus reduce campaign spending) and eliminate undue influence by officeholders retained as paid lobbyists for projects requiring City approval.

Let's take a minute to analyze the untrue arguments against Proposition F.

- The opponents claim that Proposition F will force half the City's Commissioners to resign. In fact, Proposition F does not force any Commissioners to resign. It simply says they can't be a paid lobbyist and a City Commissioner at the same time. Does a commissioner value making money by lobbying more than public service?

- Some have also alleged that Proposition F will prevent duly-elected union leaders from serving as City Commissioners. No, it won't. Proposition F prohibits "compensated advocacy"—that means lobbyists hired by an organization, not members of the organization itself. Proposition F does not apply to salaried employees of labor unions, corporations, or non-profit agencies. Moreover, Section 8.105 of the Charter precludes it specifically from applying to any member serving as a representative of any profession, trade, business, union or association on any board or commission which requires membership of representatives of specific professions, trades, businesses, unions or associations.

- Another untrue argument against Proposition F is that it prohibits City officials only from discussing pending issues with other City officers or State Legislators who are also acting as paid lobbyists in a matter and doesn't stop those officeholding lobbyists from writing City officials about their clients' objectives. That's not so. Proposition F applies to all such lobbying, written or oral. (The dictionary defines "discuss" as "to examine by means of speech or writing.")

End government decision-making by "insiders" and reduce the influence of money on local campaigns.

VOTE YES ON F.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
San Franciscans for Good Government

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

In all our years of observing San Francisco City government, we have found one maxim to be true: time after time: a good idea gets copied, especially among politicians.

For no sooner did Quentin Kopp promise to bring Proposition F to the voters than did Mayor Feinstein come up with an informal, administrative version of her own. Fine, you say (and the Mayor says), then why vote Yes on Proposition F?

(1) The Mayor's remedy of asking City Commissioners who also act as lobbyists before City agencies to resign is nothing more than a hand slap, and is good only as long as she is mayor. It's not binding on future mayors and could be changed without any vote of the Board of Supervisors, let alone the people of San Francisco. Proposition F prohibits this kind of conflict-of-interest, and it will be the law, no matter who is mayor.

(2) The Mayor's action did nothing to state legislators who can also act as lobbyists before City Boards and Commissions, nor did her action stop the law or business partners of City Commissioners from picking up the slack in big-money lobbying. Proposition F will stop these practices in their tracks.

(3) What about the other half of Proposition F, which reduced the campaign contribution limit to $500 so that all San Franciscans can enjoy equal access to City officials, not just the ones with the big bucks? The Mayor can't do anything about this, and she hasn't. Only a Yes vote on Proposition F will reduce the weight of big money and ensure our full voice in City elections and City government.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. If it's important enough for the Mayor to copy part of it administratively, it's important enough to do the job right and make it a law.

John J. Barbegala
Harry Ahe
June Cohen
Dorothy Partridge

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The worst and most persistent problem in American politics is that politicians and political races can be "bought." Reducing the size of campaign contributions will be a step forward in reducing the role of money in elections. Vote yes for more honest government.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

RESTORE to the people their rightful and equal power as individual voters by reducing the monetary clout and influence of private interests who make the laws and the policies as City officials and Commissioners or State legislators.

TELL the special interests that their money and influence can no longer interfere with representative government.

TELL the special interests that the voters will no longer tolerate the influence-buying which comes with large campaign contributions.

TELL the special interests that this measure will encourage highly talented citizens to serve San Francisco honestly and responsibly.

VOTE YES ON F:

Cheryl Arenson
Anne Renfrew
David Pacheco

Tom Hayes
Dorothy Yksich

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

"Government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

These noble words from Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, cast in bronze at the entrance to City Hall, seem to have escaped the attention of some City officials who pass by them every day. For in San Francisco City government, Lincoln's simple formula for representative government would read quite differently: "Government of the powerful, by the lobbyists, and for the wealthy."

Government of, by, and for the privileged few is bad government. Government of, by, and for all the people is good government. It's as simple as that—as simple as Lincoln first put it.

Proposition F, the Good Government Initiative, will help San Franciscans maintain control of their government and will prevent undue influence by City officeholders.

To reduce undue influence, Proposition F outlaws the practice of City Commissioners and State Legislators representing special interests for pay before City Commissions and Boards. City Commissions should render their decisions deliberately and impartially, not be swayed by the political clout of the lobbyists appearing before them, or by any political favors those lobbyist/politicians might promise. "I'll scratch your back if you scratch my back" bargains do not belong in government. And until such backroom bargains are made illegal, City government will not belong to the rest of us either.

Proposition F also reduces the maximum amount that anyone can give to a local candidate from $1,000 to $500. If large contributors and other special interests can't give as much money, they can't buy as much influence with elected officials. And the lower the contribution limit, the less campaign spending and the more City government will be responsive to all San Franciscans.

You can "buy back" City government from the privileged and powerful with the most precious of all political commodities: your vote.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Mary Lohneis
Peter Fatouh
Judith Thorson

Babette Dreke
Daniel Jordan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F, an initiative of the people, is needed to protect the voters and the integrity of the legislative process from being corrupted by the power of money and influence. It prevents City officials and State Legislators from lobbying the City on behalf of high-powered special interests. It also lowers the campaign contribution limit from $1,000 to $500, thus reducing the influence of those same special interests over our elections and elected officials.

The bogus argument that the Mayor won't be able to find qualified people to serve on City commissions if Proposition F is adopted ignores the plain fact that there are 700,000 people in San Francisco, a pool of civic-minded citizens more than large enough to accommodate the 250 commission appointments available in our City government. For example, there are plenty of architects to fill the one architectural appointment on the Art Commission, just as there are plenty of non-lobbyist business people and lawyers available to serve on other commissions.

Thousands of San Franciscans, not just the "insiders", are ready, willing, and able to serve the public. Proposition F deserves your vote. Restore integrity to City government. Restore the confidence of the citizens of San Francisco in that government. Let's have no more Wilkes Bashford situations.

VOTE YES ON F.

Oscar Sutro
Martha Gillham
Marguerite Warren

Leonel Monterey
Tony Kilroy
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE "NO" ON F

This proposition disguises itself as "good government" but, in reality, would drive good people out of government. It is so crudely drawn — so sweeping in its implications — that it would bar from government almost anyone with even a remote business or community tie to government.

It would purge from City commissions anyone who "directly or indirectly" receives compensation from any "interests" with an issue before any City agency. Effectively, this could discriminate against employees from community and neighborhood groups, civil rights organizations, non-profit corporations, labor unions, merchant and business groups, as well as architects, lawyers and other professionals.

Actually, there currently are no commissioners who represent any clients before any City agency. All who are appointed in my administration sign a statement saying they will not advocate for any paying client before any official body of the City while they are commissioners. This proposition simply is not necessary.

Proposition F also would lower the limit for any individual campaign contribution from $1000 to $500. Although this sounds good, it would permit a wealthy person with various businesses and numerous family members to contribute many thousands of dollars through different sources. This would encourage "hidden" contributions. We must strive for disclosure of contributions, not a system which drives contributions underground. Candidates must be able to raise funds enough to put their message before the voters. Reducing the contribution limit can be a tactic to discourage persons from challenging incumbents.

Vote no on Proposition F.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition F purports to achieve a noble objective: The removal of "influence peddling" from City Hall. In fact, Proposition F is so poorly-crafted, it may have exactly the opposite effect on City government. It is not a "good government" initiative. It is bad legislation.

Proposition F provides no definitions and no standards for the public to judge whether City officials comply with its restrictions. Its uncertainties will be chaotic and lead to endless, needless lawsuits.

A measure similar to Proposition F was rejected by the Board of Supervisors because no public hearings were ever held on the legislation. If the public had had a chance to comment on this initiative, it might not have the critical shortcomings, deficiencies and uncertainties that now warrant its rejection by responsible San Franciscans.

In the coming months, the Board will review good government measures that are comprehensible, effective and, most important, certain. Proposition F is a misguided disaster.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

This should properly have been titled the "SINK WILLIE BROWN ORDINANCE"! The "meat of the cocoanut" is in Section 4.

Supervisor Kopp's intentions are good, however this sloppily drafted and incomprehensible measure succeeds in "burning down the barn" to eliminate a couple of rats!

Under this proposal, to avoid any potential INDIRECT conflict of interest, (which is undefined!), one would have to be a destitute, unemployed welfare recipient to qualify for service on any City Board or Commission! The Mayor has already solved this "hired advocacy" problem with the "conflict of interest" affidavits she demands IN ADVANCE from any prospective appointee.

Quentin's proposed $500.00 campaign contribution limit is an "inside joke" and he, of all people, knows it! It merely obliges a heavy contributor to have his wife, children, business associates, or friends send in SEPARATE $500.00 checks if he wants to contribute more than $500.00 to a politician's campaign.

These proposals require additional City employees for enforcement and wind up doing far more harm than good. Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Union members and labor officials have legitimate reasons for meeting with City officers. It is unfair and wrong to lump them in the same category as special interest lobbyists, yet that's exactly what Proposition F does. Working people deserve representation on City boards and commissions. VOTE NO!

Walter Johnson
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council

LeRoy King
James Elliot
Keith Eickman
Reeva Olson

Jeff Greendorfer
Sara Smith
Larry Griffin
Steve Robusa
Terrence Ryan
Jack Beggs
Tony Marovich

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

If you want to ban business owners and executives from serving on City boards and commissions, then vote for Proposition F.
If you think board members of non-profit corporations and employees of community agencies have nothing to contribute to City government, then vote for Proposition F.
If you believe union members and labor officials should not have a voice at City Hall, then vote for Proposition F.
But if you share our belief that these individuals have legitimate concerns and expertise that is valuable in running major City departments, then join us in voting NO on Proposition F.
Proposition F is a simplistic, sloppily-drafted, meat axe approach to a problem already resolved by Mayor Feinstein's ban on commissioners lobbying on behalf of private clients.
Proposition F is not good government and it is not reform. Proposition F is bad legislation. VOTE NO.

Hon. Amy Meyer
Hon. Susan Berman
Hon. Walter Jebe
Hon. Bruce Lilienthal
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Jean Kortum
Hon. Thomas Horn
Hon. Henry Berman
Hon. Robert McCarthy
Hon. Richard Giggenheim
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Hon. Patrick McCall
Hon. Kirk Miller
Hon. Melvin Lee
Hon. Jerry Berg
Hon. Bonnie Gibson
Hon. Mary Noel Pappy
Hon. Mark Buel
Hon. Tim Carrico
Hon. Jo Hanson
Hon. Kevin Malone
John Sanger
Tom Moore

Hon. Eugene Friend
Hon. Phyllis Lyon

Donald Dider
Jim Wachob
Anne Daley
Linda Post
Lynne Williams
Todd Dickinson
Peter Hanson
Herbert Karlan
William Scoots
Van Hart
Iris Fluegel
Noam Rand
John Schmidt
James Mock
Thomas Karwaki
Wendy Goldberg
Joseph Schwartz
Belle Lazarus
Antonio Barros
Bruce Barrett
Charles Howell
Walter McGuire
Sharon Davall
Joyce Minnelli

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

We're sympathetic to the need for political reform. But it's a complicated problem, and Proposition F just isn't the way to go.
Frankly, we can't tell who is and isn't affected by this measure. While a handful of people sometimes might abuse their positions, that's no reason to question the integrity of so many solid citizens who give tirelessly to public service. Proposition F is simply the wrong approach. Please join us in voting NO.

William E. McDonnell
Frances May McAtee
N. A. Sapunar
Caroline and Michael Figoni

Martin D. Murphy
Eugene C. Payne III
Suzanne B. McCarthy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Concerned about elected officials spending $400,000 to run for supervisor and $1 million on a mayor's race? Then vote NO on Proposition F.
That's right. NO.
Proposition F isn't going to do anything about campaign spending. Prop F simply limits the size of contributions, reducing the current limit from $1,000 to $500. Supervisors can and will continue spending outrageous sums on their re-election campaigns. With Proposition F they'll just spend twice as much time raising money from twice as many sources, and that makes special interests even more powerful. They can always find ways around campaign limits.
We need campaign spending reform, but Proposition F doesn't provide it. Please join us in voting No on F.

District 8 Democratic Club
Stephen L. Taber
Ruth Gravani
Alan Reinick
Miriam Blaustein

Linda Chapman
Dale Carlton
James Firth
Debra Bax
Lev Serbin
Debra Stein

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

When campaign contributions are limited, political freedom suffers. Your right to free speech includes not only your right to express your views, but also your right to support as much as you want, any candidate who speaks for you.

 Minority viewpoints depend heavily on the contribution of a few dedicated supporters to get your message out. To limit your financial support of your beliefs is to silence your political voice.

Only incumbents, who have many opportunities for free media exposure benefit from this assault on free speech. The dangers of a campaign contribution limit far outweigh any possible benefit from this proposition. Defeat Proposition F!

San Francisco Libertarian Party
Michael R. Fowler, Secretary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

You may think Prop F only applies to big-time lawyers and a few legislators who represent developers. Think again!

Prop F would prohibit many community leaders from public service. If it passes, board members and employees of community and charitable organizations could be banned from serving on City boards and commissions.

We appreciate the public need for a government free of "influencing peddling." But restrictions on "compensated advocacy" ought to be clearly and carefully crafted to protect the voices of community leaders who argue on behalf of the public interest, not private special interests.

Vote No.

Hon. Juanita Del Carlo
Mission Hiring Hall

Bob Ross
Publisher, Bay Area Reporter

Hon. Jeffrey Ken Mori
Japanese Community Youth Council, Inc.
Bill O'Callahan
American Red Cross
Hon. George Sunclin
Horizons Unlimited
Hon. Jean Rita Alvair
Mission Education Project
Hon. Greg Day
Folk Street Town Hall
Hon. Naomi Gray
Hon. James Fosler
Carol Wong
Marlena Marseille
Lee Woods
Jo Daly
Dennis Collins
Hon. H. Welton Flynn
(Organizations listed only for purposes of identification.)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will have no effect on developers' lawyers. None.

It won't make any difference to state legislators either.

Don't kid yourself. This is not "reform" and it isn't "good government." Proposition F will allow the special interests and influence peddlers to continue exercising influence over our elected officials. It has so many loopholes, lobbying will actively continue, untouched, in the back rooms of City Hall.

And developers will always find ways around campaign contribution limits. As Common Cause has noted, Prop F simply makes tracing their dollars more difficult for the public.

Real reform would directly attack the source of huge contributions—the developers and other special interests that employ the lobbyists to peddle their influence.

VOTE NO.

Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
David Looman
Michael Mason

Rich Waller
Susan Klugerman
Rene Cazenave
Margie O'Driscoll

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION G
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has adopted an ordinance prohibiting the City, with certain exceptions, from purchasing goods or services from companies doing business with South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a declaration of policy that says the City must try to avoid doing business with companies that significantly profit from or help maintain the Apartheid system in South Africa. It calls on other public bodies and private groups to adopt similar policies. It directs the Board of Supervisors to identify the companies which have the greatest ties to Apartheid so that the public can also boycott those companies.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to avoid doing business with companies that help maintain Apartheid, and you want a public boycott of those companies.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

“The proposed Declaration of Policy be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “G” Got on Ballot

On November 6, 1985 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for the City to boycott businesses with significant ties to South Africa had qualified for the June ballot.

Arlo Hale Smith, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,546 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on October 11.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,941 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:
It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This measure calls for a public boycott of companies that aid apartheid.
Any claim of "conflict" between Proposition G and existing anti-apartheid legislation is imaginary: It is the legislative intent of supporters of this measure that it can be construed as a directive for making existing law tougher.

Personal attacks have no legitimate place in a ballot measure campaign. As proponent of this measure, I repudiate all such tactics.
Vote NO on apartheid. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Arlo Hale Smith

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Boycotts are grassroots politics. They've helped the farm-workers, they've helped win integration, and they can help end the legal racism called "Apartheid".
A Gallup poll found 77% of South Africa's black majority favoring international economic boycotts to force the Apartheid regime to accept reform peacefully.
After the Boycott Initiative made the ballot, the San Francisco Supervisors unanimously passed a similar city purchasing policy. The issue that remains is whether to call on the general public to join in, boycotting companies identified by the Supervisors as the worst offenders in each industry.
The companies that would be targeted consider profits to be the "bottom line". Economic pressure is all they understand.
The AFL-CIO, NAACP, and NOW have called a boycott of Shell Oil because of its profiteering from South Africa's oppressive economic conditions. Proposition G supports that and would put the same pressure on other industries as well.

This proposition is supported by the elected county central committee of the Democratic Party, the Peace-and-Freedom Party and the Humanist Party, and by leading attorneys, such as Terry Francois, Terence Hallinan, Tony Serra, Lewis Hope Lee, Marc Van Der Hout, Abby Ginsberg and Terence Redmond.
If South Africa were a democracy, its majority would long ago have voted to end Apartheid. We need to vote Yes — because they can't.

Atty. Arlo Hale Smith, Democratic Party County Central Committee
Paul Kangar, Peace and Freedom Party
Lois Saltzbury, Public Advocates*
Dr. Kevin Dusterh, Food First*
Jesse James, Mission Rebels
Terry Collins, Community Activist
Stony Gebert, Election Action
Robert McCall, Hotel & Restaurant Employees
Executive Board Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Attorneys speak out against Apartheid:
South African police can arrest anyone without charge. They can hold you incommunicado — no contacts with family, lawyers or press.
They regularly censor news, books, music. They have banned Christmas caroling, funerals and other peaceful gatherings. Groups which criticize the government are forbidden to hold meetings.
Blacks are subject to legal segregation; their property and employment rights are greatly restricted; often, they are simply murdered.
As attorneys, we help people who have legal rights that are being violated. But what can we do for those who have no legal rights?

Boycotts and other economic sanctions are the only way to make the Apartheid government accept reform peacefully.
In the Court of World Public Opinion, Apartheid has been convicted of crimes against humanity. By imposing a sentence of economic isolation, we can end Apartheid.
Vote Yes — take a stand for justice.

Terence Hallinan
Arlo Hale Smith
Terry Francois
Karen Andersona Ryer
Robert R. Bryan
Ann Menasche
Rachel Ginsburg
Leo Paoli
Gabriel Gesmer
Orn Prouchnick
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is a moderate, responsible but effective proposal to bring economic pressure on the South African government to establish constitutional rights for all of its citizens. Vote Yes.

Terence Faulkner, Republican
Mike Garcia, Republican

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

All decent Americans abhor apartheid. However, boycotting U.S. investment in South Africa is counterproductive; it only penalizes the actual victims of apartheid.

U.S. international firms have acted as progressive agents for change through the Sullivan principles. Their investments have improved the social and economic condition of the labor force. It is improper to penalize their positive contributions.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

We are individuals and organizations working actively to end the racist system of apartheid in South Africa. And we are voting NO on Proposition G.

Why?

(1) Because Proposition G will weaken San Francisco’s present divestment law. This law requires companies doing business with the city to sign affidavits that they will make no new contracts with South Africa.

Proposition G has no such provision.

(2) Proposition G provides no mechanism or funding to carry out its declared purpose of “boycotting” South Africa.

Proposition G will not stop South African products from entering the Port of San Francisco.

Vote against this useless, confusing, and deceptive initiative.

Yvonne Golden
Geraldine Johnson
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
AFT 2121 Anti-Apartheid Committee
Artists Against Apartheid
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Coalition of Conscience
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club Executive Committee
ILWU 10 and SEIU 250 Southern Africa Liberation Support Committees
National Conference of Black Lawyers
San Francisco Anti-Apartheid Committee
Southern Africa Freedom Committee/All Peoples Congress

Preserve the stronger divestment law San Francisco already has. Vote NO on Proposition G!

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1983 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!
PROPOSITION H

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?

YES 303
NO 304

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Several city and private agencies conduct various programs related to AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a declaration of policy that says San Francisco should support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council, consisting of a Committee on Education and a Fund-Raising Committee. The Research Committee would make recommendations on the most useful AIDS research projects and try to prevent duplication of efforts. The Education Committee would inform the public about the latest research and about ways to prevent AIDS. The Fund-Raising Committee would seek donations and grants for AIDS research and education projects.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

“The proposed Declaration of Policy for an AIDS research and education council and the formation of advisory committees of civic leaders would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, additional expenditure of public funds for AIDS research may result, the amount of which cannot be determined.”

How “H” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for AIDS research had qualified for the June ballot.

Stony Gebert, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 10,540 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on December 6, 1985.

A check of each signature on the petition showed that 7,564 of the signatures were valid. This is more than 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We need a council to expose and address major AIDS issues without the impasse of present medical/political bias.

As taxpayers, we are subsidizing a treadmill of continual AIDS casualties. There are major oversights where AIDS is concerned. Only recently was it learned that CDC statistics suggest 79% of early AIDS cases appear drug-related. We hear AIDS is 100% fatal. Perhaps that is because death may also be drug-related in the way of immuno-suppressive antibiotic and radiation overloads to already compromised immunity systems. Prevailing medicine is both tunnel-visioned and high-profit motivated. Also well-funded. This solution may be part of the problem. Some physicians are beginning to feel where AIDS is concerned many current practices are ethically, medically bankrupt.

Remissions occur. Largely through immunity-enhancing, holistic medicine. Significantly, only 1% of AIDS cases occur among people at risk in the Asian community. Perhaps this is due to less drug abuse or use of an unfunded, ignored resource: herbology as part of diet. More options: homeopathy, acupuncture, etc.

If, as anticipated, upwards of 40% of those testing positive come down with AIDS, we may become overburdened. To ignore all of the above becomes part of the problem. Vote Yes on Proposition H.

Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Rich McKirkeby, Former Orderly,
Marketing Associate, Pacific Bell
Joseph P. Clady, AIDS Hospice, Shanti Counselor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There is great need for research and education about AIDS and related conditions.

We need to attack the disease, not its victims.
Knowledge is the only vaccine available today.
Vote Yes.

John Lorenzini, President,
People With AIDS Alliance
Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Jan Beck, Steven Russell, Eugene Ewins, ARC/AIDS Vigil

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There are many possible treatments for AIDS and related conditions which are not being examined by the federal government, especially therapies based on natural substances and processes.

Vote Yes for an AIDS Research Council open to all viewpoints.

Scott Gregory, M.D.
Paul Kangas

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

A tape recording (Talking Book) of the San Francisco Voter Information pamphlet is available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

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

Name__________________________________________________________

Address________________________________Apt. #__________

Telephone No. (required)________________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any)____________________________________

Signature______________________________________________________
PROPOSITION I
Shall It be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?

YES 307
NO 308

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the Freeway with a surface roadway.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City's policy to remain as it is, and you want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to change the City's policy, and you do not want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a policy statement asking whether or not the Embarcadero Freeway should be torn down.

Controller's Statement on "I"

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

"The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway demolished, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by at least $10.2 million in local funds. Potential private sector financing and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost."

How "I" Got on Ballot

On March 3 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy placing the question of demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway before the voters had qualified for the June ballot.

Richard Hongisto, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 11,119 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,720 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

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

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land now under the Broadway ramps is put back on the tax rolls, with low-rise buildings limited by restrictive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when united with Proposition J, recognizes these facts:

1) The Embarcadero Freeway is what is left of a never-completed elevated freeway that would have ringed the City through North Beach and Marina neighborhoods to the Golden Gate Bridge.

2) Today this massive freeway, which separates us from our waterfront, would never be built.

3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.

4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf will be preserved.

5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked for this new system.

6) Only that portion of the Embarcadero Freeway east and north of the Main and Beale Street ramps — basically the portion directly on the waterfront — will be removed to make way for the new system. The removal cost, approximately $10 million to be paid for with privately-generated new revenues, is a relatively small part of the overall new system.

As for Proposition I, vote "YES, let's tear down the Embarcadero Freeway!" Then turn to Proposition J and support the plan for a beautiful waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Removing the Embarcadero Freeway will allow San Francisco to:

• Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero.

• Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway.

• Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula.

• Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero.

• Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.

• Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won't benefit San Francisco. Don't let outsiders determine our future. Vote YES on I.

Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Jack Wholey
Roger Boyer
A. Lee Knight
Robert Bradfro
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Donald A. Crosby, AIA
Rai Y. Okamoto
Robert Meyers
Ralph Hurtado
Hon. Susan Bixerman
Hon. Yoshiro Nakashima
Hon. Douglas G. Wright
Anita Sanchez

Chuck Forester
Pritz Arko
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Delatt, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones
Randal Ross
Karl Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsed
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkenna
Jon Twichell
Jane Winslow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON I

This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY—VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds — without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city's fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.

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

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT — VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree — it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

ABSSENT VOTER BALLOT APPLICATION
Application must be received by the registrar of voters no later than 5/27/86.

Election Date June 3, 1986

PLEASE PRINT REGISTERED NAME:

FIRST NAME

MIDDLE NAME

LAST NAME

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

NUMBER AND STREET — DESIGNATE N, S, E, W

CITY

ZIP

X

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT (DO NOT PRINT)

DATE

(AREA CODE) DAYTIME TELEPHONE

I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.

(AREA CODE) RESIDENCE TELEPHONE

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Prec. No. ____________________________
A.V. Prec. No. ________________________
Ballot Type/Party ______________________
Affidavit No. ____________
Signature and Registration Verified as Correct:

Date ____________________
Deputy Registrar

MAIL COMPLETED FORM TO:

Registrar of Voters

Room 155 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

NO vote!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled.

Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOPZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the consequences of inaction.

The waterfront plan requires removing the freeway in order to make way for growth. The city will pay for itself as land is redeveloped and taxes are driven back on the tax rolls, with new effective waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when combined with these facts:
1) The Embarcadero Freeway completed elevated free through North Beach and Gate Bridge.
2) Today this massive

FROM:

__________________________
__________________________

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

JAY PATTERTON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON I

This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY—VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds—without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city’s fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.

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

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT—VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to 15.7 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown, Fisherman's Wharf and the financial district would be reduced.

Travel within the city would be slowed down at all hours. Vote no to the destruction of the freeway.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:

- Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
- Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
- If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that—By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will in-crease from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
- Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
- MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
- Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Judith Tornese

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Tear it down? The concept is preposterous! There are 70,000 cars a day whizzing by on this high speed downtown elevated waterfront freeway! Where will they all go?

Aside from the outrageous demolition costs involved, (some engineers estimate $40,000,000 of taxpayer money!), eyeball observation, logic, and just plain “common sense” dictates that ground level “total gridlock” will result if this expensive freeway is now destroyed.

Nostalgic individuals must realize that the times have changed! We can't bring the Bay back up to Montgomery Street! On behalf of San Francisco's overburdened taxpayers, we urge a NO vote!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled. Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY
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Embarcadero Freeway Policy

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a policy statement that says that the City would replace the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt a policy statement which says that the Embarcadero Freeway would be torn down if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt a policy statement to replace the Embarcadero Freeway under these conditions.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway replaced with a tree-lined six lane boulevard and other traffic and transit improvements, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by approximately $27.5 million. This includes a one-time freeway demolition cost of $10.2 million plus $17.3 million required to match potential federally-funded transit improvements. Potential financing by the State and private sector and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “J” Got on Ballot

On March 5 a declaration of policy regarding the future of the Embarcadero Freeway was delivered to the Registrar from the Mayor and several supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows the Mayor or four or more supervisors to submit a declaration of policy to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

In addition to Mayor Feinstein, the March 5 document was signed by Supervisors Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker, Molinari, Kennedy and Nelder.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans now have a chance to remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with an at-grade, six-lane parkway, which will open our waterfront and restore views blocked for years by this large freeway.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for traffic and transit improvements:

- New, shorter freeway ramps connecting directly with The Embarcadero;
- A tree-lined, at-grade, 6-lane Embarcadero Boulevard, with a new waterfront Muni line, a jogging and bicycle path from Fisherman's Wharf to Mission Bay;
- Extension of Muni Metro south to the Caltrain station at 4th and Townsend;
- New ramps connecting I-280 with The Embarcadero;
- Changes in traffic flow and improvements to existing freeway ramps.

Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf will be preserved and enhanced.

The Board of Supervisors has specified that the Embarcadero Freeway will be torn down only if preliminary engineering during the next two years confirms — as traffic and environmental studies already have — that removal of the freeway will not result in more problems than it solves.

San Francisco became eligible for $88 million in federal highway funds for this new system when the Supervisors approved the plan in 1980. The $10.2 million cost of freeway demolition itself can be paid from revenues from low-rise development of the parcels now under the Broadway ramps and the increased values of nearby properties. Strict waterfront zoning limits the size of any development.

Traffic and environmental studies by the California Department of Transportation since 1980 clearly indicate that the new waterfront transportation system will be vastly superior to the existing situation, and that traffic congestion levels will not be notably different with the elevated structure removed.

Vote Yes on J and let's remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with a parkway and transit system — once again let us see our waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J gives the voters a chance to be heard on an important and timely issue. This issue is the replacement of a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway as one element of a comprehensive package of transportation improvements in the Waterfront area.

Last fall, the Board of Supervisors adopted for further study a set of traffic and transit improvements for the Waterfront. These improvements include:

- a new landscaped surface-level boulevard
- replacement of the Clay/Washington and Broadway on and off ramps with new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom
- removal of the unused stub of I-280 and construction of new ramps connecting the new waterfront boulevard to Route I-280
- a new light rail transit line linking Fort Mason with the Caltrain Depot
- extension of the Muni Metro to the train depot, improving the Peninsula Commute Service

A YES vote on Proposition J does not allocate funds for these projects. It does allow for further design and engineering studies, including cost analysis, assessment of impacts on traffic, and other matters. The studies will then be presented to the Supervisors so that they can make an informed decision on the plan. If the studies prove positive, San Francisco will be able to transform its Waterfront for the benefit of all.

Proposition J will insure that the City will not proceed with the removal of any of the Freeway until all the studies are completed and all potential consequences are assessed. This is the responsible approach. Vote YES on J.

SPUR
League of Women Voters
Embarcadero Citizens Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SAN FRANCISCO'S NEIGHBORHOODS ASK YOU TO VOTE YES ON J.

REDUCE TRAFFIC CONGESTION—YES ON J!

Traffic backed up by the Embarcadero Roadway slows travel and creates congestion in North Beach and other nearby neighborhoods. J will speed traffic flow.

IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION—YES ON J!

Proposition J will provide regular streetcar service along the Embarcadero and extend Muni Metro service to the south, ultimately extending to Bayview-Hunters Point.

PROMOTE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY—YES ON J!

If Proposition J does not pass, San Francisco could lose $88 million in federal funds for traffic improvements.

(continued)
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

RESTORE THE WATERFRONT—YES ON J!
San Francisco’s waterfront could become a focal point for the city, graced by a grand promenade, instead of the dismal, deteriorating eyesore it is now.
San Francisco’s neighborhoods join together to ask your support for an improved Embarcadero. We guarantee the freeway will not be removed unless it is replaced by facilities that will assure a smoother, more efficient traffic flow. YES ON J!
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Robert Bradford
Ruth Gravanis
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Anita Sanchez
Nancy Katz
Robert Katz
Beverly Mills
North Beach Neighbors
John Behanna
Herbert D. Kossowitz
Jerry Hurado
Gregory E. Jones
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors
Dale A. Carlisle
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Ralph Hurado
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Chuck Forrester
David M. Hartley
Donald P. Black
Mrs. Blaind Platt
Richard Reinhardt
James W. Haas
James Beam
Jill M. Jones
Peter J. Locke
Marjorie G. Stern
John B. Lowry
Lawrence Ferlinghetti
Nancy Peters
Steven Tober

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SUPPORT PUBLIC TRANSIT—VOTE YES ON J.
SAVE SAN FRANCISCO FROM GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON J.
The revitalization of the Northeastern Waterfront...as included in San Francisco’s Master Plan and transit plans, as overwhelmingly approved by the Board of Supervisors and as urged by Mayor Feinstein...will allow almost $90 million in unused federal highway funds to be used for vital downtown and waterfront transit and street improvements which will be a key to reducing needless auto congestion in San Francisco.
PROPOSITION J SUPPORTS IMPORTANT TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS TO THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT. It will:
—extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific/CalTrain depot
—create a new rail line (possibly using historic streetcars) to connect the entire waterfront from Mission Bay to the Ferry Building to Fisherman’s Wharf and Fort Mason
—set the stage for a possible streetcar line along Third Street
Since the city of San Francisco adopted the Transit First policy in the early 1970’s, transit investments in the Muni Metro, in new electric trolley an articulated bus service, and in BART and Golden Gate Transit, have saved downtown San Francisco from gridlock!
IF you are concerned about the future of transit in San Francisco, IF you are concerned about reducing needless auto congestion, THEN we urge you to join Mayor Feinstein and the majority of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in voting Yes on Proposition J.
Norman Rolf
San Francisco Muni Coalition
California Transit League
Jack Wholey
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Regina Sneed
Tony Killroy
Hon. Jack Morrison
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Bay Area Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Hon. Amy Meyer, Recreation and Park Commissioner
Alan Lubliner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A SOUND BUSINESS PROPOSITION—YES ON J!
Common sense and good business demand we make the most of our resources. San Francisco’s waterfront is an economic and civic asset unrivaled anywhere—yet much of it is cut off by an ugly, noisy, elevated roadway. The traffic improvements called for by Proposition J will benefit workers, tourists, property owners, neighborhoods...and business.
—Traffic flow and transit will move quickly on a realigned, reorganized Embarcadero Roadway, allowing easier, more pleasant access to waterfront businesses.
—An improved and beautified Embarcadero will create new commercial opportunities and increase the value of existing property and businesses.
—New jobs and an expanded tax base will generate increased revenue for the city as several lots now covered by freeway ramps return to productive private ownership. Though limited to low rise development (40 to 65 feet), tax revenues from development will more than make up the city’s share of the project.
Robert Meyers
Dennis J. Potts
Kenneth R. Lerch
M. Arthur Gensler, Jr., FAM
James T. Chungell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones
Randall Rossi
Karl A. Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
Jon Twichel
Fritz Arko
Michael J. O’Shea
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J OFFERS RESIDENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO A ONCE IN A LIFETIME OPPORTUNITY TO RECAPTURE THEIR WATERFRONT.

Covert the Embarcadero into a tree-lined boulevard and building a new streetcar line will make the waterfront more pedestrian and transit oriented, that is, more people oriented.

A freeway structure that is a source of objectionable noise and casts a pall over a large part of the waterfront will be removed. The waterfront will be opened up to sunlight and fresh air and made more inviting and cheerful to those who wish to walk on one of the world’s outstanding waterfronts. Air pollution that is now retained by the existing elevated structure will be dissipated.

The transit orientation of the new waterfront will encourage energy conservation. Proposition J will:
— Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero
— Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway
— Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula

— Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero
— Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line
— Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won’t benefit San Francisco. Don’t let outsiders determine our future.

VOTE YES ON J FOR A BETTER SAN FRANCISCO.

Sierra Club
Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage
Willinda McCrea*
Bob Cramer*
Rebecca Evans*
Richard Livingston*
Marilyn Clements*
Jennie Lew*
Jeffrey Heine*
Jane Winslow*
Roger Boyer

A. Lee Knight
Hon. Teddy Rosenberg
Patrick S. Hobin
Monica Halloran
Walter K. Morris
Kate Klairemont
Jeffrey Heller
Bob Inacson
George T. Rockrise, FAIA
Jon Tischell
Marc Raichy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J GIVES US A CHANCE TO CORRECT A COLOSSAL MISTAKE!

The Embarcadero Freeway should never have been built. The original plan was to build a freeway from bridge to bridge, destroying the Northern Waterfront, Fisherman’s Wharf, Fort Mason, and Marina Green in the process. When the people of San Francisco saw what was happening, they stopped it in mid-air—literally.

Walk under it. Hear the noise. Feel the gloom. See how it cuts out light.

It’s time to remove this mistake.

The new waterfront plan will give us a tree-lined boulevard, a new streetcar line, and a Muni Metro extension to the Southern Pacific/Caltrain depot. It will give us a transit and pedestrian oriented waterfront that will give us pride and pleasure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J!

San Francisco Tomorrow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, with a membership of 1700 working architects in San Francisco, urges a “YES” vote on Proposition J. In 1968 the citizens of San Francisco stopped highway planners from ringing our waterfront with freeways. Today voters have another opportunity to return the waterfront to our citizens. Removal of the Embarcadero Freeway is one part of a carefully researched transit plan for San Francisco. This proposition supplies an unique opportunity to carry out a broad range of transportation improvements that will have many positive effects on the City of San Francisco.

Removal of the freeway will:

1. Return the waterfront to the people by removing this barrier to access and view.
2. Facilitate needed MUNI improvements.
3. Encourage development of the Embarcadero as a grand civic boulevard unifying the City of San Francisco.

The members of the American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition I and “YES” on Proposition J.

Donald Kennedy, FAIA
President

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans love Their City, the ambiance, the Bay, waterfront, the views, the healthy neighborhoods.
Freeway builders did their damnest to destroy the City and di-vide our neighborhoods.
Now we can remove that damned spot, the concrete dinosaur, the hideous barrier that destroys our scenic views, the fence that keeps us from the Bay, the concealer of the Ferry Building.
Correct a mistake.

VOTE YES ON J.

Miriam Blaustein
Charlene Clark
Marie Cleasby
Zach Cowan
Dick Groboll
Rick Hauptman

Tony Kilroy
Jean Kortum
Ira Kurlander
Jack Morrison
Andy Nash
Norman Rolfe

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

NO ON PROPOSITION J.
"J" is for JOKE—a cruel joke on us. What will J really do?
Add traffic to every street east of Gough. Delay the construction of waterfront streetcar service. Cost millions in local dollars needed to improve MUNI. Create a ground-level freeway on the waterfront as big as Van Ness, with more cars.
I'm a private citizen who's concerned about traffic and what it's doing to our City. If you are too, vote NO on Proposition J.

Steve Colman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
• Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
• Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
• If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that—By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
—Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
—MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
—Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Blair C. Pascoe

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

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:
1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION A

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by boldface type.

3.202 Office of Risk Management
There is established under the chief administrative officer an office of risk management which shall review, analyze and report to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the finance committee of the board of supervisors the practices of the several departments, boards and commissions of the city and county regarding loss prevention and risk management, including the insurance requirements of the city and county. The office shall also establish and assist in the implementation of planning and operational guidelines regarding risk management and loss prevention for each department, board or commission. The chief administrative officer may appoint, at his or her pleasure, or contract with, a qualified individual or organization for the operation of the office. The qualifications of the individual or organization operating the office shall include relevant education, training and experience in insurance and risk management.

3.401 City Attorney
(a) The city attorney shall be an elective officer. He shall furnish an official bond in the sum of ten thousand dollars ($10,000). He shall appoint, and at his pleasure may remove, all assistants and employees of his office. He shall devote his entire time and attention to the duties of his office. He must, at the time of his election, be an elector of the city and county, qualified to practice in all the courts of the state, and he must have been so qualified for at least 10 years next preceding his election.

The city attorney must represent the city and county in all actions and proceedings in which it may be legally interested, or, for or against the city and county, or, any officer of the city and county in any action or proceeding, when directed so to do by the supervisors, except where a cause of action exists in favor of the city and county against said officer. Whenever any cause of action exists in favor of the city and county, the city attorney shall commence the same when within his knowledge or when directed so to do by the supervisors. He shall give his advice or opinion in writing to any officer, board or commission of the city and county when requested. Except as otherwise provided in this charter, he shall not settle or dismiss any litigation for or against the city and county, unless, upon his written recommendation, he is ordered so to do by ordinance.

The city attorney shall prepare, or approve as to form, all ordinances before they are enacted by the supervisors. He shall approve, by endorsement in writing, the form of all official or other bonds required by this charter or by ordinance before the same are submitted to the proper commission, board or office for final approval, and no such bonds shall be finally approved without such approval as to form by the city attorney. Except as otherwise in this charter provided, he shall not be a party in writing the draft or form of all contracts before the same are executed on behalf of the city and county. He shall examine and approve the title of all real property to be acquired by the city and county.

He shall keep on file in his office copies of all written communications and opinions, also all papers, briefs and transcripts used in matters wherein he appears; and books of record and registers of all actions or proceedings in his charge in which the city and county or any officer or board thereof, is a party or is interested.

(b) The duties of the city attorney in connection with the bureau of delinquent revenue collection shall be transferred to the city attorney for said bureau who shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

(c) There is established in the office of the city attorney a bureau of claims investigation and administration which shall have the responsibility of investigating, evaluating and processing for the several boards, commissions and departments all claims for money or damages made upon the city and county pursuant to section 7.03 of this charter or the general law of the State of California. Claim investigation functions of the police department in existence on June 4, 1986, shall continue as an adjunct to the bureau established under this section. Claims functions of the public utilities commission shall remain under that commission unless transferred to the bureau of claims investigation and administration by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the bureau shall also have the power to investigate events and occurrences giving rise to potential civil liability against the city and county and adjust and settle demands, within dollar limits to be established by ordinance, prior to their presentation as claims. There shall be established by ordinance a revolving fund to satisfy such demands adjusted to their presentation as claims. The bureau shall be responsible for the investigation of all claims and the analysis of city policies and practices upon which the bureau shall report and advise the several departments.

The city attorney shall appoint a chief of the bureau who shall serve at his or her pleasure. The chief of the bureau may appoint, subject to confirmation by the city attorney, investigators who shall serve at the pleasure of the chief; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by horizontal strikethrough.

3.100 Materials, Supplies and Equipment
The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreements for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract. All purchases in excess of one thousand dollars ($1,000) shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases and a permanent record of all such quotations shall be kept. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifteen-thousand-dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) for materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifteen-thousand-dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of materials, supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two or more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require such department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned and may advertise for
bids on the basis of such specifications, under condi-
tions permitting manufacturers of or dealers in other
articles made and sold for the same purpose to bid on
such specifications or on the specifications and pro-
own products. If the purchaser of supplies recom-
mands the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stat-
ning his reasons in writing therefor, and if the
department head concerned recommends the accep-
tance of any other bid on such proprietary articles,
statting his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall
be determined by the controller.
The purchaser of supplies shall require depart-
ments to make adequate inspection of all purchases,
and shall make such other inspections as he deems
necessary. He shall direct the rejection of all articles
which may be below standards, specifications or
samples furnished. He shall not approve any bill or
voucher for articles not in conformity with specifi-
cations, or which are at variance with any contract.
He shall have charge of central storerooms and
warehouses of the city and county. He shall also
have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair
of city and county equipment. All garages and shops
therefore maintained by departments for the con-
struction, maintenance, and repair of departmental
supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned
thereto, excluding the shop and personnel for fire
alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufac-
ture and repair operated by the department of elec-
tricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and
shop.
He shall, under the supervision of the controller,
maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and
equipment purchased for and in use in all depart-
ments and offices of the city and county. He shall be
responsible for the periodic check of such property,
and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be
due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the
mayor, the chief administrative officer and the con-
troller. He shall have authority to require the trans-
fer of surplus property in any department to stores or to
other departments.
7.103 Requisition, Contract and Payment
All purchase orders and contracts shall be based on
written requisitions, or, for materials, or supplies in
common use in the various departments, on the pur-
chaser's records of average use by all departments.
Purchase orders and contracts in excess of fifteen-
thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars
($50,000) must be approved by the chief administra-
tive officer. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the
board of supervisors shall be authorized to in-
crease or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount
of contracts requiring approval of the chief
administrative officer under this section. The pur-
chaser of supplies shall approve all bids and vouchers
for materials, supplies, equipment, and contractual
services before the controller shall draw and approve
warrants therefor. All contracts for the purchase of
materials, supplies and equipment shall be made after
inviting sealed bids by publication. All sealed bids
received shall be kept on file. When an award of con-
tract is made, notice that the same has been made
shall be given by one publication, and any interested
person may examine the bids and records at the pur-
chaser's office.
The purchaser of supplies shall by rules and regu-
lations, approved by the chief administrative officer
and the controller, designate and authorize ap-
propriate individuals within the purchasing de-
artment to exercise the purchaser's signature
powers for purchase orders and contracts ap-
proved as provided in this charter.
7.200 Public Works and Purchasing Contracts
The construction, purchase, rental, lease or repair of pub-
lic buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or
improvements, and the purchasing of supplies, ma-
terials and equipment, when the expenditure involved
in each case shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand
dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000),
shall be done by contract, except as otherwise
provided by this charter. It shall constitute official
misconduct to split or divide any public work or im-
provement or purchase into two or more units for the
purpose of evading payment of any purchases or provi-
sions of this section.
In an emergency, provided an actual emergency
be declared by the board of supervisors to exist, and
when authorized by resolution of said board, any pub-
lic work or improvement may be executed in the most
expedient manner. Notwithstanding any other pro-
vision in this section or this charter contained, upon
the approval of the chief administrative officer
declaring the work to be emergency in character,
there may be expended by the department of public
works the sum not to exceed five hundred dollars
($500) for new construction of any type in or upon
unimproved or unaccepted streets.
Any public work or improvement estimated to cost
less than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty
thousand dollars ($50,000) may be performed under
written contract or written order or by the employment
of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary
materials and supplies directly by the city and county.
Any public work or improvement estimated by the
city, other than routine repair work, shall be autho-
rized by the chief administrative officer when the cost
exceeds fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thou-
sand dollars ($50,000), or by the heads of depart-
ments not under the chief administrative officer, only
after detailed estimates have been prepared and sub-
mitted by the head of the department concerned.
There shall be separate accounting for each work
or improvement so executed, which accounting shall in-
clude all direct, indirect and supervisory elements of
cost chargeable to such work or improvement, and
each cost accounting shall be reported to the chief
administrative officer, or to the mayor when such work
shall have been performed by departments not under
the chief administrative officer. All such accounts
shall be reported to the controller. Any public work or
improvement costing less than fifteen thousand dol-
ars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) and
not performed by the city and county labor, materials,
and supplies shall, if not performed under
contract, be covered by written order or agreement
which shall be based on less than three bids, noti-
ce of which shall be given by three days' posting.
Records of such bids shall be kept by the department.
When the expenditure for any public work or im-
provement shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand
dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000),
the same shall be done by contract, except as other-
wise provided in this charter. The head of the depart-
ment in charge of or responsible for the work for
which a contract is to be let, or the purchaser of sup-
plies in the case of purchases of materials, supplies
and equipment, shall let such contract to the lowest
reliable and responsible bidder not less than ten days
after advertising by one publication for sealed pro-
posals for the work, improvements or purchase con-
templated. Each such advertisement shall contain the
reservation of the right to reject any and all bids.
The officer responsible for the awarding of any such con-
tract shall require from all bidders information con-
cerning their experience and financial qualifications,
as provided by general law relative to such investiga-
tions authorized by department of public works.
The purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the
chief administrative officer for bids in excess of fif-
teen-thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dol-
ars ($50,000), shall be determined by the board of
supervisors or by the committee to which he is respon-
sible, may reject any and all bids and readvertise for
bids.
The department head or the purchaser of supplies,
as the case may be, shall have power to sign such con-
tact for the estimated expenditures thereunder not in
excess of fifteen-thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty
thousand dollars ($50,000). Any contract involving
the expenditure of more than fifteen-thousand dollars
($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), if for the
purchase of materials, supplies or equipment, shall
require the joint approval of the purchaser of supplies
and the chief administrative officer. If such contract
is for any public work or improvement, it shall re-
quire the joint approval of the department head and
the chief administrative officer for amounts in excess
of fifteen-thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand
dollars ($50,000), relative to departments under his
jurisdiction, or the signature of the department head
and the chief administrative officer for departments
concerned for amounts not under the chief
administrative officer.
The board of supervisors, by ordinance, shall es-
stable procedures whereby appropriate city and county
departments may properly be allowed to perform any
type of work to be performed under contract. If
such bid is the lowest, the contract shall be awarded
to the department. Accurate units costs shall be kept
of all direct and indirect charges incurred by the
department under such contract, which unit costs shall
be reported to and audited by the controller monthly
and on the completion of the work.
In any case where the lowest gross price or unit cost
bid is not accepted, and a contract is entered into with
another bidder, written report shall be made to the
chief administrative officer, the mayor and the con-
troller by the officer authorized to execute the con-
tact, with the reasons for failure to accept such
lowest bid.
If any provision of this section is in conflict with
any provision of section 7.100 of the charter, the pro-
vision contained in section 7.100 shall govern and
control.
Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of
supervisors shall be authorized to increase or de-
crease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in
any provision of this section.
7.201 Public Works Contract Procedure by Ordinance
Nowherein any other provision of this charter
and, in particular, the provisions of section 7.200, the
board of supervisors shall by ordinance determine
the monetary limits not to exceed $50,000 fifty
thousand dollars ($50,000), within which the construc-
tion, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets,
utilities or other public works or head concerns may
do not contract or by written order by the em-
ployment of the necessary labor and purchase of the
necessary materials and supplies directly by the city
and county, consistent, save as to monetary limits,
with the manner provided for in section 7.200 and
section 7.100.
Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of
supervisors shall be authorized to increase or de-
crease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in
any provision of this section.

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.
point two commissioners to terms of one year each, one commissioner to a term of two years, one commissioner to a term of three years and one commissioner to a term of four years. Notwithstanding the terms of the commissioners shall be for four years from the commencement thereof. Not less than one-fourth of said commission shall be of the same sex, and one member shall have prior experience representing labor and one member shall have prior experience representing management.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of one hundred dollars ($100).

Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of hearing charges shall be held, adopting examination questions shall be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission, after the regular daily working hours of 8am to 5pm. Such persons or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

In accordance with section 3500, the commission shall have the power and it shall be its duty to appoint an executive assistant to be the administrative head of the affairs under its control who shall serve at its pleasure; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of assistant secretary to the civil service commission on the effective date of this section as amended shall continue to have civil service status in the position of executive assistant under the civil service provisions of this charter.

3661 General Powers and Duties
(a) The civil service commission shall be the employment and personnel department of the city and county and shall determine appointments on the basis of merit and fitness, as shown by appropriate tests. The commission shall classify and, from time to time, may reclassify, in accordance with duties and responsibilities of the employment, and training and experience required, all places of employment in the departments and offices of the city and county, not specifically exempted from this charter from the civil service provisions thereof, or which may be created hereafter by general law and not specifically exempted from said civil service provision. The commission shall likewise classify all other positions or places of employment in the city and county service specifically exempted from the civil service provisions of this charter, but which, by the provisions of section 8308 thereof, are made subject to classification for a ten-year standardization purposes on the basis of duties and responsibilities of the employment and training and experience required. The civil service commission shall be the judge of such classification.
(b) The civil service commission shall, in accordance with duties and responsibilities, allocate and, from time to time, may re-allocate, the positions to the various classes of the classification. The allocation or re-allocation of a position shall not adversely affect the civil service rights of an occupant regularly holding such position. No person shall hold a position outside of the classification to which he has been appointed, provided every employee of any department or office shall discharge any of the duties pertaining to such department or office to which his chief may temporarily assign him.
(c) The commission shall adopt rules to carry out the civil service provisions of this charter and, except as otherwise provided in this charter, such rules shall govern applications, examinations, eligibility, duration, determination of eligibles, certification of eligibles, appointments, promotions, transfers, resignations, lay-offs or reduction in force, both permanent and temporary, the filling of positions, temporal, seasonal and permanent, classification, approval of payrolls and other matters as are not in conflict with this charter. The commission may, upon one-week's notice, make changes in the rules, which changes shall be entered on file and become effective on the date of filing, provided that the rules of rules shall affect a case pending before the commission. The secretary may certify eligibles and payrolls and conduct examinations under the rules of the commission.
(d) The commissioners shall have power to institute and prosecute legal proceedings for violations of any section of the civil service provisions of this charter.
(e) The civil service commission shall establish an inspection service for the purpose of investigating the conduct of and action of appointees in all positions and of securing records of service for promotion and other purposes. All departments shall cooperate with the commission in making its investigations and any person who hinders the commission or its agents shall be subject to suspension.
(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the civil service commission shall by rule establish procedures to review and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ancestry, age, physical handicap, political affiliation, or membership or non-membership in a labor union, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. The determination reached under civil service commission procedures shall be final and shall be forthwith be enforced by every employee and officer.
3662 General Powers and Duties
(a) The civil service commission shall have the power to inquire into the operation of the personnel system of the city and county and shall make reports to the mayor concerning the operation of such system. Pursuant to section 3663, the mayor or any other officer of the city and county shall make such reports to the commission as the commission may require.
(b) The civil service commission may recommend to the personnel director, as established pursuant to section 3663, the mayor or any other officer of the city and county such action as the commission believes necessary to carry out the provisions of this charter. In any hearing conducted by the civil service commission or by any hearing officer it appoints, the commission or the hearing officer shall have the power to subpoena and require the attendance of witnesses and the production of records as provided in section 3701.
(c) The civil service commission may require periodic reports from the personnel director in a manner and form which it shall prescribe.
but not limited to, announcements, minimum qualifications, classes of applicants, components, construction, weighting, content, type, list length, duration and certification shall be final.

(c) The personnel director shall adopt personnel regulations which, except as otherwise provided in this charter, shall be given the same effect, persuasive and conclusive, as if they were issued under the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration and the exercise of the authority granted in this section, including, but not limited to, recruitment; appointments; examinations; eligibility; duration of eligible lists; certification of eligibles; promotion; impromptu examinations; regular performance evaluations; promotions; transfers; resignations; layoffs or reduction in force due to lack of work or lack of funds, reorganization, retrenchment or completion of work; and classification. No personnel regulations shall be adopted, amended or repealed without a prior public hearing upon at least two weeks public notice by the personnel director and after meeting and confer sessions with recognized employee organizations as required by state law. All civil service commission rules relevant to the powers and duties as provided for in sections 8.322, 8.323, 8.326, 8.328, 8.329, 8.330, 8.331, 8.332 and 8.340 of this charter shall become personnel regulations on the effective date of this charter amendment.

(d) The personnel director shall conduct the salary survey for the civil service commission as set for elsewhere in this charter.

(e) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall establish procedures to review and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, pecuniary status, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the personnel director shall forthwith be enforced by every employee and officer, unless the decision is appealed to the civil service commission in accordance with personnel regulations.

(f) The personnel director shall investigate all employee complaints concerning job-related conduct of City and County employees and shall promptly report to the source of the complaint. The personnel director by personnel regulation shall promote effective and efficient management through personnel programs that encourage high productivity and exemplary performance.

(g) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall provide a procedure for resolution of employee disputes which shall be consistent with other provisions of this charter and shall be utilized by all department heads and appointing officers upon the expiration of the existing term of any otherwise binding agreements.

(h) Consistent with the foreseen and other applications of this charter, the personnel director shall delegate to the various appointing officers appropriate personnel responsibilities, including but not limited to appropriate disciplinary procedures, and consult with appointing officers with respect to personnel regulations affecting their operations.

(i) Personnel services contracts shall be reviewed and approved by the personnel director in accordance with the provisions of appropriate personnel regulations. Personal services contracts reasonably expected to involve payment of more than $25,000 shall also be reviewed and approved by the Commission. Failure of the Commission to act within 30 days of submission of the contract by the personnel director shall be deemed to constitute approval by the commission.

(k) The personnel director shall establish a system of job classification. The provisions of section 8.200 shall govern whenever new classifications are created or existing positions are reclassified. The personnel director shall be the judge of such classification determinations.

(l) From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the department of personnel administration shall determine whether a position within a classification is, "in character," temporary or permanent. Appointments may be made on a permanent, temporary or, where confirmation is required, a provisional basis.

(m) Excepting sections 3.500, 3.660, 3.661, 8.105, 8.107, all but the second to the last paragraph of section 8.341, section 8.346, the last sentence of section 8.400, all but the last three words in the first sentence of the third paragraph of section 8.401, sections 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.406, 8.407 and this section, wherever the words "civil service commission" or "commission" appear in the personnel provisions of this charter, they shall be replaced by the words "department of personnel administration", "department", "personnel director" or "director" as the context permits, the word "rule" or "rules" shall be replaced by the words "personnel regulation" or "regulations," the words "general manager, personnel" and "secretary to the general manager, personnel" shall be replaced by the words "personnel director" and the words "section 3.661" shall be replaced by the words "section 3.662" or "section 3.663", as appropriate.

The clerk of the board of supervisors, after consultation with the city attorney, is hereby directed to conform the language of this charter as herein amended when next the charter is submitted for republication.

8.322 Protest of Written Questions and Answers —After the written portion of a civil service examination has been held, the questions used and the answers thereto shall be available for review by the participants. This review period shall not apply to questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written test. During the review period, participants shall have an opportunity to answer questions or examination items that may be incorrect or improper. After all protested items have been acted on and after the official rating key has been adopted and the identification sheets have been opened, further changes in the rating key shall not be made.

8.323 Protest of Tentative List of Eligibles —Any employee who has been placed second on a tentative list of eligibles shall be posted for the inspection of the public and of participants. The posting period shall be for a minimum of three (3) working days for the entrance examinations or five (5) working days for promotional or combined entrance and promotional examinations. The posting period shall end by noon on the fourth day after the inspection of the papers of each eligible shall be charged by the civil service commission. The amount of such fee shall be established by ordinance of the board of supervisors. The fee shall be waived for eligibles who wish to inspect their own papers. Inspection of papers shall include all documents supporting the eligibles rank and score except noting the identity of the examiner giving any mark or grade in an oral examination nor the questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written test, shall be included. Any objections under this paragraph shall be reviewed by the examiners and not the questions used in the examination. If no protests are received during the posting period the eligible list is automatically adopted. If protests are received during the posting period the investigation and action of the general manager, personnel, shall be expedited so that final adoption of the eligible list is not delayed beyond sixty (60) days after the date of posting. Eligibles who, as a result of their ranking, would receive a notice of appointment regardless of the results of the promotional examination, from adopted lists pending the resolution of any protest(s) and amendment to the adopted eligible list 8.326 Promotions in General —Except as specifically provided for in section 8.327, the Civil Service Commission shall provide for promotions in an employer-employee relationship on the basis of ability and merit, performance and promotional basis. Consideration shall be given to permanent employees in separate, promotional examinations and in promotional examinations which are combined with entrance examinations for city and county service. When the passing mark has been attained, the employee or employees with the highest scores and other credits. When an examination announcement is issued for a class on both a promotional and entrance basis, there shall be one resulting list of eligibles which shall include all successful candidates—both promotional and entrance—in order of relative performance. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this or any other provision of this charter, an employee who has been certified from a regularly adopted eligible list to a non-permanent position in a civil service classification shall be permitted to participate in promotional examinations and be considered for appointment to a position in that same classification subject to demonstration of satisfactory performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the civil service commission.

The provisions of this section are hereby amended so as to only be applicable to promotional examinations announced after its effective date.

8.328 Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave —Employees under permanent civil service appointment who, because of absence on duty authorized military leave after June 27, 1950, did not participate in a promotional examination held after June 27, 1950, and during time of war as defined in section 8.324 of this charter, and in which examination the employee would have been otherwise eligible to compete had the war not intervened, and which examination the employee was not eligible to participate in, shall be permitted to participate in an equal compensation examination—after abridgment of military leave, have the right to participate in a similar promotional examination. Provided that persons and employees who were on-entrance or promotional-eligible lists, shall, for the purpose of this amendment, be deemed to be eligible for examination. Any examinations from the time their names were reached for permanent certification while in the military service.

In order to qualify for participation in a similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section, such employee—whose desire to participate then made application in writing to the civil service commission—within thirty days after the abridgment of his military leave, or within thirty days after the effective date of this amendment, failure to file such written request to participate in a similar promotional examination as herein provided shall be considered a waiver of all rights of the employee to participate in such similar promotional examination.

The civil service commission shall arrange to hold such similar promotional examination within a reasonable time after employees eligible to request participation in any such similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section indicated their desire to so participate, or have waived their right to participate, as herein provided.

The civil service commission shall be the sole judge of the adequacy of such similar promotional examination. If the employee obtains in the similar promotional examination a score rating equal to or
more than the minimum passing mark established by the civil service commission for inclusion on the list of eligibles on the basis of original promotional examination, his name shall thereupon be entered on the eligible list resulting from the original promotional examination in accordance with the relative excellence obtained by all the qualified participants in the original and similar promotional examinations. Such employees shall be eligible to appointment from such list of eligibles in accordance with civil service rules to any vacancy thereafter occurring, and subject to satisfactory completion of a probationary period as provided in section 8.340 of this charter for a period of four years after the date on which their names were first entered on the eligible list and being in the continuance of procuring standing through examinations held subsequent to the original promotional examination.

If it is determined by the civil service commission that the name of such person would have been reached for permanent appointment from the list of eligibles established as a result of the original promotional examination during his term of military service, said the name of such person appeared thereon, then such employee, upon appointment to a permanent position as herein provided, shall be granted seniority in such appointment from the date his name would have been reached for appointment to the permanent position for which the said person may be found eligible, and seniority shall be used for the purpose of determining salary increments and calculating city and county service credits in other promotional examinations held subsequent to the similar promotional examination herein authorized. For all other purposes, seniority of service shall be determined from the date of the appointment as a result of qualifying in the similar promotional examination as herein authorized.

Such employees who qualify for appointment as a result of a similar promotional examination as herein provided, and who are appointed to permanent positions, shall be eligible for appointment to other promotion examinations in which they are otherwise eligible, while serving under probationary appointment in the position to which appointed as a result of the similar promotional examination, provided that certification from lists of eligibles established from such other examinations shall not be made until the employee has satisfactorily completed the aforesaid probationary appointment.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules to govern the administration of similar promotional examinations herein authorized, and appointments and other matters resulting therefrom.

8.329 Certification of Eligibles—Rule of Three

No positions established by the civil service commission of this charter is to be filled; the appointing officer shall make a certification to the civil service commission for a person to fill it. Thereupon, the commission shall certify to the appointing officer the names and addresses of the three persons standing highest on the list of eligibles for such position; in case the position is promotive, the commission shall certify the names of the three persons standing highest on such list. If there are fewer than three names on the list from which certification is to be made, there shall be certified the number thereof.

The appointing officer shall fill the position by the appointment of one of the persons certified. The provisions of this section as herein amended at the election of November 2, 1976, shall be applicable only to lists of eligibles finally adopted by the civil service commission pursuant to the provisions of section 8.323 of this charter on or after the effective date of this amendment. In making such certification, the section shall be disregarded except when a statute, a rule of the commission or the appointing officer specifies otherwise.

From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the commission shall determine whether the position is, in character, temporary, seasonal or permanent, and shall notify the candidate in accordance therewith to the end that the candidate may keep the knowledge of the nature of employment. The commission shall provide for such waiver of temporary or seasonal employment as it may deem just to candidates.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this or any other provision of the charter, an employee who has been certified from a list of eligibles to a permanent position in a civil service classification shall be entitled to appointment to a permanent position within the same classification before the commission certifies to the appointing officer the names and addresses of persons standing highest on the list and being eligible for appointment thereon, except that the commission, in its discretion, may, for good cause, appoint employees, subject to a demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the commission. The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to requirements for permanent positions filled from and after January 1, 1980.

8.330 Duration of Lists of Eligibles

The civil service commission may remove all names from the list of eligibles after they have remained thereon for more than two years and all names thereon shall be removed at the expiration of four years from the date of the examination. The commission may, however, provide in the examination announcement that the list of eligibles so secured thereby shall automatically expire at a date not less than two or more than four years after the adoption of such list.

8.331 Limited-Tenure Appointments

When in time of war declared by the Congress of the United States eligible persons are not available for appointment from registers established through the regular examination procedure as provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof, the civil service commission may qualify applicants for wartime appointments to positions through informal and non-competitive tests. Such tests and appointments resulting therefrom shall be governed solely by the provisions of this section and by rule of the civil service commission adopted pursuant thereto and the tests shall be adequate in the judgment of the civil service commission to determine the capacity of applicants to perform the duties of the positions to be filled placing reliance on lists of eligibles through the regular examination procedure as provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof. Such civil service commission may make limited tenure appointment thereto for a period not exceeding one hundred and thirty working days. Such non-permanent civil service appointments are made at the will of the employer and are subject to removal at any time, and shall cease prior to the expiration of such thirty working days at the time of their expiration.

If a list of eligibles exists for the position requisitioned, but immediate service is deemed necessary by the commission, appointments from such list may be made in accordance with the rules of this section as herein amended and on a temporary basis for a period not exceeding thirty working days. Such non-permanent civil service appointments, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such thirty working days at the time of their expiration. A list of eligibles shall be annually published and made available to the public in such a manner as to show the number of eligibles and the dates upon which they were placed on such list.

8.332 Temporary and Emergency Appointments

When no list of eligibles exists or no eligible is available on an existing list for a position in the class requisitioned by the appointing officer, and immediate service in the position is required by the appointing officer and another list exists which is deemed by the civil service commission to be suitable to provide temporarily the service desired, the commission shall certify for civil service temporary appointment an eligible from such list; if no such other list deemed by the commission to be suitable exists, the commission pursuant to its rules may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment thereto for a period not exceeding one hundred and thirty working days. Non-civil service or emergency appointments extended beyond ninety days must be approved by the civil service commission. Such non-civil service or emergency appointments, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such one hundred and thirty working days at the time a civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in section 8.329 of the charter.

If a list of eligibles exists for the position requisitioned, but immediate service is deemed necessary by the commission, appointments from such list may be made in accordance with the rules of this section as herein amended and on a temporary basis for a period not exceeding thirty working days. Such non-permanent civil service appointments, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such thirty working days at the time of their expiration.
8.340 Dismissal During Probation Period

Any person appointed to a permanent position shall serve a probationary period of six months. The civil service commission personnel director shall by rule establish a probationary period of not less than six months' service and up to a maximum of twelve months' service for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed ranks of the police department, Fire Department, sheriff's department and San Francisco International Airport police force shall be for twelve months except that, with respect to members of the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve months' service from the day following completion of the prescribed department field training officer program, but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment; provided further that probationary members of the uniformed ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in section 8.340 of this chapter. Any probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four months may be established for executive and management classifications. At any time during the probationary period the appointing officer may terminate the appointment upon giving written notice of such termination to the employee and to the civil-service commission specifying the reasons for such termination. Except in the case of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments the civil service commission shall review the termination. The civil service commission shall by rule establish the procedures for such review. If the appointment remains in force after the termination disqualifica-
tion may declare such person dismissed or may return the name to the list of eligibles under such conditions for further appointment as the commission may deem just. If the appointment resulted from a promotional examination the employee shall have the right of appeal and hearing before the civil service commission. The commission shall render a decision within thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person dismissed; or (b) order such person reinstated to the position without prejudice; and the commission may in its discretion order that the employee be paid salary from the time of the termination including any pay earned from the day of return of such person to a position in the classification from which that person was promoted and may reestablish the employee's eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same promotional classification under such conditions as the commission may deem just.

The decision of the commission shall be final. Immediately prior to the expiration of the probationary period the appointing officer shall report to the civil service commission as to the competence of the probationer for the position and if competent, shall recommend permanent appointment. Nothing in this section shall preclude the civil service commission from reviewing ing after a probationary period the future employ-
ability including terminations in the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments.

8.407 Definition of Generally Prevaling Rates of Wages

Notwithstanding any provision of section 8.401 or any other provision of any classification of this chapter to the contrary, generally prevalent rates of salaries and wages for those employees covered by section 8.401 of the charter shall be determined by the civil service commission as set forth below.

The civil service commission personnel director shall conduct a comprehensive investigation and survey of basic pay rates and wages and salaries in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment for like work and like service, based upon job classifications as provided in section 3656.3656 of this chapter and findings, based on facts and data collected, as to what are the generally prevailing basic pay rates for each benchmark class of employment solely in the manner hereinafter provided. A benchmark class is defined as a "key class" within an occupational grouping selected as the class for which a representative sample of data will be collected. Basic pay rate data for public and private employment shall be collected solely from the Bay Area counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, San Francisco and Santa Clara; provided, however, that for any benchmark class of employment for which the civil service commission personnel director determines there is insufficient data from Bay Area public jurisdictions the commission personnel director shall survey major public agencies in the state employing such class, major public agencies to be defined as these employing more than 3,000 persons.

The commission personnel director shall collect basic pay rate data for like work and like service from Bay Area public jurisdictions as follows:

(a) The counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara.

(b) The ten most populous cities in these five Bay Area counties based on the latest federal decennial census.

(c) Agencies of the state and federal governments and from school districts and other special districts in the six Bay Area counties as determined by the civil service commission personnel director. The commission personnel director shall collect private basic pay rate data from recognized governmental Bay Area salary and wage surveys of private employers in the city and county of San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. The data collected shall be limited to basic rates of pay and salaries actually being paid by public and private employers for like work and like service.

The term "prevailing rates of wages" for employers governed by charter section 8.401 and this section shall be defined as the rate ranges developed from the weighted average of the midpoint of the basic pay rates, excluding fringe benefits, for surveyed public and private employers for employees in the classification for private employment to be determined as follows:

1. Multiply the medians from the private and the midpoints from public employment data base by the number of employees in the given classification from each data base;
2. add the products of (1);
3. divide the sums in (2) by the total number of employees surveyed for that classification; and
4. extend this figure by 10 percent to establish the maximum of the range and reduce this figure by 10 percent to establish the minimum.

When fixing rates of compensation the board of supervisors shall make the payments as reasonably possible to prevailing rates, provided, however, that the board of supervisors shall not set the maximum rate of pay for any class in excess of the maximum prevailing rate for that class; provided further, however, that no employee shall have his basic pay rate reduced below the prevailing rates except as provided for in section 8.406. For those classifications of employment in which the practice is customary, the schedules of compensation shall provide for minimum, not less than three intermediate, and maximum salary steps and for a method of advancing the salaries of employees from minimum to intermediate to maximum in terms of service.

The term "basic pay rate" as used in this section is hereby defined as applying only to the basic rate of wages, with included range scales, and does not include any other benefits of employment or working conditions.

It is the declared intent of the qualified electors of the city and county that neither the board of supervisors nor the mayor have any power to provide any benefits of employment except those enumerated already provided for in the charter. An any additional deletion or modification of benefits of employment enumerated in the charter shall be submitted, as a charter amendment, to the qualified electors of the city and county. The qualified electors expressly state that they understand that benefits of employment are sometimes referred to as "fringe benefits" of employment and the qualified electors are not so referred to such benefits except those conditions of employment commonly referred to as "working conditions". Any reference to working conditions shall mean those compensations which must necessarily be provided in order for the employee to perform his job description duties efficiently and safely, and shall include but not be limited to such working conditions and benefits as are typically included in the administrative provisions of the salary standardization ordinance and the salary ordinance.

The board of supervisors mayor, in his or her discretion, may provide working condition benefits over and above the right this section and or section 8401 of this charter only in accordance with the following provisions:

(a) The civil service commission personnel director must determine, certify and recommend to the board of supervisors mayor that the working condition benefit is equitable and necessary for the efficient and safe performance of the employee's duties as enumerated in his job description.

(b) The working condition benefit, as recommended by the civil service commission personnel director, is substantially compatible for like work and like service to that provided for the job classification and is provided to not less than 50 percent of the employees of the class in the jurisdiction covered by the salary survey.

9.108 Initiative, Referendum, and Recall

(a) The registered voters shall have power to propose by petition, and to adopt or to reject at the polls, any ordinance, act or other measure which is within the power conferred upon the board of supervisors to enact, or any legislative act which is within the power conferred upon the mayor, on commission or chief officer to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinance, act, charter amendment or other measure may be so proposed by filing with the registrar a petition setting forth said measure in full, signed by registered voters of the city and county as many in number as the percentages hereinafter required of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor cast at the last preceding regular municipal election.

Any declaration of policy may be submitted to the electorate in the manner provided for the submission of ordinances; and when approved by a majority of the qualified electorate voting on the same, the commission or chief officer may enact an ordinance or ordinances to carry such policies or principles into effect, subject to the referendum provisions of this charter.

Any ordinance which the supervisors are empow-
ered to pass may be submitted to the electors by a majority of the board at a general election or at a special election called for that purpose, said election to be held not less than thirty days from the date of the call. Any such ordinance may be proposed by one-third of the supervisors, or by the mayor, and when so proposed shall be submitted to the electors at the next succeeding general election. No ordinance passed by the supervisors granting any public utility franchise
or privilege, shall go into effect until the expiration of sixty days from the date it becomes final. At the end of such sixty days such ordinance shall be in force and effect, unless within such period there shall be filed with the registrar a petition signed by registered voters equal in number to five percent of the entire vote cast for mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election, requesting that such ordinance be submitted to the voters. In case such petition is filed, such ordinance shall not go into effect until approved by a majority of the voters voting thereon at a general or special election.

If, before the time any other ordinance involving legislative matters becomes effective, there shall be filed with the board of supervisors a petition signed by qualified electors of the city and county equal in number to at least ten per centum of the entire vote cast for all candidates for mayor at the last preceding general municipal election at which a mayor was elected, protesting against the passage of such ordinance the same shall be suspended from going into operation, and it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to reconsider such ordinance, and if the same be not entirely repealed, said board shall submit the ordinance to the vote of said electors either at the next general municipal election or at a special election to be called for that purpose, and such ordinance shall not go into effect or become operative unless and until a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon shall vote in favor thereof. The provisions of section 9.109 and 9.110 of the charter shall apply to and govern the verification and certification of such petition.

Annual budget and appropriation ordinances, supplemental appropriation ordinances, the annual salary ordinance, or ordinances amending the same, the ordinances levying taxes, any ordinance appropriating money from the emergency reserve fund, ordinances authorizing the city attorney to compromise litigation, and ordinances necessary to enable the mayor to carry out any of the powers vested in him in the case of public emergency as defined in section 3.100 of the charter, ordinances enacted pursuant to section 1.05 of the charter, as well as ordinances relative to purely administrative matters, shall not be subject to referendum.

Any elective official, the chief administrative officer, the controller or any member of the board of education or public utilities commission may be recalled by the electors. The procedure to effect such recall shall be as follows: A petition demanding the recall from office of the person sought to be recalled shall be filed with the registrar. Said petition shall contain a statement of the grounds on which the recall is sought. Any insufficiency of form or substance in such statement shall in no way affect the validity of the election and proceedings held thereunder. No recall petition shall be filed against any officer until he has held his office for at least six months.

(b) In the event the representative of the board of supervisors, mayor and the representatives of recognized employee organizations do not reach an agreement through the meet-and-confer process on matters contained in the annual salary standardization ordinance by March 15th of any year, the mayor shall recommend and the board shall adopt approve or reject a schedule of compensation which reflects current prevailing rates for the classifications covered by Section 8.40 of this Charter the last good faith offer presented by the mayor or his or her representative.

In any year when an agreement on matters contained in the salary standardization ordinance has not been achieved, the civil service commission personnel director, upon receipt of a written demand from a recognized employee organization made upon the mayor and the personnel director shall prepare, prior to April 1, a schedule of compensation and administrative provisions which reflect additional rates that would be payable, and working conditions, based upon the last demands made by the recognized employee organization(s) which participated in the meet-and-confer process. Said schedule shall be transmitted to the registrar of voters for submission to the voters of the city and county at a general election or a special election called for the purpose, and said special election shall be held no less than sixty (60) days from the date of the call. No such schedule shall be withdrawn after it has been received by the registrar of voters. At said election, the ballot shall contain the following two alternatives:

(1) Approval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

(2) Disapproval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

If a majority of the valid votes cast in the election favor paying the additional rates set forth in the schedule of compensation based upon the last demands of the recognized employee organizations which engaged in the meet-and-confer process, it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to amend the salary standardization ordinance to reflect said increased compensation.

located across Phelan Avenue from the presently occupied campus of City College and consisting of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted. Section 4. The term "building permit" includes building permits, site permits and any other permits for the performance of construction work.

Section 5. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of the ordinance shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. No provision of this ordinance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent implementation of the policy stated above.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

NOTE: All sections are new.

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

Section 1. This ordinance may be called the "City College Public Lands Preservation Ordinance."

Section 2. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall disapprove or deny, WITH NO EXEMPTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS, any building permit application for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, which consist of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

Section 4. No member of the California State Legislature shall appear before any City and County board, department or commission as a compensated advocate representing a private interest.

Section 5. In the financing of city and county campaigns: (a) No person other than a candidate shall make, and no campaign treasurer shall solicit or accept, any contribution which will cause the total amount contributed by such person with respect to a single election in support of or opposition to such candidate, including contributions to political committees supporting or opposing such candidate, to exceed $500.00. (b) If any person is found guilty of violating the terms of this section, each campaign treasurer who received part or all of the contribution or contributions which constitute the amount by which such individual exceeded the $500.00 limit shall be required to provide not less than such amount in available campaign funds, if any, the amount received from such person in excess of the amount permitted by this section to the City and County Treasurer for deposit in the General Fund of the City and County. (c) This section shall not apply to any in-kind contribution of television or radio airtime to any candidate or committees granted to said candidate or committee pursuant to the "Fairness Doctrine" articulated in Cullman Broadcasting, 40 FCC 576 (1963). Section 6. Any person violating the terms of this ordinance shall be subject to the penalties set forth in San Francisco Charter Section 8.105. Such penalties shall include, but not be limited to, removal from office.

Section 7. If any provision of this ordinance, or its application to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, it is the expressed intent of the people of the City and County of San Francisco that the remainder of the ordinance, or the application of such provision, or any other provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

continued on page 78
rates and the same shall be in lieu of said annual compensation, and notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, said rates shall become effective and be payable as if adopted prior to April 1, of any year.

The provisions of sections 3.100 and 3.100-1, relating to the emergency powers of the mayor, shall not be applicable to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

11.105 Effective Date of Amendments
The effective date of the amendments, additions in or with, or makes loans to, South Africa.
(c) If any exception to the above policies is found to be necessary or appropriate, the responsible official must promptly and publicly report it to the Board of Supervisors, clearly describing the exception and the reasons for it.
(d) The term “city” includes all agencies, departments, officials, employees, units and subunits of the city and county of San Francisco, and all funds administered by or on behalf of the city or county.

3) WE CALL ON ALL OTHER PUBLIC BODIES AND PRIVATE OR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS TO ADOPT SIMILAR POLICIES.
(4) WE CALL A GENERAL PUBLIC BOYCOTT, FOCUSING ON THOSE COMPANIES HAVING THE GREATEST TIES TO APARTHEID.
The Board of Supervisors must determine and announce which company or companies are the worst offenders within each major industry, so that the public can focus its boycott on these companies.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION G

We the people of San Francisco declare this to be our policy:
1) IT IS IMPROPER TO PROFIT FROM OR PROVIDE SUPPORT TO THE RACIST POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SYSTEM IN SOUTH AFRICA, KNOWN AS APARTHEID.
Therefore it is necessary to sever commercial ties to South Africa, until people of all races obtain equal rights in that country, including equal voting rights.
2) COMPANIES HAVING SUBSTANTIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH APARTHEID MUST BE CONSIDERED IRRESPONSIBLE.
(a) The Board of Supervisors must determine which companies doing or seeking business with the city have the greatest ties to Apartheid. Companies that have a significant involvement in profiting from or maintaining the Apartheid system, may, on that basis, be deemed “irresponsible bidders.”

In purchasing goods and services and awarding other contracts, the city must give priority to avoiding such companies; the degree of the preference must be in proportion to the company’s complicity with Apartheid, according to the following criteria:
— how much business the company does in or with South Africa;
— how much the company profits from that business;
— how much support the company provides the Apartheid government in taxes, loans, payments or other funding;
— the nature of the company’s South Africa business;
— the degree of the company’s cooperation with South African political censorship or secrecy agreements;
— the degree to which the company provides the South African government with the technology, materials and other means to maintain and enforce Apartheid.

(b) City funds must not be deposited or invested with any bank or other company which does business in or with, or makes loans to, South Africa.
(c) If any exception to the above policies is found to be necessary or appropriate, the responsible official must promptly and publicly report it to the Board of Supervisors, clearly describing the exception and the reasons for it.
(d) The term “city” includes all agencies, departments, officials, employees, units and subunits of the city and county of San Francisco, and all funds administered by or on behalf of the city or county.

3) WE CALL ON ALL OTHER PUBLIC BODIES AND PRIVATE OR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS TO ADOPT SIMILAR POLICIES.
4) WE CALL A GENERAL PUBLIC BOYCOTT, FOCUSING ON THOSE COMPANIES HAVING THE GREATEST TIES TO APARTHEID.
The Board of Supervisors must determine and announce which company or companies are the worst offenders within each major industry, so that the public can focus its boycott on these companies.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION H

SUMMARY: This initiative states that the AIDS epidemic is a major public health problem of concern to everyone, requiring increased support for related medical research and education. It calls for a council for AIDS research and education or similar united effort to stop AIDS. The people of San Francisco hereby adopt the following policy:
The AIDS epidemic has rapidly become a major public health problem, costly both in human lives and in general community resources;
The first steps in dealing with such a crisis are:
— the scientific research needed to discover and understand the nature, causes, co-factors, prevention, diagnosis and treatment of the disease, and
— the education of the public about the lessons of that research;
A proper program of research and education pays for itself in the long run;
Prompt action is urgent, because of the rapidly growing number of persons affected, increasing not only the suffering but also the difficulty of eradicating the disease;
The leadership and support of such an effort is everyone’s responsibility;
While San Francisco’s role in the overall effort against AIDS has been viewed as a positive example to other areas, the continued rapid increase in the spread of the disease means that we cannot afford to rest on our laurels or leave further responsibility to others.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:
We call on all appropriate government bodies as well as medical, professional, charitable and community organizations and concerned individuals to join together in an all-out effort to stop AIDS;
We call for support to an organized united effort along the lines of an AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION COUNCIL, including, in some form:
— A COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, to provide informed evaluations as to priorities among research projects and proposals, recommending those which are most cost-effective and most likely to produce early results useful in the prevention or treatment of the disease, to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts or neglect of promising approaches, and to provide the council with complete and up-to-date information regarding comparative results of experimental treatments, prevention programs and other existing research;
— A COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, to inform the public regarding prevention and other research findings, and to inform relevant government officials and the general public, concerning the factual basis for a re-ordering of current public funding priorities toward an increased war against disease, including research and education against AIDS and related conditions;
— A FUND-RAISING COMMITTEE, to solicit donations, lobby for grants, organize benefits and other fund-raising projects spreading the financial burden by appealing to many sources;
We ask the council and committees to be responsive and accessible to public input, to include representation of all interested groups, to consider all viewpoints, and to be capable of prompt action;
We ask appropriate city officials to determine whether a suitable form of such a council already exists; if it does, we wish the city to support it actively; if not, we wish the city to seek to encourage its formation by such means as may appear proper.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION I

SUMMARY: This initiative asks “Shall we tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?” The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated portion of Route 480 known as the Embarcadero Freeway. This initiative declaration of policy will give the voters the opportunity to establish the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco regarding the proposed teardown of the Embarcadero Freeway.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION J

Shall the City replace a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if such replacement would open up the Waterfront to its citizens, improve the tax base, and create a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic?
Candidates

FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: The Bill of Rights guarantees that every person accused of a crime shall have the effective assistance of counsel. Whether an individual is rich or poor, that person is entitled to a competent and dedicated attorney.
In San Francisco it is the duty of the Public Defender to uphold this sacred right. In every case, we provide the client with the best defense under the law.
In the last 7 years, my outstanding staff has done this work with the highest degree of professionalism. In the next 4 years, that same strong, professional, independent and ethical representation will continue.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John D. Bardis, 501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative In Congress, 5th District
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1695 4th St., Clerk
Linda T. Friess, 830 35th Ave., Artist/Community Organizer
Brian Gotz, 55 22nd Ave., Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson, Sheriff of San Francisco
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Matti J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., International Vice President, ILGWU
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for Children & Youth
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070 26th Ave., Executive Assistant to Sala Burton M.C.
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Community Health Director
Linda Ann Post, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative
Jim Rivaldo, 430 Steiner St., Political Consultant
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Member, SF Community College District Governing Board
Yori Wada, 955 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel W. Walker, 562 Campbell Ave., President—Local 250-A Transport Workers Union of America
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiltirius Ave., Minister
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor
C. R. Zanca, 1966 Pacific Ave., Auto Repair Proprietor

FOR ASSESSOR

SAM DUCA

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I was elected your Assessor in 1978 and re-elected in 1982. My years in the Assessor’s Office were spent in a professional appraisal capacity personnel and administration. I have two university degrees, the coveted MAI designation, and am the recipient of a special Congressional Advisory Board award from the United States Congress. I have served in an advisory capacity, both nationally and internationally, in property tax administration and will continue to serve the taxpayers of the City and County of San Francisco in dealing with Article XIIIA of the State Constitution. My community involvement includes participation in cultural, civic business organizations.

Sam Duca

The sponsors for Sam Duca are:
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
Eugene L. Friend, 2910 Lake St., Investor
Nancy Pelosi, 40 Presidio Ter., Housewife and volunteer in politics
Walter H. Shorenstein, 700 El Camino del Mar, Chairman, Milton Mayer & Co.
Stanley Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Emma W. Louie, 1257 Jackson St., Housewife
Alfred S. Wilsey, 2590 Jackson St., Ch. of Exec. Comm. of Diversified Holding Co.
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
Geran Bakar, 2310 Hyde St., Investor
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management
Jane Macklakle Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired
Joseph C. Orrego, Sr., 866 Faxon Ave., Publicity Dept., - S.F. Giants
James A. Scatena, 101 Elmo Way, Chairman of the Board, Scatena York Co.
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher
Frances May McInteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Recreation & Park Commissioner
Frederick F. Campagnoli, 2609 Larkin St., Attorney
Betty Brooks, 1738 26th St., Field Representative
Jess Teruel Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Businessman
Cyril I. Magnin, 994 California St., Merchant
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John H. Swanson, 145 Lake Merced Hill South, Bowling Alley Owner
Francis G. Goldman, 945 El Cerrito Del Mar, Child Guidance
Irma M. Bernardo, 2822 34th Ave., Housewife
Leo J. Murphy, 61 Annapolis Terr., Real Estate Broker
Charles M. Cunningham, 475 Connecticut St., Self Employed
Lawrence V. Eppinette, 815 Fell St., Conf. Secretary
Mary M. O'Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Volunteer & Homemaker
Elizabeth R. Duca, 16 Wawona St., Homemaker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Application for Absentee Ballot
is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

Name ________________________________
Residence Address ________________________________
Mailing Address ________________________________
Signature ________________________________

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

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

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

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible. This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
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YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 5, 1986.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
• are a U.S. Citizen,
• are at least 18 years of age on election day,
• are a resident of California, and
• are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—at a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, such as this one, you can only choose among the candidates of your party.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Senator, State Assemblymember, County Central Committee, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your polling place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 3, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in”. If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

Q—Can a worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
• Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
• mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see enclosed card).

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

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
• your home address,
• the address where you want the ballot mailed,
• then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail by absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 3, 1986.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS CONCERNING VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

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

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando los dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

E 第一步
请双手中指向自动机将整张选票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.
Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos artículos que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con los dos cabecitos rojos.

E 第二步
请切记将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合於二红点之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.
Pero para votar, sostengo el instrumento de votar y perforo con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

E 第三步
请把带錐之選票針，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

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

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

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封接上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void. If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO ÚNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perforé la balota en el circulo que señala la flecha opuesto al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perforé la balota en el circulo que señala la flecha opuesto de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al numero de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el titulo del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perforé la balota en el circulo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SÍ" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borraduras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precincto y obtenga otra.

選民須知:

選民必須選擇任何其他候選人，請在選票上所點其中之候選人名打孔。如果在兩候選人以上
候選人名選付一候選，即在選票上所點其中之候選人中，選定你要選的候選人打孔，從不
要超過選票的規定數。

選民宣明的非候選的候選人，請在非候選候選人選票信封所提供的預定空位上寫下該候選人
所選選的單位和候選人的姓名。

選民選票，請在選票上所點 "YES" 或 "NO" 字樣的打孔。

選票上若有圖畫或污點等，選票作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔錯了，請撕或撕破了；或撕破了、撕破了非候選候選人的選票信封，應
把該選票返回選區的監票員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

請在下頁開始投票

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>HUGH G. BAGLEY</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRANK L. THOMAS</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EILEEN ANDERSON</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singer and Dancer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cantante y Bailarina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHARLES “CHUCK” PINEDA, JR.</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Hearing Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oficial de Audiencias Estatales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOM BRADLEY</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor, City of Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alcalde, Ciudad de Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>whose name does not appear on the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ballot, please refer to the posted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>instructions. Do not vote for more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>LEO T. McCARTHY</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicetribunador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of</td>
<td>MARCH FONG EU</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Secretary of State of California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretario de Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>whose name does not appear on the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ballot, please refer to the posted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>instructions. Do not vote for more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(CONTROLLER)  主計官

JOHN GARAMENDI
State Senator, Businessman
Senador Estatal, Hombre de Negocios

ALISTER McALISTER
Assemblyman, 18th District, California Legislature
Asambleista, Distrito 18, Legislatura de California

GRAY DAVIS
Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature
Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Legislatura de California

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

(TREASURER)  司庫

JESSE M. UNRUH
California State Treasurer
Tesorero del Estado de California

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

(PROCURATION GENERAL)  司法廳長

JOHN VAN DE KAMP
Attorney General, California
Procurador General, California

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member, State Board of Equalization</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BERT DE LOTTO</strong></td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraiser/Broker/Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxator/Intermediario/Agricultor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONWAY H. COLLIS</strong></td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization, Second District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(WRITE-IN)* To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United States Senator</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT</strong></td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Scientist-Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profesor-Especialista en Ciencias Politicas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHARLES GREENE</strong></td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Senior Legislature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro, Legislatura Superior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRIAN LANTZ</strong></td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultor de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALAN CRANSTON</strong></td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senador de Estados Unidos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROBERT J. BANUELOS</strong></td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Technician</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Técnico de Comunicación</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(WRITE-IN)* To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

**DEMOCRATIC PARTY**

**ELECCION PRIMARIA 3 DE JUNIO DE 1986**

**UNITED STATES SENATOR**
United States Representative

Barbara Boxer
Member of Congress
Miembro del Congreso

James Legare
Motor Truck Operator
Conductor de Camión

(There is no contest for State Senator in this district)
(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal)

Member of the State Assembly

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Legislator/Lawyer
Legislador/Abogado

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

Vote for Uno

158

160

162

178

180
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CATHERINE DODD</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNE BELISLE DALEY</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RON HUBERMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERENCE HALLINAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney-at-Law</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESSE J. IVY</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Deputy Sheriff</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSAN J. BIERMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAR JAICKS</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNETH JOHN AZBILL</td>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian Lawyer</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td>Community Service—Attorney</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WADE “SPEEDY” WOODS</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONY KILROY</td>
<td>Neighborhood Environmentalist</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES LEGARE</td>
<td>Motor Truck Operator</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLE MIGDEN</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LULU M. CARTER</td>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>Educadora</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Write-in) To vote for candidates not on the ballot, write the name and office title on the long side of your ballot.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>Daniel Nusbaum</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeanne Baird</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Honig</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessors</td>
<td>Sam Duca</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeff Brown</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(VOTE for 1) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

Nonpartisan Ballot

Primary Election
June 3, 1996

City & County

Election Primaria
3 de Junio de 1996

Assesor

Defensor Publico

Public Defender
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Veterans Bond Act of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $850,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Community Parklands Act of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for acquiring, developing, improving, rehabilitating, or restoring urgently needed local and regional parks, beaches, recreational areas and facilities, and historical resources.</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Water Conservation and Water Quality Bond Law of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $150,000,000 to provide funds for water conservation, groundwater recharge and drainage water management, and clarifies language in the Clean Water Bond Law of 1984.</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Deposit of Public Moneys in Credit Unions. Authorizes Legislature to provide for deposit of public moneys in any credit union. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect. Legislation already approved implementing measure could result in greater interest income to state and local governments.</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Property Taxation. Provides exception to property tax limit when acquisition or improvement of real property approved by two-thirds of voters. Fiscal Impact: By itself, measure has no fiscal effect. No increase can occur in local property tax rate unless bond issue is approved by two-thirds vote. State costs for tax relief programs could increase. State income tax revenues could decline as taxpayers deduct greater amounts for property tax payments.</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Allocation of Vehicle License Fee Taxes to Counties and Cities. Requires allocation of Vehicle License Fee taxes to local governments. Fiscal Impact: Measure would have no direct fiscal effect. Prevents Legislature from changing the law to take vehicle license fees away from counties and cities. Measure would not prevent state reducing other forms of aid to local governments or changing existing formula for dividing vehicle license fee revenues between counties and cities.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td></td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Legislators' and Judges' Retirement Systems. Limits retirement allowances for persons entering Legislators' and Judges' Retirement Systems after January 1, 1987. Fiscal Impact: Minor savings to state in future years if rate of inflation exceeds increase in salaries paid to current officeholders.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NÚMERO</td>
<td>VOTO</td>
<td>DESCRIPCIÓN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1960.- Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $850,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en la compra de granjas y casas para los veteranos de California.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE TERRENOS DE PARQUES DE LA COMUNIDAD DE 1960.- Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $700,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la conservación del agua, embalse y riego, y la conservación del medio ambiente.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ASIGNACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS POR PAGOS DE LICENCIA DE VEHÍCULOS A LOS CONDADOY CIUDADES.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>SISTEMAS DE JURISDICCIÓN DE LOS LEGISLADORES Y JUECES. Limite las penalidades de jubilación para aquellos que se afilien al Sistema de Jubilación de los Legisladores y Jueces después del 1º de enero de 1967. Impacto Fiscal: Ahorro maneras para el estado en años futuros si la tasa de inflación excede el aumento en los salarios que se pagan a los que actualmente ocupan cargos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

### STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>NONPARTISAN OFFICES. Prohibits a political party or party central committee from endorsing, supporting, or opposing a candidate for nonpartisan office. Fiscal Impact: No direct state or local government fiscal impact.</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. DISASTERS. Base-year value of property damaged or destroyed by disaster transferable to comparable replacement property in same county. Fiscal Impact: Local property tax revenues would decrease by an unknown amount. County assessor and tax collectors would have nonsignificant higher administrative costs. State would replace revenues lost by school and community college districts. State income tax revenues could increase due to lower property tax deductions on replacement properties. These state costs and revenues cannot be estimated.</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>MULTIPLE DEFENDANTS TORT DAMAGE LIABILITY. Plaintiff's non-economic damage recovery limited to defendant's liability based on defendant's percentage of fault. Fiscal Impact: Substantial savings to state and local governments. Savings could be several millions of dollars in a year, varying significantly from year to year.</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>COUNTY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county correctional facilities and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of four hundred ninety-five million dollars ($495,000,000).</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgments against the City?</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>PROPOSITION C HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THE BALLOT BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Letra</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Contenido</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>CARGOS NO PARTIDARIOS</td>
<td>Prohibir a un partido político o a un comité central de un partido político privado, apoyar o oponerse a un candidato a un cargo no partidario. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo a los gobiernos estatal o locales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE DESASTRE</td>
<td>El valor en el año base de propiedad inmueble dañada se reducirá en la medida que dicho daño afecte a la propiedad. Impacto Fiscal: Los ingresos provenientes de impuestos locales se disminuirán en un porcentaje. Los rendimientos de impuestos a la propiedad no se descontarán.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>RESPONSABILIDAD CIVIL MULTIPLE</td>
<td>Exige la indemnización total en juicios de agravios indemnizables. Los límites máximos de las indemnizaciones de los daños deben ser ajustados en el porcentaje de la culpabilidad del demandado. Impacto Fiscal: Los daños deben ser compensados por los gobiernos estatal y locales. Los daños pueden ser algunos millones de dólares al año, que variarán significativamente de año en año.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA INSTALACIONES CORRECTIONALES DE CONDADOS DE 1965</td>
<td>Permite la emisión de bonos por hasta $495,000,000 para financiar el construcciones y adaptaciones de las instalaciones. Impacto Fiscal: Los ingresos provenientes de impuestos aumentarán.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>&quot;¿Debe la Ciudad establecer una oficina de administración del riesgo y un despacho de investigación y administración de demandas, para estudiar y reducir el riesgo de pleitos y sentencias contra la Ciudad?&quot;</td>
<td>Impacto Fiscal: Aumento de los costos adicionales al presupuesto de la ciudad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OFICIALMENTE ELIMINADA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Letra</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Contenido</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>CARGOS NO PARTIDARIOS</td>
<td>Prohibir a un partido político o a un comité central de un partido político privado, apoyar o oponerse a un candidato a un cargo no partidario. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo a los gobiernos estatal o locales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE DESASTRE</td>
<td>El valor en el año base de propiedad inmueble dañada se reducirá en la medida que dicho daño afecte a la propiedad. Impacto Fiscal: Los ingresos provenientes de impuestos locales se disminuirán en un porcentaje. Los rendimientos de impuestos a la propiedad no se descontarán.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>RESPONSABILIDAD CIVIL MULTIPLE</td>
<td>Exige la indemnización total en juicios de agravios indemnizables. Los límites máximos de las indemnizaciones de los daños deben ser ajustados en el porcentaje de la culpabilidad del demandado. Impacto Fiscal: Los daños deben ser compensados por los gobiernos estatal y locales. Los daños pueden ser algunos millones de dólares al año, que variarán significativamente de año en año.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA INSTALACIONES CORRECTIONALES DE CONDADOS DE 1965</td>
<td>Permite la emisión de bonos por hasta $495,000,000 para financiar el construcciones y adaptaciones de las instalaciones. Impacto Fiscal: Los ingresos provenientes de impuestos aumentarán.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>&quot;¿Debe la Ciudad establecer una oficina de administración del riesgo y un despacho de investigación y administración de demandas, para estudiar y reducir el riesgo de pleitos y sentencias contra la Ciudad?&quot;</td>
<td>Impacto Fiscal: Aumento de los costos adicionales al presupuesto de la ciudad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OFICIALMENTE ELIMINADA**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## VOTER SELECTION CARD

**PRIMARY ELECTION**  
**JUNE 3, 1986**

**POLLS ARE OPEN**  
**FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.**

Fill out this card and take it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR CANDIDATE SELECTION
**MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS**

**D**
Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?  
**YES 288**  
**NO 289**

**E**
Shall the City deny or revoke any voire at Ocean and Phelan Avenue?  
**YES 209**

**F**
Shall the City prohibit compensation before any city commission, and candidate for municipal office to be?  

**G**
Shall it be the policy of the people greatest ties with South African?  

**H**
Shall it be the policy of the people and private organizations to station Council?  

**I**
Shall it be the policy of the people Freeway?  

**J**
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?  
**YES 310**  
**NO 311**

---

**VOTER SELECTION CARD**
Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>County Central Committee*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>5.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td>6.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>7.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>8.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>9.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate</td>
<td>10.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supl. Public Inst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See reverse side for Propositions.

*Refer to your sample ballot for the number of County Central Committee members to be elected. The number varies with each district.
PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

288 SI 贷成
289 NO 反对

"¿Debe la Ciudad transferir la administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil a un departamento de administración de personal que tenga poder para cambiar las normas del servicio civil que al presente constan en la Carta Constitucional?"

292 SI 贷成
293 NO 反对

"¿Debe la Ciudad negar o revocar cualquier permiso de construcción para edificar en la Represa Baboos en los Avenidas Ocean y Phelan en los próximos tres años?"

296 SI 贷成
297 NO 反对

"¿Debe la Ciudad prohibir la defensa remunerada efectuada por oficiales de la Ciudad y legisladores estatales antes de cualquier comisión de la Ciudad, y limitar la cantidad con la que una persona puede contribuir para un candidato a una oficina municipal en $500?"

300 SI 贷成
301 NO 反对

"¿Debe ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el bloquear las empresas que tengan mayor vinculación con la segregación racial sudaficana?"

303 SI 贷成
304 NO 反对

"¿Debe ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el apoyar a todas las organizaciones apropiadas, públicas y privadas, para establecer y mantener un Consejo para la Investigación y Educación sobre S.I.O.A. (A.I.O.S)?"

307 SI 贷成
308 NO 反对

"¿Debe ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el demoler el Autopista Embarcadero?"

310 SI 贷成
311 NO 反对

"¿Debe ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el recuperar parte de la Autopista Embarcadero, si este aumentara el acceso del público a la zona de los muelles y mejorar el tráfico?"
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT — An official list of candidates and propositions.

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

VOTE BY MAIL — See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

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

MEASURE — Another name for proposition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

COMPENSATED ADVOCACY — Compensated means being paid for doing something; Advocacy means speaking or writing on behalf of someone else. Proposition F concerns the issue of compensated advocacy.

RISK MANAGEMENT — This field covers two areas: (1) deciding on when it is better to buy insurance and when it is better to be self insured or uninsured, then shopping for the insurance; (2) identifying hazardous conditions on one's property and seeing that they are corrected so that liability and damage claims will be avoided. Proposition A concerns risk management.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

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

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

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

Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgments against the City?

YES 278
NO 279

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Consultants hired by the Chief Administrative Officer are available to City departments that have questions about "risk management", such as how to keep damage claims to a minimum and how to find the best insurance rates. In some cases, the departments use these consultants. In other cases, the departments make their own decisions. When damage claims are filed, some are handled by the City Attorney's Office and some are handled by City departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would amend the City Charter to create an Office of Risk Management, under the Chief Administrative Officer. The office would set risk management guidelines for all City departments, boards and commissions. Proposition A would also establish a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration in the City Attorney’s Office. The bureau would be responsible for investigating, evaluating and processing all damage claims made against the City, except those claims made against the Public Utilities Commission and the Police Department. The bureau would also have the power to investigate potential suits against the City and to make settlements within dollar limits to be set by ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer and a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want damage claims and risk management decisions to continue to be handled the way they are now.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not affect the cost of government. However as a result of its potential future application and the exemption of certain employees from the civil service provisions of the Charter, costs may be affected in an amount presently indeterminate."

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 10 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted "No."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 71
VOTE YES ON A

Last fiscal year, over 6,400 claims and law suits were filed against the City, costing us more than $10 million in settlements. I believe that it is time to change the way we handle our claims, secure insurance, prevent risks and settle legitimate claims against the City.

Last summer, we appointed a task force of citizens, under San Francisco Bar President Jerry Falk, to make recommendations on how to streamline our procedures and save money at the same time. The present system is very slow, costly, and inefficient.

Currently, all claims are investigated by the department involved. The City Attorney cannot act on any claim until the department is ready. This results in delay and duplication of effort and increased costs. A centralized and accountable Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney would be more efficient, cost-effective, and professional. It would enable the City to settle many claims quickly, before litigation is begun, saving the City the costs of defending itself in court and lowering the average cost of settling a case.

This can be accomplished without creating new jobs by sim- ply moving into one office the city positions presently scattered throughout the government.

Vote “Yes” on A. Reduce the cost of City government.

Adoption of this measure would also formally establish responsibility for Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer, where it has been unofficially since 1978. With this strengthened authority, the Risk Management Office would be responsible for the gathering of claims data on a City-wide basis, the creation of incentives for both reducing the possibility for injuries and damage and the number of claims for each department, the coordination of insurance purchasing and specific suggestions to avoid and reduce risk.

This amendment is presented with the recommendation of the Mayor’s Task Force on Claims and Judgments, the Chief Administrative Officer, City Attorney, the President of the San Francisco Bar Association, and the President of the Lawyers’ Club of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Each year the City spends almost $10 million to settle damage claims. It is estimated that the overall costs to the City for all risk-related activities exceeds $125 million a year. It is time for action to be taken to reduce these huge expenditures. This charter amendment is designed to do just that.

Claims Investigation and Adjustment

Right now, the City claims investigation process is decentralized and largely unorganized. Each department investigates its own claims. Investigators may or may not be specially trained for their duties. There is no uniformity of investigation procedure or claims reporting. In only a few departments do investigators contact injured parties within days of an accident in order to settle the claim quickly and economically.

This amendment will create a claims investigation and adjustment bureau in the Office of the City Attorney. Claims investigation and adjustment activities will be centralized, economized and made much more efficient. The new bureau will be able to respond immediately to accidents and claims, providing quick compensation to deserving persons while at the same time producing a prompt, professional investigation. This reform is greatly needed.

Risk Management

Presently, there is no overall plan for the management of the City’s risk exposure: insurance purchasing, avoidance of industrial accidents, gathering data on accident patterns, etc. Again, risk management as a function is fragmented among the various City departments. As a consequence, departments cannot develop the necessary expertise to manage themselves to reduce risk-related costs.

This measure will establish a risk manager under the Chief Administrative Officer. For the first time, overall City planning will be possible in order to control risk. Departments will be told what activities are producing injuries or damage and advised on corrective measures. Private industry has been utilizing risk managers of this type for years. It is time that the City did the same.

This amendment will reduce the cost of government and insure a more efficient delivery of City services to all San Franciscans. We urge you to give it your unqualified support.

Board of Supervisors

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This charter amendment was proposed by a citizens' task force appointed by Mayor Feinstein. Its mission was to propose ways of reducing the number and financial costs of claims and lawsuits against the City.

The amendment has two principal features. The first is to centralize within the City Attorney's office the investigation of claims filed against city departments. This will allow for improved training and supervision of the investigators, who presently are scattered throughout city government. The result will be more efficient, cost-effective and professional investigation of claims. By improving the quality of claims investigation, the City can identify those claims which have merit and attempt to reach early — and less costly — settlements. Meritorious claims will be denied with greater confidence that if suit is filed it can be defended successfully.

The second major feature of the amendment will establish a Risk Management Office under the Chief Administrative Officer. Risk management is a concept widely used in private business. Risk managers are professionals skilled in reducing the overall cost of claims. The Risk Manager would be responsible for coordinating the City's insurance program, data collection, and correcting problems within the City which lead to claims. The Risk Manager would review those claims which have been filed against the City. Where it appears that an unsafe condition or practice has led to a claim, the Risk Manager would suggest to the affected department that corrective measures be taken. Reports to the Mayor and to the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors of the recommended corrections and the actions taken would ensure that the various departments will be responsive.

The City cannot eliminate claims and lawsuits against it. But it can limit its exposure by managing the claims process more effectively. This measure will reduce injuries and reduce claims, and that is good for everyone.

Jerome B. Falk, Jr.
Chair, Mayor's Task Force on Claims and Judgments Against the City

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTPDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, May 31, 1986

12 Noon State Senate, Assembly, Congress and State Propositions
1:00 Proposition A — Risk Management & Claims
1:15 Proposition B — Purchaser & Contracts
1:30 Proposition D — Civil Service
2:15 Proposition E — Balboa Reservoir
2:30 Proposition F — Compensated Advocacy
3:00 Proposition G — Apartheid
3:20 Proposition H — AIDS
3:30 Propositions I, J — Embarcadero Freeway
3:50 Statewide Candidates

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

PROPOSITION B

Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?

YES 281

NO 282

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchaser must get the approval of the Chief Administrative Officer before signing certain contracts for more than $15,000. Only the voters may change that dollar limit. The Purchaser must personally sign every contract that comes through his office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would raise the limit on contracts requiring the Chief Administrative Officer's approval to $50,000. It would also allow the Board of Supervisors to change that limit by ordinance. Proposition B would also permit the Purchaser to name certain people in his office to sign contracts on his behalf.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer's approval only on contracts for more than $50,000. You also want the Purchaser to be able to name certain people in his office to be able to sign contracts on his behalf.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to require the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer's approval on contracts for more than $15,000. You also want him to sign all contracts himself.

Controller's Statement on "B"

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On March 3 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON B!

The City's Charter requires that a permanent, non-elected City official, the Chief Administrative Officer, review all purchases and contracts above $15,000. Of course, CAO approval of major contracts is very important. But, due to inflation, the number of contracts that have to go to the CAO for approval is always increasing. Today there are too many documents requiring CAO approval. This slows down the purchasing process, occupies staff time—and ultimately costs the City money. Proposition B will raise the CAO approval level to $50,000, and help the City to improve the efficiency of its purchasing operations.

The City’s budget includes more than $250 million for purchases on tens of thousands of contracts. At the current $15,000 review limit, the CAO must approve thousands of documents every year—a costly, time-consuming process. In the long run the City loses money because of the inordinate length of time required to complete all the paperwork.

An adjustment must be made to remove the smaller contracts from this cumbersome process. Review and approval of contracts under $50,000 should be under the responsibility of the City Purchaser, a highly trained and experienced professional, who reports directly to the CAO. By changing the present $15,000 to $50,000, it will be possible for the CAO to give each document that comes to him the attention it requires. And, by placing its orders and paying its bills faster, both the City and businesses will benefit—especially small business and those owned by minorities and women.

Proposition B will allow future adjustments to the limit to be made by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility will ensure the City’s ability to adjust to inflation and changes in the market.

This amendment comes to you with the recommendation of auditors, controllers, bankers, and others who exercise fiduciary responsibility within their own organizations.

VOTE YES ON B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor.
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will make essential changes to update the purchasing and payment procedures under the Chief Administrative Officer. These measures are necessary and desirable because they will save the City money by significantly increasing our management efficiency.

Right now, the City loses because it takes too long for contracts to be reviewed and payments okayed, which means that early payment incentives go unutilized. The CAO has to approve every contract greater than $15,000—and with City purchases last year over $250 million, the paperwork logjam is vast and overwhelming.

An increase in the review limit from $15,000 to $50,000 will make an adequate adjustment for inflation—$50,000 now is only about $15,000 in 1967 dollars. Proposition B will also enable the City Purchaser, who reports to the CAO, to maximize potential savings through early payments by designating appropriate personnel to approve contracts up to $50,000. These “Good Business” amendments are consistent with private sector practices and should be incorporated by the CAO in the City’s best interests.

Finally, Proposition B will give the City the ability to respond quickly to changes in the market place by allowing changes in the CAO review limit by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility is necessary to ensure that in the future we will not lose money because of institutional rigidity. Control is maintained with the necessity of Board action and Mayoral approval to adjust the review limit, and this same feature will allow for change when desired.

Vote yes on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

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

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?

YES 288
NO 289

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the civil service system of the City of San Francisco. The structure of the civil service system and certain rules governing its operation are written into the Charter and can only be changed by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would make major changes. A Department of Personnel Administration would run the Civil Service system and would be able to change rules with Commission approval. Major features of Proposition D are described below. The complete charter amendment is printed in this voters’ handbook.

Department of Personnel Administration

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Certain civil service rules governing the general operation of the system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs, are written into the Charter and carried out by the Civil Service Commission. Only the voters can change these rules.

THE PROPOSAL: A department of Personnel Administration would be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. A Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor would run the Department. Certain rules governing examination, selection and appointment would be taken out of the Charter. The Personnel Director would be able to change these rules with the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

Civil Service Commission

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the general operation of the civil service system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs. The Commission also hears and decides appeals on civil service matters.

THE PROPOSAL: The Civil Service Commission would no longer be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. The Commission could investigate the operation of the system, approve rule changes proposed by the Personnel Director, and hear and decide appeals only on claims of job discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest.

Employee Relations

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors appoints an Employee Relations Director to negotiate contracts with City employees; the Board approves all contracts.

THE PROPOSAL: The Mayor or his or her agent would negotiate with City employees; the Board of Supervisors would still approve all contracts.

What your vote means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing civil service system.

CONTROLLER’S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE
Controller's Statement on “D”

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not directly affect the cost of government, as it removes many civil service policy setting functions from the Charter and an independent Civil Service Commission and transfers responsibility for personnel matters, including labor negotiations, to the Mayor.

"As a product of its inherent flexibility and possible future application, costs could be affected or savings realized in amounts presently indeterminate but probably substantial."

How "D" Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative Charter amendment rewriting the civil service provisions of the Charter had qualified for the June ballot.

Robert Bradford, Jonathan Bulkeley, Lee Munsen and Mary Hilton, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 36,049 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1983.

A random check of the petition showed that 25,027 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

POLS CLOSE AT 8:00 p.m.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. Consistent with the City's and County's affirmative action goals, no applicant or employee shall be selected, appointed, reduced in rank, removed or in any way favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, union activities, political affiliation or sexual orientation.

(b) The purpose of the civil service system is to obtain for the city and county the best qualified persons to fill city and county positions in a timely and economical manner, using professional, fair and equitable personnel selection and personnel management practices with consideration of the following merit principles:

1. Recruiting, selecting and advancing employees on the basis of their ability, knowledge, skills and performance relative to the work to be performed.

2. Establishing equitable and adequate compensation, as provided elsewhere in this charter.

3. Training employees, as needed, to promote productivity and high quality performance and to facilitate career development.

4. Retaining employees during good service and separating employees for good cause.

5. Assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration, with proper regard for their privacy and constitutional rights; and assuring equal employment opportunity, based on the person's ability to do the job.

6. Assuring that employees are protected against coercion for political purposes and are prohibited from using their official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the outcome of an election or a nomination for office.

(c) This charter does not limit the power of departments, agencies, or other subdivisions of the city and county in their exercise of management prerogatives including but not limited to:

1. Directing employees in the performance of their duties;

2. Hiring, promoting, transferring and assigning employees from those qualified;

3. Classifying positions in accordance with Section 3.663 (k);

4. Disciplining employees;

5. Laying off employees because of lack of work, lack of funds or other reasonable cause; and

6. Determining the mission of its departments and divisions, and its budget, organization, the number of its employees, and the numbers, types, classifications and grades of positions or employees assigned to an organization unit, work project, shift or tour of duty, and the methods and technology of performing its work.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. No person shall in any way be favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, age, religion, national origin or other non-merit factors.

—Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in subsection (a) or any other provisions of the charter, it shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, consistent with a policy of acquiring qualified personnel for the service of the city and county, to encourage the hiring of blind persons. It shall further be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that no otherwise qualified blind person shall be discriminated against in examination, re-examination, appointment, re-appointment, waiver of eligibility for appointment or re-appointment, promotion or demotion in any class, subclass or position in the civil service unless eyesight is indispensable for the performance of the duties and responsibilities of the class, subclass or position. It shall be the duty of the commission to classify, and from time to time it may reclassify, places of employment in the civil service the duties of which may be efficiently performed by sighted-blind persons and to conduct appropriate examinations which will fairly test the capacity of blind persons as well as sighted persons to perform such duties.

2.203-2 Employee Relations Director

—Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3.310 of this charter, the employee relations director shall be appointed by the board of supervisors and shall hold office at the pleasure of said board.

3.102 Employee Relations

It shall be the duty of the mayor to meet and confer with employee representatives on behalf of the city and county and all its constituent boards, commissions, departments and agencies as required by applicable law. These duties may be performed by a designee of the mayor who shall serve at the pleasure of the mayor. Nothing herein shall limit the mayor from contracting for the performance of these duties.

—Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the mayor shall submit all memoranda of understanding or ordinances to be enacted pursuant to Article VIII of this charter herein to the Board of Supervisors for its approval or rejection.

3.660 Commission; Composition; Meetings

There is hereby established a civil service commission, which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county shall have the general powers and duties set forth in Section 3.661.

The civil service commission shall consist of five members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and this charter section as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms of the officers which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by this amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981. And their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years, beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote YES on D

Vote YES and join 34,000 San Franciscans who signed petitions to get this crucial reform on the ballot. "D" clears the way to modernize Civil Service so that it is fair and efficient. The present system is a 50-year conglomeration of rules that tie the City’s hands—

- A protest by one applicant can hold up hiring for an entire job classification for months—even years.
- Often tests cannot be given frequently enough to maintain current tests of qualified employees. This leads to delays and temporary appointments that make hiring top candidates all but impossible.
- Appointments to jobs are restricted to the top three names on a list even though more than three people have the same score!
- Many provisions are out of date. Some deal with hiring during the Korean War. Others limit our ability to carry out affirmative action.

"D" would remove archaic rules from the Charter so they could be changed as the times require—subject to meet and confer and public hearings. Job tests could be expedited; hiring and promotions speeded up; opportunities opened to women and minorities.

Specifically, Proposition D:

1) Creates a Department of Personnel Administration at no additional cost. Like other U.S. cities, day-to-day administration would be the responsibility of a director, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Supervisors.

2) Makes the Civil Service Commission the oversight body to set policy and hear appeals. Rulings would have to be within 60 days, eliminating endless delays.

3) Moves the office of labor relations from the Supervisors to the Mayor, who must make the tough-minded decisions to balance the budget. Never again could the Board give labor $27 million for "comparable worth."

This reform is the product of years of work with SPUR, League of Women Voters, Chamber of Commerce. Members of the Board of Supervisors could have put the reform on the ballot last year but bowed to some labor leaders, and 34,000 San Franciscans had to do the job for them.

Proposition D will enable City government to work better for you. Vote YES.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON 'D'

Proposition D is a complex proposition with a simple goal: remove the archaic restrictions on the hiring, promotion, or firing of city employees and bring San Francisco’s personnel system into the modern age.

Archaic is the only way to describe a system that keeps equally qualified people from competing for a job, and that takes months—sometimes years—to fill vacancies.

For example, if 50 people score equally high on a competitive examination, shouldn't they all have a chance for any job for which they are eligible? Not under the current system, which requires complicated tie-breaking rules not at all related to a person's qualifications or abilities.

Or what about being able to hire the best person available for a given job? Currently, eligibility lists are frozen for two years and every person on each list, including the lowest-scoring, must be offered a job before the highest-scoring person on a more recent list. Private businesses couldn't function saddled with such absurdities.

Proposition D cuts through the red tape. It creates a modern personnel department, with a director responsible for carrying out rules to ensure fairness and efficiency. Accountable to the Mayor, the director would be selected from a list provided by the Civil Service Commission, and subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.

The Civil Service Commission remains an independent body, with the right to approve new personnel rules and hold hearings on abuses. Also under 'D', negotiations with employee unions would be under the Mayor, subject to approval by the Supervisors, providing checks and balances in balancing our budget.

With greater accountability and continued checks and balances, Proposition D will open the way to more efficient government in our City.

Bill Maher, Supervisor
Louise Renne, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON 'D'

Proposition D is a necessary reform to the City's Civil System. As the City’s Chief Administrative Officer for almost ten years, I have found that quality employee hiring is difficult and the process causes long delays.

The current system is:

- inflexible. The City cannot hire and promote the most qualified persons.
- inefficiently administered by a commission. Other large (continued)
Civil Service

Cities do not have such a bureaucratic process.
• antiquated. Civil service rules represent practices of the 1950s rather than the 1980s.

The new system:
• allows the Mayor to appoint an effective personnel director, who controls administration and procedures.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

It's 1986 and we're still trying to manage City business as if it were 1932. As heads of City departments, charged with the daily responsibility of putting out fires, fighting crime, maintaining hospitals, parks, libraries and providing other essential services, we know from bitter experience about shortcomings of the existing Civil Service System.

Enacted with the City Charter in 1932, the system is foundering in red tape. Outdated rules are the subject of endless challenges. Tests are put off; vacancies go unfilled; promotions delayed; any appeal, however groundless, stops the process in its tracks.

Proposition D would take old procedures out of the Charter so they could be changed in an orderly process by the Civil Service Commission, which also would hear appeals.

Day-to-day administration of the tests — the content, scoring, all the myriad details of managing a complex system, would be put into a modern, highly professional personnel office. Tests would be speeded up. Hiring would keep pace with need. Promotions would be on the basis of competence. High performance would be the standard. Discipline could be imposed with working rights fully protected, and women and minorities would be assured equal opportunity.

Proposition D will help improve management and the quality of City services. Vote Yes on D.

Frank Jordan, Chief of Police
Emmett Condon, Fire Chief
Don Birrer, Director, Public Works
Mary Burns, General Manager, Recreation & Park
John Franz, City Librarian
Eugene Garrland, Director, Port
Marvin Geislinger, Purchaser
Wilbur Hamilton, Executive Director, Redevelopment Agency
Claire Isaacs, Director, Arts Commission
Ray King, Director, Parking Authority
Dean Macris, Director, City Planning
Grant Mickins, Director, Human Rights Commission
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, PUC
Joyce Ream, Director, Aging
Ed Sarsfield, General Manager, Social Services
Thelma Shelley, Managing Director, War Memorial
Moira So, Executive Director, Community Development
Louis Turpen, Director of Airport
Dr. David Werdegard, Director, Health Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The hiring practices outlined in San Francisco City Charter have been virtually unchanged since 1931, a severe handicap in running a modern city. Proposition D is designed to streamline the charter and ensure that the rights of present city employees and candidates for city jobs are protected, while improving the hiring process itself. The initiative also builds management accountability in the city system.

Proposition D Is More Fair, More Efficient, More Economical

The day-to-day personnel functions, including hiring, will be consolidated under a Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. Decisions of the Director of Personnel on examination content and administration are final, unless a decision is stayed during the appeal process by a unanimous vote of the Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D will make it easier to modernize the many archaic Civil Service rules and procedures now included in the Charter, while maintaining a strong and independent Civil Service Commission to safeguard the merit system and protect the rights of city employees. Many detailed rules will come out of the Charter and will become personnel regulations. These regulations can then be modernized, but only through a process which includes public hearings and meet and confer sessions with the union involved. In addition, the Civil Service Commission must approve any changes or new regulations governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfer, resignation and terminations.

Proposition D Will Improve Performance And Public Confidence

The openness and fairness of the proposition will benefit everyone. Well-qualified job candidates will have a better chance of being hired, and well-qualified job holders will have a better chance of being promoted. This means generally better job performance in all departments, resulting in higher employee morale and more public confidence in city government.

Submitted by
Louis Hop Lee, President
Civil Service Commission
Lee Munson, Member Civil Service Commission and Treasurer, San Franciscans for Fair and Efficient Government

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D
Cities can survive only with strong management. The greatest budgetary restraint must be exercised to assure that full value is received for each tax dollar spent.

With firm limits on what it can spend and faced with a possible loss of Federal funds next year, the City must be managed with the greatest possible efficiency.

Essential to greater efficiency is the need for Civil Service reform. As members of City Commissions, we constantly confront the tortuous delays and confused rules that gridlock the present system. The present system simply can't respond to the City's personnel needs.

Qualified applicants become frustrated and seek employment elsewhere. Promotions are blocked. Morale suffers. Temporaries fill in; overtime mounts. The ability to plan is crippled; management is weakened.

Proposition D would put the system on a business-like basis. A personnel department would handle day-to-day administration. The Civil Service Commission would be the watchdog to assure the integrity of the merit system.

This streamlined system would replace what is now inflexible and cumbersome. Testing could be accelerated; hiring made more efficient and promotions made on time. The result would be greater efficiency and elimination of costly waste.

Vote Yes on D.

Jerry E. Berg, President, Board of Permit Appeals
Henry Berman, President, Fire Commission
Mo Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
John Blumenta, Health Commission
Hector Chimachila, Rent Board
Rev. Harry Chuck, Housing Authority
Dr. Arthur Coleman, President, Port Commission
Owen Davis, Police Commission
J. Edward Fleishel, Airports Commission
H. Welton Flynn, President, Public Utilities Commission
James Foster, Health Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation & Park Commission
James Fussell, President, Housing Authority
Anne Halade, Port Commission
Tommy Harris, Recreation & Park Commission
Tom Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Walter Jebe, Public Library Commission
Jeffrey Lee, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Philip Lee, President, Health Commission
Bruce W. Lilienthal, Small Business Advisory Commission
Jacqueline Nemernovski, President, Arts Commission
Toby Rosenblatt, President, Planning Commission
Dr. David Sanchez, President, Police Commission
Joan San Jule, Housing Authority
John Patrick Short, President, Parking Authority
Marjorie G. Stern, President, Public Library Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D contains civil service reform measures urged by the League of Women Voters since 1969.

Proposition D will:
— Modernize the City's outdated personnel system by creating a Director of Personnel, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors
— Preserve the principles of merit through policies set by the Civil Service Commission
— Create a more responsive Civil Service system at no additional cost to the taxpayer

EFFICIENCY AND FLEXIBILITY
Proposition D transfers authority for day-to-day management of the City's personnel system from the Civil Service Commission to the Director of Personnel. This will:
— Prevent hiring delays
— Ensure only the most qualified individuals are hired and promoted
— Provide City managers with more administrative flexibility

FAIRNESS FOR EMPLOYEES
Proposition D will:
— Safeguard the rights of City workers
— Protect gains made in hiring women and minorities
— Retain the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit appeals board
— Retain the ability of the City's unions to negotiate working conditions
— Create a system that can respond quickly and fairly to the needs of City workers

Proposition D will bring the Civil Service system into the 20th century by making the Mayor accountable for the management of a system employing more than 25,000 people. Hiring by merit is still guaranteed by the Charter. Please join us in voting for this Reform!

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
Esther Marks, Past President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote Yes on Proposition D the Civil Service Modernization Initiative.

Prevent abuse of a system that was intended to serve the public and protect against favoritism. Prevent situations like this: an employee failed to report to work for a week without explanation; he was telephoned, notified by certified mail and a message left under his door; he was terminated 13 days later; he did not appeal the termination and the civil service commission up-
held the termination. Two months later, the employee petitioned the commission for reinstatement. The employee got his job back, not because the process of termination was wrong but because the commission had a long standing objection to using "absent without leave" as a reason for firing.

The quality of public services is dependent upon the effectiveness of the staff who deliver them. The primary role of the civil service commission should be to facilitate recruitment and retention of the best available personnel. It must protect against favoritism and must assure that everyone has an equal and fair chance at employment.

The present system does not do that. We feel this initiative will make the system work better, for the managers, for the employees and for the public.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco government is huge, with a budget of more than $1 billion per year and 25,000 employees. It is expected to solve serious problems. This requires that the City have the ability to hire and promote talented people to do the job.

The present civil service system is so tied up in red tape that jobs remain vacant for six months to a year, and all too often someone who is not capable of doing a good job is hired. Your tax dollars are being wasted, and you are not receiving the quality of services you need and deserve.

Proposition D will modernize San Francisco’s civil service system. It separates the personnel department from the Civil Service Commission, and puts the department under the Mayor where it belongs. The Mayor is responsible for balancing the budget and delivering city services as efficiently as possible. She cannot do this unless she can find capable people to do the job. That is the task of the personnel department in any organization.

Proposition D will also insure that the independent Civil Service Commission has sufficient authority to require the personnel system to be fair in its treatment of City employees. The Commission will be able to issue subpoenas and require testimony of witnesses on investigations it conducts. Should it find that discrimination has occurred, it can issue orders that must be obeyed.

Most major American cities, and virtually all cities and counties in California, have the kind of civil service system that will be established by Proposition D. San Francisco’s present system is still mired in the past. It hobbles the ability of the City to deliver services and spend your tax dollars as efficiently as possible.

SPUR has not placed a statement in the Voter’s Handbook for any other issue over the past 15 years. We feel that Proposition D is so vital for San Francisco’s future that we are making this appeal for your support.

Vote “YES” on Proposition D.

SPUR—The San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Reform Initiative, will give San Francisco citizens the HIGH PERFORMANCE GOVERNMENT necessary to meet the many challenges of the future. Proposition D corrects the outdated and inflexible requirements originally written in San Francisco’s City Charter in 1931. It will eliminate the problems which prevent San Francisco’s personnel system from operating with efficiency the City’s voters and taxpayers deserve:

Proposition D insures City jobs will be filled from current lists of the most qualified employees.

Proposition D prevents ungrounded appeals from delaying for years the appointment or promotion of qualified employees.

Proposition D eliminates the repetitive tasks currently monopolizing the Civil Service Commission meetings and directs the Commission to serve as an appellate body to protect the City’s good employees.

Proposition D centralizes the day-to-day operation of the civil service system and makes the Director of Personnel responsible to the Mayor.

Proposition D simplifies the budgetary process by making the Mayor the City’s chief labor negotiator, responsible for setting working conditions within the City’s financial capacity.

Proposition D is the result of years of painstaking review by the most experienced, able and respected management experts in San Francisco. It is a plan intended to move City government out of the 1930s and equip San Francisco to enter the twenty-first century without being burdened by the red tape of the past.

After ten years of commitment to improving our City, the Mayor’s Fiscal Advisory Committee is convinced adoption of Proposition D is one of the most important issues facing the voters. CHANGE IS LONG OVERDUE. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by,
The Mayor’s Fiscal Advisory Committee

David Ancher
Jerome Anderson
Richard Blum
Charles Chapman
Arthur Cooke, Jr.
Benton Dial
James Edgar
Ruben Garcia
Robert Hayden
Walter Hoodley
John Jacobs
Michael McGill
Ellen Newman
Roy Nordman
Frank Tatman
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Civil Service

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PERSONNEL MANAGERS SAY YES ON PROPOSITION D

As the personnel managers for City Departments, we are charged with the responsibility of managing the City’s personnel system. The activities include examinations, hiring, training, discipline, union-management relations, affirmative action and compensation. No one knows better than we the frustrations experienced in attempting to monitor an unbelievable sequence of overlapping bureaucratic activities in attempting to get the job done.

Proposition D will bring our personnel system into line with most other public personnel systems. The improved system will create the potential for being more responsive to the needs of operating departments. It will improve labor relations by transferring this function to the executive branch of government where it belongs.

Proposition D will streamline certain routine procedures resulting in a reduction of cost and time. Under the current system delays are experienced due to lengthy appeals during which time the departments’ objectives are delayed.

Proposition D will create an atmosphere of increased accountability for department managers in the areas of affirmative action, discipline and job performance.

Proposition D has been endorsed by the San Francisco Council of Human Resource Managers, the association of over one hundred personnel managers in City government.

Proposition D strengthens merit system principles. Civil Service commissioners will have more time to enforce and protect these principles rather than being bogged down in the day-to-day activities of administration.

Proposition D will help bring about improved methods and practices in personnel administration and should result in a more competent and effective workforce which the citizens of San Francisco have a right to expect.

Alvin W. Schaaf
Personnel Director
Recreation and Park Department
Marnita Ramirez
Personnel Officer
San Francisco Port
Edward M. Gezanski
Personnel Director
Department of Health
James Horan
Senior Personnel Officer
Department of Social Services
James Ilmicki
Personnel Director
San Francisco International Airport

Andrea R. Gourine
Manager, Bureau of Personnel & Training
Public Utilities Commission
Mori Naguchi
Senior Department Personnel Officer
Mary Smith
Senior Personnel Officer
Laguna Honda Hospital
Thelma Proctor
Senior Personnel Officer
San Francisco General Hospital
John Burke
Personnel Director
Controller’s Office

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will assist the Department of Public Works by streamlining the Civil Service process.

• Under the current system, the duration of eligible lists from 2 to 4 years hampers the Department from hiring graduates of colleges and universities on an annual basis. Consequently, many excellent candidates are not entered into the Civil Service System. Passage of the proposition will improve the quality of the pool of applicants and thereby the quality of public service given by the Department.

• The establishment of a Personnel Director to administer the day-to-day tasks of the system will speed up the decision making process to the advantage of employees and management alike.

• The proposition still calls for checks and balances in that the Commission will continue to hear appeals on discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest. The Commission will act as a watchdog while leaving the general administration to the Personnel Director.

The initiative will make for an improved system for employees, management and the citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Donald Birrer
Director of Public Works

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Passage of this amendment will update our civil service system. These changes will make it comparable to other merit system agencies. Some of these changes are:

(A) removal of administrative details from the charter which inhibit timely and effective personnel actions.

The following subjects will be placed in personnel regulations:

• Protests of written questions and answers
• Protests of tentative employment lists
• Promotional examinations

• Examinations for employees on military leave
• Certification of eligibles—Rule of three
• Duration of employment lists
• Temporary employee appointments
• Allows continuous up-dating of employment lists.
• Allows equitable treatment of job candidates with same test score.
• Realigns responsibilities: the Civil Service Commission dealing primarily with compliance and adjudication activities

(continued)
while the Personnel Department administers the day-to-day operation of the merit system.

Equally important the amendment retains important merit system provisions dealing with:
- Employee salary setting procedures
- Positions subject to merit system examinations
- Public hearing and meet and confer requirements
- Penalties for examination fraud
- Seniority, meritorious service and applicable educational credits for promotional examinations in the Police/Fire De-

partsments
- Termination of unsatisfactory employees
- Disciplinary suspensions
- Conflict of interest
- Creation of positions

Proposition "D" merits a 'YES' vote.

John J. Walsh
General Manager Personnel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Initiative, is a long-overdue reform to streamline antiquated hiring practices in San Francisco's fifty-year-old charter. Proposition D will ensure that the best and brightest job candidates are chosen to serve our city, thus promoting excellence in job performance and helping to eliminate incompetence. This initiative builds management accountability in the city system, while giving the Civil Service Commission the independence to protect the rights of women and minorities.

A Better, More Efficient System at Less Cost

Proposition D consolidates personnel functions, including hiring, under a new Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. The Director has final authority over content of examinations given city job applicants, so more flexibility is possible in finding truly qualified candidates.

Proposition D redefines the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit systems appeals board and policy-setting body. The merit principles are spelled out in the Proposition. This allows the Commission to protect the rights of women and minorities at no cost to the public.

More Fair to Everyone

Proposition D greatly improves the city charter. Well-qualified job candidates have a better chance to be hired and well-qualified job holders have a better chance to be promoted. The public is rewarded with the better job performance, efficiency and friendliness one expects from good government employees. All of these improvements are at no additional cost to the taxpayer.

Submitted by
James W. Haas

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service System, as presently constituted, (vintage 1932!), is uncivil, and there is nothing "systematic" about it! It's pure, unadulterated municipal lunacy and chaos! Remarkably, BOTH Management and Labor despise it. It certainly is NOT producing the best qualified persons to fill City jobs!

Let's follow Mayor Feinstein's recommendations. If this operation doesn't dramatically improve, there are always FUTURE ELECTIONS where additional, more Draconian changes can be considered by the voters.

As matters now stand, it is far better to light a candle than just sit and curse the darkness! Any changes will be an improvement! Vote YES!

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

For more than a half-century, San Francisco Mayors have abided by the employee examination, hiring and promotion policies administered by a strong and independent Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D is a deceptive and dangerous scheme that would give future Mayors and top-level bureaucrats the power to ignore competence and reward political loyalty.

Proposition D would take key Civil Service employment rules out of the City Charter and make them subject to wheeling and dealing by City Hall politicians.

There's an old saying — "if it ain't broke, don't fix it." Civil Service has worked well for more than 50 years. Proposition D is unnecessary, ineffective and even counter-productive.

It's not just deceptive, it's dangerous.

Joseph L. Alioto
Former Mayor of San Francisco
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Time and time again, different groups have put various propositions on the ballot to weaken our Civil Service System and reintroduce political patronage into City employment practices. And every time the voters have wisely rejected these schemes, no matter how cleverly they have been disguised. Proposition D is just another power grab by bureaucrats at the top in City Hall.

We've said NO! loud and clear in the past. Let's say NO one more time.

Submitted by:
TAXPAYERS FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT
Thomas Scanlon
City Treasurer, Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “D”!!!!

During the eight years while a member of the Board of Supervisors, I fought hard to reform the Civil Service Commission and to bring working conditions and city workers' pay equitable to both workers and taxpayers. I fought to insure an independent Civil Service Commission that would remain just that—independent and free from political influence and political patronage of particularly the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

I am truly saddened by the Mayor's insistence in bringing this disastrous Proposition “D” before the voters. Some of the Supervisors rejected this misguided measure for what it is; an unwise consolidation of authority to hire, fire and promote city workers by the Mayor and newly created personnel officer.

My efforts to bring pay equity to both taxpayers and city workers were continually squashed by then Supervisor Feinstein and Supervisor Molinari. Finally, in 1975, shortly after a disastrous city strike, I was able to place on the ballot, for voter approval, a measure that almost eliminates the power of the Mayor and Supervisors to manipulate the pay of city workers. This measure was overwhelmingly passed by the voters that year and we have not had any labor unrest since that date.

Vote No on “D”!
“D” stands for disaster. It will undo many of these reforms. Also, right now, the City is almost broke, thanks to the manipulation of Mayor Feinstein and her chief ally Supervisor Molinari.

If “D” passes the cost of operating our city government will increase in the next 24 months by not less than $60,000,000. Contrary to the provisions of Proposition 13, property taxes would be increased, thus forcing up rents.

Don't weaken our Civil Service Commission, whereby least deserving city employees could be promoted because of connection or clout.

We now almost have more problems than we can handle. We don't want our city turned into another Chicago, wherefor nearly half a century a corrupt political system flourished under Mayor Richard Daley.

John Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We join San Franciscans for Fair Employment in opposing the Civil Service Initiative, Proposition D.

This measure will severely hamper the well-being of the San Francisco Fire and Police Departments. These departments are two of the finest in the Country and have consistently protected life and property in a professional manner. They must continue that tradition with a civil service system based on MERIT and not political patronage.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.
Andrew C. Casper
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired
Keith P. Caldon
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired
William F. Murray
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Our present Civil Service system was designed to keep corruption out of government. It has generally served that purpose well. This proposition would dismantle that system and in my opinion open the doors to nepotism, favoritism, patronage and corruption. Better a city government that is bureaucratic than one that is corrupt. Vote NO on D.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is an attack on the merit system and an attempt to return patronage to the Mayor's office by eliminating the authority of the Civil Service Commission and its built in checks and balances.

The present Civil Service system is not perfect, but corrections can be made within the Charter without destroying a system that has worked for over 50 years and has been free from fraud and corruption.

This proposition will do nothing to improve the caliber of police performance and could have the opposite effect. I urge you to vote NO on PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by
The San Francisco Police Supervisors and Investigators Association

Don Goed, Captain SFPD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D could be a dangerous first step toward weakening the independent, impartial administration of our City government.

Proposition D would transfer power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor. The Director's decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline and certification would be final. The Commission would have no right to hear examinations or disciplinary appeals.

With the transfer of duties and responsibilities from the Commission to the Mayor's appointed Personnel Director, the Mayor would have control over personnel functions. Currently, commissioners have independent status and can be dismissed for cause. The Personnel Director could be dismissed at will.

The Merit System could be replaced by a patronage system. Proposition D could open the door to rules permitting the Personnel Director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his or her position on the list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Proposition D is NOT a reform package. The checks and balances for efficient City government would be lopsided, with too much power in the hands of unknown future Mayors.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
John L. Molinaro, President
Harry G. Brit
d Richard Hongisto
Willie B. Kennedy
Wendy Nelder
Nancy Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Beware of PROPOSITION D!

Powerful special interest groups are attempting to remove key City employees from the independent and impartial Civil Service system in the name of "reform".

They want instead to make these employees answerable directly to future Mayors and politically-appointed Personnel Directors and department heads.

PROPOSITION D got on the ballot because the Chamber of Commerce and such companies as Pacific Bell and PG&E paid a professional southern California campaign firm, $70,000 to collect signatures.

They're trying to destroy the merit system and replace it with an old-fashioned patronage system.

Department heads will be able to ignore examination scores and reward loyalty rather than competence in promotions and hiring.

Don't let the Chamber of Commerce, big business and their allies in the City bureaucracy dictate who's hired, fired and promoted among public employees.

PROPOSITION D is not just deceptive, it's dangerous! Vote NO on PROPOSITION D!

Libby Denebein
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Ron Huberman
Vice-Chairman, Democratic Central Committee
Jim Wacob
Democratic Central Committee
Roberto Estrac
President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Rick Pancar
President, Harvey Milk Lesbian Gay Democratic Club
Walter L. Johnson
Exec. Secy., S. F. Labor Council
Michael Bernick
Sal Roselli
John Mehring
Nancy Walker
Harry Brit
Carole Migden
Jack Morrison
Linda Pest
Deborah Stein
Pat Norman
Gwen Craig
Louise Minnick
agar Juacks

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

Proposition D places too much power in the hands of ONE. Proposition D will provide for a personnel director to be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. The Mayor now appoints five members of the Civil Service Commission who also serve at her pleasure.

You work for years to climb the civil service ladder and then somebody comes along with an idea to cut you off at the pockets.

Marguerite Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service Merit System has served our City well, giving San Franciscans an equal opportunity. It has helped us obtain employment and earn promotions based on objective examinations.

The Civil Service Merit system replaced the old patronage system that rewarded political loyalty more than competence.

Now the supporters of PROPOSITION D want to create a new Personnel Director, accountable only to the Mayor, and give department heads the absolute power to decide who works for the City and who gets promoted.

If PROPOSITION D passes, equal opportunity would give way to opportunity based on membership in the bureaucratic "establishment".

Keep our Civil Service Merit System strong and free from the political abuses of the past.

Vote NO on D!

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly
Ben Tom
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
JoAnne Miller
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
A. Richard Cerbulo
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Sadonia Wilson
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, President
S. F. Community College Governing Board
Julie Tang
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Alvin S. Wong
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Henry Der
Albert Chang
Rudy Meraz
Robert "Bob" Morales
Yori Wada

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Can you imagine studying for a civil service examination, being rated at the top of the eligible list and never receiving the promotion? That's exactly what Proposition "D" will do should the electorate adopt this amendment.

The civil service merit system has defects, but to totally eliminate the system and replace it with a patronage system where promotions are based on who you know, rather than what you know is scandalous.

Civil service was put into place to prevent scandal and the "favor seeking" individual from getting a paid position because he/she happened to support the right elected official.

Proposition "D" will allow one person, chosen by the Mayor, to decide who will be promoted, hired and fired. This is awesome power for one single individual to have at any level of government.

Our current Mayor may choose a fair person for this position, but will future Mayors be as careful? As each new Mayor assumes office, the civil service system will again change. The potential to favor one individual or group over others is great.

Proposition "D" has a great potential to diminish the quality of services we now provide to our citizens, as the future of how people are hired and promoted in the San Francisco Police Department is completely unknown.

It's true our promotional system is fraught with delays and delays frustrate us all, but Proposition "D" is not the answer. Proposition "D" will only add to our existing problems. Several years ago, our citizens elected a Charter Commission to streamline city government and make civil service work more efficiently. The voters eventually rejected those proposals. The checks and balances that make our government stable were no longer present. It simply went too far.

Proposition "D" goes even further. It brings about a system of patronage and should be defeated lest we want to engage in "free-wheeling and dealing" of civil service jobs and promotions.

We urge a strong No vote against Proposition "D"!

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION

Bob Barry, President
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The purpose of the Civil Service Commission is to ensure that the merit system would be the only criteria in any examination process.

If Proposition D passes, all authority concerning examinations would be taken from the Civil Service Commission and given to a Personnel Director, who is appointed by the Mayor. This Personnel Director would have the authority to hire and fire at his discretion, with no appeal available. This proposition is contrary to everything the Fire Department and all City employees have strived for over the years.

The Civil Service Commission in its present form was instituted to prevent any possibility of a patronage system, where one person has complete control.

This proposition would do nothing to improve your Fire Department. If you are satisfied with the work and make up of the San Francisco Fire Department in its present form, “Vote No On Proposition D”! You will be doing a service for the San Francisco Fire Department, and the people of San Francisco.

Submitted by the San Francisco Fire Chiefs' Association
John Flaherty, Battalion Chief SFFD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is bad government and bad politics, changing our independent civil service system into a system dominated by the Mayor:

. . By shortening the six year terms of Civil Service Commission to conform to the Mayor's four year term of office.
. . By transferring most of the Commission's powers to a Personnel Director who serves solely at the Mayor's pleasure.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Keep politics out of employment services. Vote NO on Proposition D!

Alice B. Toklas, Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Roberto Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D fails to offer enough new and improved procedures to cure the current defects in the civil service system. Charter sections and civil service rules are repealed without specific known replacements.

Proposition D transfers power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created personnel director appointed by, and to serve at the pleasure of, the Mayor. The director's decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline, and certification would be final. The commission would have no right to hear examination or disciplinary appeals.

There are hidden costs with Proposition D because the new Personnel Administration Department will employ a personnel director, and other employees "as may be necessary to carry out (its) functions and duties."

The Merit System could be replaced by an old style Patronage System. Proposition D could open the door to rules which permit the personnel-director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his/her position on the civil service testing list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Police and Fire Commissions would lose functions as a result of the personnel director's new power. The director's unlawful employment discrimination policy would be binding upon department administrators. The director's procedure for employee dispute resolution must be used by all department heads and appointing officers.

Proposition D is not the answer. The checks and balances for efficient city government would be lopsided.

I urge a no vote on Proposition D.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, 17th Assembly District
Sala Burton
Congresswoman
Art Agnos
16th Assembly District
Milom Marks
State Senator

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
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**Balboa Reservoir Development Ban**

**PROPOSITION E**

Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?  

YES 292

NO 293

---

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The Public Utilities Commission declared Balboa Reservoir South (located across Phelan Avenue from San Francisco City College) surplus in 1984 and made the site available for low, moderate and market rate housing. In July 1985, a City-community advisory committee chose a developer to build 203 single-family homes on the 13 acre site. Construction has not yet begun.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition E would prohibit granting new building permits and would revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site (Assessor’s Block 3180, Lot 1) between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want to prohibit granting any new building permits and you want to revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you want to continue to allow building permits to be granted for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

---

**Controller’s Statement on “E”**

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

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

---

**How “E” Got on Ballot**

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for a three-year ban on development of the Balboa Reservoir site had qualified for the June ballot.

Sidney Kass and Jesse David Wall, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 12,430 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 10,012 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

---

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

---

**THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 77**
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Having been responsible for providing leadership at City College from 1947 to 1977, we cannot stand by and see this site converted to housing. We must speak out. Such a move would preclude forever the logical and much needed campus expansion to what was once our West Campus. We left that site reluctantly to make way for water storage. If it is no longer required for that purpose, let us return it to City College.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 'E'

We question:
1. Why no EIR was required when the proposed development could have a substantial impact.
2. Whether the future needs of City College for classrooms, housing, and parking have been considered.
3. What the impact on taxpayers is with below market land sale and construction financing by bonds.

This moratorium will permit adequate study of these issues. Vote YES on Proposition 'E'.

Bruce Bonacker, President
Board of Directors, Glen Park Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let a developer make a mint on land across from the most overcrowded college in the Bay Area! Parking is already an impossibility for residents near City College...adding 200 homes to this land would make the situation much worse.

It's simple: a college which can't find room for more students at a time when more people are returning to education doesn't serve the community.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

You'd probably be upset. We certainly are. Please help us protect our neighborhood. Please vote YES on proposition E.

Westwood Park Residents: Sunnyside Residents:
Edna Tooker Ellen Wall
Minnie Dorwin Melissa Wilhurtad
Eugene Eden David Wall
Donna Nicoletti
Robert Armstrong
Pauline Armstrong
Joel Martinez
Richard & Lisa Patterson
David Bean
H. Bozzone
William Burke
Richard Robel
Clyde Theriot
Danae Manus
Esma Manus

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let the greedy developers take this potentially picturesque open space.
A yes vote means you want more time to consider its future use. All we ask is time to think and plan.

John Barbagelata
Former member, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Suppose there was a publicly owned open space across the street from the main U.C. Berkeley Campus.
Can you imagine for one moment that it would be passed into private ownership?
Vote Yes on E for Equality and Excellence in Education

City College Students:
William Lew, Student
Tim McGuire, Student Council Member
Joseph Goldstein, Student Council Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

In 1952, the "Experts" said we needed reservoirs. They felt so strongly that they condemned the City College West Campus, destroyed the buildings, and constructed the reservoirs—all at taxpayer's expense.

Now, in 1986 with more demand for water, the "Experts" say the reservoir is no longer needed. What is the concerned taxpayer to believe?
When in doubt, the city should hold on to the expensive things already paid for.

Stop the reservoir giveaway. Vote YES on E.

Taxpayers for Preserving the Reservoir.
Richard Patterson
Dorice Murphy
Lucille Carson
Daniel Gutierrez
Franz Wate
Bernhard Scholand
Ruth Hanson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This is a Planning issue
We have been accused of trying to stop housing for poor people. Not true. In the first place, the price levels are certainly middle income and above, but our main objection is that this badly done plan is damaging to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as to the over-crowded community college across the street.

WHAT WE WANT
Even our critics point out that we originally SUGGESTED housing for that site, but they don't talk about what else we suggested. We want two levels of parking under a City College Li-

library, Bookstore, and Auditorium, with housing on top. Furthermore, let the housing be TRULY affordable—for students and seniors. We are trying to stop the bureaucrats' subsidized middle income housing project because it makes our dream impossible.

We ask for three years to give the neighborhood and the college a chance to produce a better plan.

SNAP (Sensible Neighborhood Planning Committee)

Helen Crizer, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council, representing 17 neighborhood associations in the area of the surplus reservoir property in question has voted to endorse the three-year stop of private construction on the old West Campus of City College.
Dr. Louis Batmale, Chancellor of City College from 1970-1977, has persuaded us that City College needs the lands.

Juanita Raven, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Be a sport.
Give City College a vote of support.
City has 23,000 students and badly needs a library. The only place to put it is in the reservoir site. City College has walked closely with San Francisco for five decades. The reservoir site has always been understood to be reserved for City College.
Until now when someone wants it for housing. Housing is important, but it can be anywhere in town. But a City College library can only be located at the College.
Vote yes to support a book—and a reader.
Reading, studying, writing and research make up our town also.
It is hard to understand criticism of City for wanting to keep this area for a library. Sure, housing sites are at a premium—but even more so a library site for City which is one of the largest schools in the Nation.
Some people blast City for wanting a library because of the need for housing. Housing is needed. But some of those very same people want a big battleship stationed here that will bring in 15,000 new family members.
The Educational and cultural growth of San Francisco mandates living space for the City College library.
If this measure gets a no vote, it means there will be no site for a Library. This is the last chance. Vote YES to help out a book—and a reader.
State financing, when approved, will construct this building.
It is the top building priority at City College.
A YES vote here means there will be time to think about the use of the site. During that three year period, cooler heads may realize this is the only site for a Library. If the housing goes in there will be no library there.
Vote yes for a book, for a good school and a better City.

John Riordan, Board of Governors
San Francisco Community College District.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Sunnyside Neighborhood Association is not against housing, but we are trying to stop a hasty and short-sighted plan. We are asking for this moratorium to get time for a better plan that will answer a variety of needs and benefit the entire city as well as our community.

This is a planning issue.
The release of the reservoir property as surplus by the water department came as a surprise to our neighborhood. The June 1984 "Residence Element" of the city's Master Plan did not even list the land as surplus. By 1985 major decisions were being made for use of the land without adequate neighborhood input.

There were some meetings attended by a few people carefully selected for their zealous pro-housing views or potential financial gain. The resulting plan has gone out of control. Now it benefits only the developer and the lucky few who will get houses on free land.

Proposition E is not an attack on housing.
Please help us save our neighborhood against poor planning by voting YES on Proposition E.

Joe Mahoney, President
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Miraloma Improvement Club urges a YES vote on Proposition E.

Frank Mastro, President
Arnell Rodrigues
Maggie Kroll
Dorothy Evers

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION E

All the talk in the world can't change the fact that City College has fewer acres of land relative to its student population than any college in the Bay Area.
Enrollment at City College is INCREASING, as is the enrollment of the San Francisco public schools from which City College draws most of its students. It is obvious that City College needs and deserves the reservoir land. The three year moratorium will give time to produce a better plan which will have input by faculty, students and alumni who know the college's needs and want to support it.

Sid Kass
Susie Langdon Kass
Phil Kass
City College Student
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The homeowners of Westwood Park, a neighborhood adjacent to the Balboa Reservoir, support the ballot initiative calling for a 3 year development moratorium. We believe that the City and City College should take additional time to determine their needs and how they might be met by using the Reservoir. In the event that City College does not need this property, we support its development as open space or as single family detached housing.

Westwood Park Association
Don C. Swander
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Let's not aggravate the traffic problem around City College before we first develop solutions for the existing problems. A three-year moratorium only buys our neighborhood and elected officials time to find solutions; it doesn't say no to housing. A YES vote is a vote for prudent development. A YES vote helps to preserve the family character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ken Hoegetter
Realtor and community Activist

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As representatives of the students of City College, we understand first-hand, the intense need to reserve a site for future school expansion.

Preservation of the Balboa Reservoir, a site directly adjacent to the campus, is particularly crucial. The facilities that CCSF requires, such as a library and an auditorium, are essential to the main structure of the campus. Unlike classrooms, it would be unreasonable to build an auditorium or a library on an off-campus site, since these facilities are integral to the main function of the school.

In short, opposition to the moratorium based on the notion that alternate sites could be secured, is misleading. Once a site near the college is taken, any hope of expansion would be eliminated.

Associated Student Council of City College
Jack Lee, Vice President of Associated Counsel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Local 2121 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, representing City College faculty, urges a yes vote on Proposition E.

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

Yes on E for continued excellence in community college education.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is twice as crowded as any community college in northern California. It needs a much larger library, bookstore and auditorium, and more parking.

The college has always expected to use the empty SOUTH reservoir for educational needs. That land is finally surplus. Neither the college Governing Board nor the Chancellor attended the Mayor's planning sessions for the property and the faculty was not informed. When the 12.3 acre site was offered to a developer for $36,900 for subsidized housing, the Chancellor said, "We are at a crossroad and the correct path is for the Board of Supervisors, with the Mayor's support, to deed this surplus land to City College so that the college may continue to serve the city effectively for the next 50 years as it has for the past half century." The Mayor refused. Now only Board member John Riordan supports the correct path.

The Water Department says it may need the NORTH reservoir now used for student parking. If that crisis occurs, the Chancellor says, "We'll deal with the situation then." How, if the south reservoir is gone?

(continued)
When land is available other community colleges finance large projects through alliances with civic, athletic and cultural organizations, and through property sales. New methods for public funding are being developed.

The faculty would like three years of careful study to unravel misunderstandings and poor management, and to find the best way to be a good neighbor.

Ken Crizer
Lene Johnson
Madeline Mueller
Julia Scholand
Steering Committee,
City College Faculty for Responsible Development

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College needs land now for desperately needed facilities, one of which is a library. City College has an enrollment of 23,000 students but our library has seating for 450. There are other possible locations for new housing, but City College can’t be moved. Give us an opportunity to plan a development for the community and the college.

Annie M. Young
City College Library Faculty and Staff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty and staff members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco’s community college for our students’ needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Virgie Applin
Bill Carpenter

Mathew Casaneda
Hortensia Chang

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco’s community college for our students’ needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Darlene Alioto
Mary Allen
Mary Axler
Tom Angeloff
Robert Balasteri
Don Bateni
Diana Bernstein
Joe Berry
Anna Bruton
Thomas Brendel
James Bristol
Richard Brongel
Laurent Brussalu
Philip Brown
Barbara Cabral
John Callen
John Caris

Darlene Alioto
Mary Allen
Mary Axler
Tom Angeloff
Robert Balasteri
Don Bateni
Diana Bernstein
Joe Berry
Anna Bruton
Thomas Brendel
James Bristol
Richard Brongel
Laurent Brussalu
Philip Brown
Barbara Cabral
John Callen
John Caris

ARGUMENTS PRINTED ON THIS PAGE ARE THE OPINION OF THE AUTHORS AND HAVE NOT BEEN CHECKED FOR ACCURACY BY ANY OFFICIAL AGENCY.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Water Department has begun a resource study of water use, due for completion in two or three years. The study may well indicate that one or both reservoirs will be needed. The American Water Works Association states that reservoirs should be used in pairs. This is particularly important because it is the only reservoir at an elevation of 305 feet.

The Mayor twisted the arm of the Water Department to declare one of these reservoirs surplus before the water resource study is completed. Don’t let her get away with this kind of political manipulation.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Kurt Common
Ken Crizer
Ed Dierauf
Herb Naylor
CCSF Engineering Professors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The South Balboa Basin has been unused since college leased buildings, including a large auditorium, were torn down on that site thirty years ago. We hope that three years of thorough planning would explore the possibility of returning a part of that property to the college for the development of a multi-purpose medium-sized auditorium which could be shared with community groups.

Robert Bosina
Mack Crooks
Bob Davis
Helen Dilworth
Franz Enciso
Richard Esterman
Richard Fenner
Lawrence Ferrara
Ted Fleming
Peggy Gorham
William Grothkopp
David Hardiman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition E. This moratorium is necessary because there are too many worthy uses for this land to make a hasty and potentially very costly decision. Only through careful planning can the limited land available for development be best used.

Jerome Hosken
Robert Koar
James Kurck
Duck Lee
Chelcie Liu
William Maynez
Annette Rappleyea
Oleg Reouit
David Wall
City College Music Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, as Physical Education Instructors, have always been committed to a diversified program for our students and community. The reservoir space is a natural land resource for a Multi Educational and Cultural Center.

Your YES vote on E will allow us the freedom to explore ways that this property could most constructively benefit all.

Nicolas Alexander
Paul Hewitt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, full-time faculty of the Computer and Information Science Department of City College, urge a YES vote to postpone the decision until additional planning and surveys can be conducted. The current proposal would negatively impact the College’s enrollment.

Gail Barton
Curtis Decker
Brad Duggan
Tanaka Hagiwara
John Hahn
Daniel Hayes

Lene Johnson
Grover Klemmer
Paula McCallum
Art Octavio
Louise Scourkas

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

William Beaver
Ronald Cerruti, Chairman
Kirk Gilson
Howard Granger
Frank Holden
Michael Kelly

George Lany
Norbert Ludkey
Charles Metzler
Charles Miller
Marilyn Schnake

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

A YES vote on Proposition E helps STOP a scheme to GIVE AWAY $12,300,000 worth of City land for $1,800,000 (or less) to a Redwood City real estate developer.

A YES vote will SAVE taxpayers $550,000 per year. The housing project will produce $240,000 in taxes, but supplying City services will cost $790,000 per year.

The Controller's cost estimate does NOT account for the $12,300,000 land value, since land sale below value is NOT technically a cost of government. The Controller also is NOT permitted to assume that the housing project will be constructed, since construction has NOT yet been ordered by the Board of Supervisors.

The plan does NOT restrict housing sales to moderate-income first-time buyers. The plan only restricts use of tax-subsidized funds. Any person favored by the developer or politicians can buy these dwellings and get the benefits of the public land giveaway.

The houses are made "affordable" by giving away the land far below market value, by City-backed low interest, and by cutting construction corners.

The real beneficiaries of the subsidized housing project are the financiers (NOT the project dwellers). Bondholders receive 9.6% average tax-free interest, which is equivalent to 24.6% taxable interest at 61% maximum tax. The developer and bond establishment receive $5,340,000; this is $26,300 (or 22.40%) for each $117,400 unit.

The City loses $51,700 worth of land GIVEN AWAY for each unit.

Vote YES on Proposition E for good fiscal management.

William Marquardt
Financial Analyst, SNaP
Helen Crizer, Treasurer, SNaP

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

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

Given these facts, why does the Governing Board not try to get the old West Campus back? Why don't they support this moratorium to delay the land grab?

The Governing Board is under political pressure from City Hall. They have been threatened with the loss of the north reservoir parking lot and funding for special projects. Forgive them. Vote Yes on E.

Friends of City College
David Newton
Glen Simpson
Jack Baker
Thomas Velasquez
Tillie McCullough

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The student population at City College is increasing. This semester's enrollment is up 1,265 students over last semester.

The enrollment in the San Francisco public schools has been increasing by 1,218 per year for the last three years. City College draws most of its enrollment from public schools in San Francisco.

Obviously, City College will have a larger enrollment in the future years, and will be in desperate need of space if we do not give it back its old West Campus.

Please reserve this public land for the college.
Please vote YES on E.

Barbara Holman

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E
VOTE NO ON E

In 1981, I launched a six-point program to expand San Francisco's housing supply and the voters had approved a City policy to add 20,000 new housing units within five years. This Proposition would destroy a major portion of the effort to build affordable, single-family housing in our city.

The Balboa Reservoir Site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now a site for development of 203 new single-family homes, most with three bedrooms and two baths. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed as other homes built under the City's program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom could not afford homeownership. It is believed that these new homes will sell rapidly.

The Balboa Reservoir site is one of the few sites large enough to accommodate a substantial number of new homes. Please do not let a few people stop a major opportunity for new housing. Vote no on Prop E.

Not only would Proposition E halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site, but the 9.8% fixed-rate, 30-year mortgage money set aside for the housing would also be lost.

Nothing constructive is accomplished by this measure—it does not provide additional land or facilities for City College. As a matter of fact, City College has neither plans nor money to use the property. Further, the Community College Board of Directors, the governing body for City College, has voted overwhelmingly to oppose the initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting "No on E."

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the site of the unused Balboa Reservoir and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost.

These homes are desperately needed for San Franciscans who can't afford to buy in the city where the average house is selling for over $160,000. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

The homes would be built on land that belongs to the City. Over two years ago, it was declared surplus and available for housing. It is not part of City College, and City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

We urge you to vote no on Proposition E if you want more affordable housing for San Franciscans.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

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

The 203 affordable owner occupied single family units slated for the southern portion of Balboa Reservoir are part of the 1988 total. Our progress in addressing the City's housing shortage will be curtailed if this ill-advised initiative is approved. SUPPORT OWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Housing production is essential to check rising prices and to maintain our social, economic, and ethnic population diversity. AS A SAN FRANCISCO VOTER, YOU CAN BE PART OF OUR HOUSING PROGRESS BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

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

WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT THE CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY HOUSING BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

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

Doris M. Ward, Member
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

A critical issue facing San Francisco today is the lack of housing middle class San Franciscans can afford.

That is why I have joined these neighborhood associations to support the Balboa Reservoir neighborhood housing proposal. Those participating in the development of the proposal includes:

O.M.I. Community Association
Dorado Terrace Association
Outer Mission-Ingleside
Political Action Committee
Greater Ingleside Community
Mount Davidson Manor
Ocean Avenue Merchants Association
Ingleside Terrace Association
The San Francisco Open Space Committee
City College of San Francisco

From early in 1985 I worked closely with these neighborhood groups in the discussions between city government and community leaders concerning the development plans for this desperately needed new housing at the unused Balboa reservoir site.

THESE ARE THE REASONS YOU SHOULD VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

1. The neighborhood housing proposal that this initiative seeks to stop is the result of months of hard work by the largest coalition of neighborhood associations ever to join together to plan a housing development in San Francisco.

2. The housing at the Balboa Reservoir site was designed with the involvement of the coalition of neighborhood associations to enhance the surrounding community.

3. The governing Board of the Community College District has made clear that they have no plans for the site and no ownership rights to it. City College does not oppose the construction of this development and opposes this initiative.

4. Self-proclaimed “Friends” of City College want to stop the proposal in order to preserve the site for future faculty parking. A clique of City College staffers involved in a neighborhood association pose as community opposition to this development even though a representative from this organization, the Sunnyside Neighborhood Association, had helped plan and support the proposal.

5. By masquerading as concerned neighbors these self-appointed “friends” of City College hope to prevent the construction of 204 critically needed units of housing and pull off one of the biggest land grabs in San Francisco’s history.

DON’T BE FOOLED. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Residence Element of the Comprehensive Plan of the City and County of San Francisco assesses the City’s housing needs and lays out specific steps to meet those needs. This document was adopted by the City Planning Commission in 1984 after extensive public review at neighborhood meetings and public hearings, and consideration of the detailed Environmental Impact Report.

The first objective of the Housing Element is “to provide new Housing for all income groups” in locations appropriate for residential development. To meet this goal, development of housing is to be aggressively pursued and encouraged on surplus, underused and vacant public land.

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

If you want more affordable housing in San Francisco vote no on Proposition E.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Susan J. Bierman, City Planning Commissioner

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

Vote NO on E.

Proposition E deprives San Franciscans of one of their last real chances to become homeowners at an affordable price. At the South Balboa Reservoir we have City-owned land on which 203 units of three-bedroom, two-bath homes can be built at low prices which average San Franciscans can afford to pay. These homes need to be built now, not in three years. In three years the low interest rates on mortgages and the bond financing will be gone. Two hundred families will have lost the opportunity to become homeowners, and the City will have lost the opportunity to ease the tight market in rental housing.

Nor does this ill-conceived initiative help City College in any way. City College does not need this land. Speculation that the College may at some future date find a use for the land is not founded on fact. The College may never be able to build on the reservoir. Their enrollment has dropped by over 4000 students in the last few years.

This initiative is designed to confuse you. It will make our housing shortage worse for three long years. If you support affordable housing in our City, Vote NO on Proposition E.

Bill Maher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Balboa Reservoir site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now planned for development of 203 new single family homes. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed — other homes built under this program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom would not otherwise be able to afford home ownership.

San Francisco has the most expensive housing in the nation where last year the average home sold for over $160,000. Housing is difficult to produce because the obstacles are great — little land on which to build, high construction costs and uncertain interest rates.

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost. The initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional land or facilities for City College. The Community College Board, the governing body of City College, in fact recently voted to oppose this initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No” on Proposition E.

John L. Molinari

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

In 1980, the voters of the City and County of San Francisco approved a measure making it City policy to add 20,000 new units of housing within five years. In 1984 in an effort to satisfy this objective, the Board of Supervisors adopted a policy encouraging the expansion of the City’s housing supply. Making surplus City-owned land, such as the site at Balboa Reservoir, available for affordable housing was an important part of that policy. A proposal to build 203 homes on the unused Balboa Reservoir site was advanced to help implement the pro-housing policy.

Approval of Proposition E would HALT construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.

The Balboa Reservoir homes would be built on land currently belonging to the City and County of San Francisco. The property IS NOT part of the City College, and City College has neither plans or money to buy the property and convert it for City College use.

The only debatable issue is the future of affordable housing on the Balboa Reservoir site.

As we are all aware, San Francisco has the most expensive homes in the United States. The average cost of a home is $152,000. Not many can afford such prices. However, the housing proposed for the Balboa Reservoir will give many more citizens the opportunity to become homeowners. The homes to be built will be sold to first-time buyers at prices ranging from $83,000 to $145,000.

Other homes built in San Francisco under the direction of similar affordable housing programs have been snapped up quickly by San Franciscans. Without the program, most would not have been able to purchase the home and become homeowners.

Again, if you desire to preserve the construction of more affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site, vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Willie B. Kennedy
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

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

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

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

Stop these self-serving no-growth obstructionists! Please vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Prop E would halt affordable housing construction at the Balboa Reservoir site. Many gay people need affordable housing, too, and we join with other community groups urging you to vote NO on Prop E.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Robert Estoves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E, if approved, would block the construction of 203 badly needed single-family homes on the south portion of the Balboa Reservoir in San Francisco. Sixty percent of these homes would be available for purchase by moderate and middle income families at purchase prices between $80,000 and $120,000. They would be constructed on surplus public land and financed by the sale of mortgage revenue bonds to enable the developer to sell the homes at below market prices.

A neighborhood group headed by two city college faculty members is responsible for placing Proposition E on the ballot. The group contends that the land which is intended to be used for the project should be made available instead to City College for the construction of new teaching facilities even though enrollment at City College is declining and the City College Board has voted 6 to 1 to oppose the initiative.

Like many other areas of the country, San Francisco suffers from a shortage of housing. Purchase prices here are among the highest in the nation. The use of surplus public lands and revenue bond financing provide a means for making single family homes available to a broad spectrum of families at affordable prices.

The Balboa Reservoir project is supported by the leaders of 8 neighborhood groups in the area surrounding the location of the proposed project and by a majority of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, as well as by Mayor Dianne Feinstein. We urge you to encourage the construction of this type of housing in San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition E.

San Francisco Board of Realtors
William L. Jansen, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

SAVE OUR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS!
BERNAL HEIGHTS SAYS, “VOTE NO ON PROP E!”

We are residents of Bernal Heights in San Francisco. We’ve worked hard to build affordable family and senior citizen homes in our neighborhood.

We need more affordable housing in our City to survive. The real issue in Prop E is affordable family housing—a “yes” vote prevents the construction of 203 family homes. That’s crazy!

Join us in preserving what’s best in our City.
Vote “no” on Prop E!

Sylvia M. Yee, Bernal Heights Community Foundation Board of Directors***
Frank Hutchins, BHCF Board*
Mary Lou Bertoloni, BHCF Board*
Lola Havener, BHCF Board*
Elizabeth Egger, BHCF Board*
Sister Janet Simons, BHCF Board*
Stephen Antonaros, BHCF Board*
Lorenzo R. Dill, BHCF Board*
Barbara Bagot, BHCF Board*
Margaret C. Randolph, Northwest Bernal Block Club*
Mayrene Lamb, NWBBC*
Tim Molinaro, BHCF Planning & Dev’s Committee*
Buck Bagot, BHCF P & D Committee*
***Organization for identification purposes only.
Balboa Reservoir Development Ban

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco Needs Affordable Housing—
Vote No on Proposition E

Everyone agrees that San Francisco needs affordable housing. The questions are how and where that affordable housing can be built.

The Balboa Reservoir housing development, to be built on the site of a reservoir built thirty years ago and unused since that time, answers those important questions for more than 200 San Francisco first-time homebuying families by providing:
- 203 new affordable three-bedroom, single family homes
- 98% fixed-rate financing
- A mix of 30% low-income, 30% moderate-income and 40% market-rate first time buyers
- A convenient site that has been declared “surplus” by the City and “available for development of affordable housing”

The Balboa Reservoir housing development is a small but significant step in the effort to generate affordable housing in our City.

Thousands of San Franciscans from every community, neighborhood group and viewpoint agree that the Balboa Reservoir development is good for San Francisco. Virtually every elected official, including the Governing Board of City College also agree.

All these San Franciscans ask you to say “yes” to affordable housing and “NO” to Proposition E.

San Francisco Coalition for Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar, Executive Director

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The viable plan for affordable single family housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site is being threatened by Proposition E. If Proposition E passes, 203 single family homes will be lost to the citizenry of San Francisco at a time when they are greatly needed.

The facts about the proposed housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site argue strongly against Proposition E. All 203 homes will be for first time home buyers. One-third of the homes will be available to households earning $27,000. Another third of the homes will be available to households earning $36,000. Adequate parking will be provided within the development itself, thus answering any concerns that traffic in the area will be congested.

City College has no need or plan to use South Balboa Reservoir for its facilities. City College’s priority is to develop its existing campus. South Balboa Reservoir should therefore be used for one of the City’s greatest needs: increased and affordable housing which is available to lower and middle income families.

As homeowners who live in the vicinity of South Balboa Reservoir, we welcome its planned use for single family housing and feel it will become an integral and contributing part of the community. We therefore urge you to vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Submitted by:
Stephen Graham, Chairman of the Housing Sub-committee of the Citizen’s Committee for Community Development
Roderick A. McLeod, Vice-Chairman of the Citizen’s Committee on Community Development

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing is a group of neighbors which consists of many of the renters of Westwood Park and Sunnyside neighborhoods as well as owners and renters of Ingleside which are the closest neighbors to the Balboa Reservoir along with some of the students and teachers of City College.

We strongly support the Balboa Reservoir for housing. We believe that the Balboa Reservoir is an ideal spot for housing.

Our neighborhood wants homes in the South Balboa Reservoir.
Vote No On Prop. E.

Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughney
Submitted by Patricia Vaughney

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

As Merchants as well as residents of Ocean Avenue, Greater Ingleside and San Francisco, we support the Development of the Balboa Reservoir as housing.

A Traffic Survey has stated that there will be minimal impact on the existing patterns of traffic by this development.

Additional City College Parking is being considered on another location off I-280 to keep the college congestion away from the neighborhood’s streets.

City College has 44 more acres in which to expand and existing buildings at City College have viable means to expand.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
We believe that housing on the Balboa Reservoir is the most viable solution to develop a vacant piece of property that is directly adjacent to our store on a Transpreferential Street. Affordable housing is in great need in San Francisco and is as much needed here as anywhere. We want to help provide this need. Vote No on Prop. E.

Ocean Avenue Merchants Assoc.
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughy
Submitted by Patricia Vaughy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction on much-needed affordable, single-family housing at the long vacant south Balboa Reservoir site. This proposal would also block a major housing development that would bring jobs into an area of the city that has little industry or private business.

Sale prices for these units are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the San Francisco housing market, where the average home is selling for $160,000. Construction of these homes will help all young, first-time home buyers and will require only 5% down, instead of the 20% down payment on houses bought with conventional home mortgages.

This plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by nine nearby neighborhood organizations. If Proposition E is approved and this project is blocked, more young adults will purchase their first home in Vallejo or some other outlying area, further draining San Francisco of the young families that every growing community needs.

San Francisco residents will gain apprenticeships, jobs, contracts and subcontracts from this development.

This plan calls for 2 and 3 bedroom, family-sized houses, with space for another bedroom which can be finished when needed.

Each house will have 2½ parking spaces in front and would not cause parking problems in the area. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

City College of San Francisco has no plans to buy the property, has no money for institutional expansion, nor any mention of this land in any master plan. Some supporters of this proposition are motivated by racist notions and have said they fear that this development will become another "Geneva Towers." This type of thinking is similar to support for apartheid practiced in South Africa and must be defeated by progressive San Francisco voters. Property values will increase, instead of decrease as a result of this project.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition E.

Larry Ukali Johnson-Rod—President, O.M.I. Pilgrim Community Center Inc. Maria Campbell-Casey—Program Director, Bay Area Engineering Societies Committee for Manpower Training, Inc. Clara Mills-Bradford—Program Director, O.M.I. Senior Center John C. Jackson Linda Rosse-Gipson Jon Still—Secretary, Young Adult Committee Kenneth Butler

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote "No" on Proposition E.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Greater Ingleside Political Club—Frank Now, Treasurer
Housing Conservation and Development Corporation—Lennie Lawson,
Board of Directors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Bayview Baptist Minister Fellowship—Rev. N. B. Mills, President
Bread of Life Missionary Baptist Church—Rev. S. A. Bailey
Cosmopolitan Baptist Church—Rev. A. Bay Gentle
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Raymond M. Howard Sr.
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Carole Nelson
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Cornelius P. O’Reilly
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Paul G. Theiss
Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee—Charles Gale, Chairman
St. Peters Housing Committee—Zena Rouvelo

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON’T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: With certain exceptions, City officers, including elected officials and commission members, may represent clients before City boards and commissions other than their own, and be paid for their services. State legislators may represent clients before City boards and commissions, and be paid for their services. Any person may contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would prohibit City officers from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay. This proposition would prohibit State legislators from appearing before City boards, commissions and departments on behalf of clients for pay. City officers would be prohibited from discussing with these officers and legislators matters that the City is deciding. Proposition F would also prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit City officers and State legislators from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to allow City officers and State legislators to represent clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to allow any person to contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 77

How “F” Got on Ballot

On February 26 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for limitations on compensated advocacy and campaign contributions had qualified for the June ballot.

Quentin Kopp, Marth Gillham and Cheryl Arenson, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 9,400 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,986 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The purpose of Proposition F is to cut campaign contributions by large contributors (and thus reduce campaign spending) and eliminate undue influence by officeholders retained as paid lobbyists for projects requiring City approval.

Let's take a minute to analyze the untrue arguments against Proposition F.

• The opponents claim that Proposition F will force half the City's Commissioners to resign. In fact, Proposition F does not force any Commissioners to resign. It simply says they can't be a paid lobbyist and a City Commissioner at the same time. Does a commissioner value making money by lobbying more than public service?

• Some have also alleged that Proposition F will prevent duly-elected union leaders from serving as City Commissioners. No it won't. Proposition F prohibits “compensated advocacy”—that means lobbyists hired by an organization, not members of the organization itself. Proposition F does NOT apply to salaried employees of labor unions, corporations, or non-profit agencies. Moreover, Section 8.105 of the Charter precludes it specifically from applying to any member serving as a representative of any profession, trade, business, union or association on any board or commission which requires membership of representatives of specific professions, trades, businesses, unions or associations.

• Another untrue argument against Proposition F is that it prohibits City officials only from discussing pending issues with other City officers or State Legislators who are also acting as paid lobbyists in a matter and doesn't stop those officeholding lobbyists from writing City officials about their clients' objectives. That's not so. Proposition F applies to all such lobbying, written or oral. (The dictionary defines “discuss” as “to examine by means of speech or writing.”)

End government decision-making by “insiders” and reduce the influence of money on local campaigns.

VOTE YES ON F.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
San Franciscans for Good Government

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

In all our years of observing San Francisco City government, we have found one maxim to be true time after time: a good idea gets copied, especially among politicians.

For no sooner did Quentin Kopp promise to bring Proposition F to the voters than did Mayor Feinstein come up with an informal, administrative version of her own. Fine, you say (and the Mayor says), then why vote Yes on Proposition F?

(1) The Mayor's remedy of asking City Commissioners who also act as lobbyists before City agencies to resign is nothing more than a hand slap, and is good only as long as she is mayor. It's not binding on future mayors and could be changed without any vote of the Board of Supervisors, let alone the people of San Francisco. Proposition F prohibits this kind of conflict-of-interest, and it will be the law, no matter who is mayor.

(2) The Mayor's action did nothing to state legislators who can also act as lobbyists before City Boards and Commissions, nor did her action stop the law or business partners of City Commissioners from picking up the slack in big-money lobbying. Proposition F will stop these practices in their tracks.

(3) What about the other half of Proposition F, which reduced the campaign contribution limit to $500 so that all San Franciscans can enjoy equal access to City officials, not just the ones with the big bucks? The Mayor can't do anything about this, and she hasn't. Only a Yes vote on Proposition F will reduce the weight of big money and ensure our full voice in City elections and City government.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. If it's important enough for the Mayor to copy part of it administratively, it's important enough to do the job right and make it a law.

John J. Burghelata
Harry Aho
June Cahn
Dorothy Partridge

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The worst and most persistent problem in American politics is that politicians and political races can be “bought”. Reducing the size of campaign contributions will be a step forward in reducing the role of money in elections. Vote yes for more honest government.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

RESTORE to the people their rightful and equal power as individual voters by reducing the monetary clout and influence of private interests who make the laws and the policies as City officials and Commissioners or State legislators.

TELL the special interests that their money and influence can no longer interfere with representative government.

TELL the special interests that the voters will no longer tolerate the influence-buying which comes with large campaign contributions.

TELL the special interests that this measure will encourage highly talented citizens to serve San Francisco honestly and responsibly.

VOTE YES ON F.

Cheryl Arenson
Anne Renfrew
David Pacheco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

"Government of the people, by the people, and for the people." These noble words from Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, cast in bronze at the entrance to City Hall, seem to have escaped the attention of some City officials who pass by them every day. For in San Francisco City government, Lincoln's simple formula for representative government would read quite differently: "Government of the powerful, by the lobbyists, and for the wealthy."

Government of, by, and for the privileged few is bad government. Government of, by, and for all the people is good government. It's as simple as that—as simple as Lincoln first put it.

Proposition F, the Good Government Initiative, will help San Franciscans maintain control of their government and will prevent undue influence by City officeholders.

To reduce undue influence, Proposition F outlaws the practice of City Commissioners and State Legislators representing special interests for pay before City Commissions and Boards. City Commissions should render their decisions deliberately and impartially, not be swayed by the political clout of the lobbyists appearing before them, or by any political favors those lobbyist/politicians might promise. "I'll scratch your back if you scratch my back" bargains do not belong in government. And until such backroom bargains are made illegal, City government will not belong to the rest of us either.

Proposition F also reduces the maximum amount that anyone can give to a local candidate from $1,000 to $500. If large contributors and other special interests can't give as much money, they can't buy as much influence with elected officials. And the lower the contribution limit, the less campaign spending and the more City government will be responsive to all San Franciscans.

You can "buy back" City government from the privileged and powerful with the most precious of all political commodities: your vote.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Mary Lohneis
Peter Fatooh
Judith Thorson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F, an initiative of the people, is needed to protect the voters and the integrity of the legislative process from being corrupted by the power of money and influence. It prevents City officials and State Legislators from lobbying the City on behalf of high-powered special interests. It also lowers the campaign contribution limit from $1,000 to $500, thus reducing the influence of those same special interests over our elections and elected officials.

The bogus argument that the Mayor won't be able to find qualified people to serve on City commissions if Proposition F is adopted ignores the plain fact that there are 700,000 people in San Francisco, a pool of civic-minded citizens more than large enough to accommodate the 250 commission appointments available in our City government. For example, there are plenty of architects to fill the one architectural appointment on the Art Commission, just as there are plenty of non-lobbyist business people and lawyers available to serve on other commissions.

Thousands of San Franciscans, not just the "insiders", are ready, willing, and able to serve the public.

Proposition F deserves your vote. Restore integrity to City government. Restore the confidence of the citizens of San Francisco in that government. Let's have no more Wilkes Bashford situations.

VOTE YES ON F.

Oscar Suto
Martha Gillham
Marguerite Warren

Leonel Monterey
Tony Kilroy
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE "NO" ON F

This proposition disguises itself as "good government" but, in reality, would drive good people out of government. It is so crudely drawn — so sweeping in its implications — that it would bar from government almost anyone with even a remote business or community tie to government.

It would purge from City commissions anyone who "directly or indirectly" receives compensation from any "interests" with an issue before any City agency. Effectively, this could discriminate against employees from community and neighborhood groups, civil rights organizations, non-profit corporations, labor unions, merchant and business groups, as well as architects, lawyers and other professionals.

Actually, there currently are no commissioners who represent any clients before any City agency. All who are appointed in my administration sign a statement saying they will not advocate for any paying client before any official body of the City, while they are commissioners. This proposition simply is not necessary.

Proposition F also would lower the limit for any individual campaign contribution from $1000 to $500. Although this sounds good, it would permit a wealthy person with various businesses and numerous family members to contribute many thousands of dollars through different sources. This would encourage "hidden" contributions. We must strive for disclosure of contributions, not a system which drives contributions underground. Candidates must be able to raise funds enough to put their message before the voters. Reducing the contribution limit can be a tactic to discourage persons from challenging incumbents.

Vote no on Proposition F.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition F purports to achieve a noble objective: The removal of "influence peddling" from City Hall. In fact, Proposition F is so poorly-crafted, it may have exactly the opposite effect on City government. It is not a "good government" initiative. It is bad legislation.

Proposition F provides no definitions and no standards for the public to judge whether City officials comply with its restrictions. Its uncertainties will be chaotic and lead to endless, needless lawsuits.

A measure similar to Proposition F was rejected by the Board of Supervisors because no public hearings were ever held on the legislation. If the public had had a chance to comment on this initiative, it might not have the critical shortcomings, deficiencies and uncertainties that now warrant its rejection by responsible San Franciscans.

In the coming months, the Board will review good government measures that are comprehensible, effective and, most important, certain. Proposition F is a misguided disaster.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

This should properly have been titled the "SINK WILLIE BROWN ORDINANCE"! The "meat of the coconuts" is in Section 4.

 Supervisor Kopp's intentions are good, however this sloppily drafted and incomprehensible measure succeeds in "burning down the barn" to eliminate a couple of rats!

Under this proposal, to avoid any potential INDIRECT conflict of interest, (which is undefined!), one would have to be a destitute, unemployed welfare recipient to qualify for service on any City Board or Commission! The Mayor has already solved this "hired advocacy" problem with the "conflict of interest" affidavits she demands IN ADVANCE from any prospective appointee.

Quentin's proposed $500.00 campaign contribution limit is an "inside joke" and he, of all people, knows it! It merely obliges a heavy contributor to have his wife, children, business associates, or friends send in SEPARATE $500.00 checks if he wants to contribute more than $500.00 to a politician's campaign.

These proposals require additional City employees for enforcement and wind up doing far more harm than good. Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr., President
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Union members and labor officials have legitimate reasons for meeting with City officers. It is unfair and wrong to lump them in the same category as special interest lobbyists, yet that's exactly what Proposition F does. Working people deserve representation on City boards and commissions. VOTE NO!

Walter Johnson
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council
LeRoy King
James Elliot
Keith Eckman
Reeva Olson

Jeff Greendorfer
Sian Smith
Larry Griffin
Steve Balista
Terrence Ryan
Jack Beggs
Tony Marovich

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

If you want to ban business owners and executives from serving on City boards and commissions, then vote for Proposition F.

If you think board members of non-profit corporations and employees of community agencies have nothing to contribute to City government, then vote for Proposition F.

If you believe union members and labor officials should not have a voice at City Hall, then vote for Proposition F.

But if you share our belief that these individuals have legitimate concerns and expertise that is valuable in running major City departments, then join us in voting NO on Proposition F.

Proposition F is a simplistic, sloppily-drafted, meat axe approach to a problem already resolved by Mayor Feinstein's ban on commissioners lobbying on behalf of private clients.

Proposition F is not good government and it is not reform. Proposition F is bad legislation. VOTE NO.

Hon. Douglas Engmann
Hon. Charlotte Bark

Hon. Eugene Friend
Hon. Phyllis Lyon

Hon. Amy Meyer
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Walter Jee
Hon. Bruce Lilienthal
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Yoshi Nakashima
Hon. Jean Kastum
Hon. Thomas Horn
Hon. Henry Berman
Hon. Robert McCarthy
Hon. Richard Guggenheim
Hon. Toby Rosenblat
Hon. Patrick McGrew
Hon. Kirk Miller
Hon. Melvin Lee
Hon. Jerry Berg
Hon. Bonnie Gibson
Hon. Mary Noel Pepys
Hon. Mark Buell
Hon. Tim Carrico
Hon. Jo Hanson
Hon. Kevin Malone
John Sanger
Tom Moore

Donald Disler
Jim Wachob
Anne Daley
Linda Post
Lynne Williams
Todd Dickinson
Peter Hanson
Herbert Karlan
William Scortis
Van Hal
Iris Flutien
Noam Rand
John Schmidt
James Mock
Thomas Karwaki
Wendy Goldberg
Joseph Schwartz
Belle Lazarus
Antonio Barries
Bruce Barrett
Charles Howell
Walter McGuire
Sharon Duvall
Joyce Mauriello

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

We're sympathetic to the need for political reform. But it's a complicated problem, and Proposition F just isn't the way to go.

Frankly, we can't tell who is and isn't affected by this measure. While a handful of people sometimes might abuse their positions, that's no reason to question the integrity of so many solid citizens who give tirelessly to public service. Proposition F is simply the wrong approach. Please join us in voting NO.

William E. McDonnell
Frances May McCarthey
N. A. Sapanar
Caroline and Michael Figoni

Martin D. Murphy
Eugene C. Payne III
Suzanne B. McCarthy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Concerned about elected officials spending $400,000 to run for supervisor and $1 million on a mayor's race? Then vote NO on Proposition F.

That's right. NO.

Proposition F isn't going to do anything about campaign spending. Prop F simply limits the size of contributions, reducing the current limit from $1,000 to $500. Supervisors can and will continue spending outrageous sums on their re-election campaigns. With Proposition F they'll just spend twice as much time raising money from twice as many sources, and that makes special interests even more powerful. They can always find ways around campaign limits.

We need campaign spending reform, but Proposition F doesn't provide it. Please join us in voting No on F.

District 8 Democratic Club
Stephen L. Taber
Ruth Gravani
Alan Raznick
Miriam Blaustein

Linda Chapman
Dale Carlson
James Firth
Debra Barnes
Lew Serbin
Debra Stein
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

When campaign contributions are limited, political freedom suffers. Your right to free speech includes not only your right to express your views, but also your right to support as much as you want, any candidate who speaks for you.

Minority viewpoints depend heavily on the contribution of a few dedicated supporters to get your message out. To limit your financial support of your beliefs is to silence your political voice.

Only incumbents, who have many opportunities for free media exposure benefit from this assault on free speech. The dangers of a campaign contribution limit far outweigh any possible benefit from this proposition. **Defeat Proposition F**

San Francisco Libertarian Party
Michael R. Fowler, Secretary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

You may think Prop F only applies to big-time lawyers and a few legislators who represent developers. Think again!

Prop F would prohibit many community leaders from public service. If it passes, board members and employees of community and charitable organizations could be banned from serving on City boards and commissions.

We appreciate the public need for a government free of “influencing peddling.” But restrictions on “compensated advocacy” ought to be clearly and carefully crafted to protect the voices of community leaders who argue on behalf of the public interest, not private special interests.

Vote No.

Hon. Juanita Del Carlo
Mission Hiring Hall

Bob Ross
Publisher, Bay Area Reporter

Hon. Jeffrey Ken Mori
Japanese Community Youth Council, Inc.

Bill O’Callahan
American Red Cross

Hon. George Suncin
Horizons Unlimited

Hon. Jean Rita Alvar
Mission Education Project

Hon. Greg Day
Polf Street Town Hall

Hon. Naomi Gray
Hon. James Foster

Carol Wong
Mariena Marseille

Lee Woods
Jo Daly

Dennis Collins
Hon. H. Welton Flynn

(Organizations listed only for purposes of identification.)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will have no effect on developers’ lawyers. None.

It won’t make any difference to state legislators either.

Don’t kid yourself. This is not “reform” and it isn’t “good government.” Proposition F will allow the special interests and influence peddlers to continue exercising influence over our elected officials. It has so many loopholes, lobbying will actively continue, untouched, in the back rooms of City Hall.

And developers will always find ways around campaign contribution limits. As Common Cause has noted, Prop F simply makes tracing their dollars more difficult for the public.

Real reform would directly attack the source of huge contributions—the developers and other special interests that employ the lobbyists to peddle their influence.

**VOTE NO.**

Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
David Looman
Michael Mason

Rich Waller
Susan Klugerman
Rene Cazenave
Margie O’Driscoll

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON’T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
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PROPOSITION G

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?

YES 300
NO 301

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has adopted an ordinance prohibiting the City, with certain exceptions, from purchasing goods or services from companies doing business with South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a declaration of policy that says the City must try to avoid doing business with companies that significantly profit from or help maintain the Apartheid system in South Africa. It calls on other public bodies and private groups to adopt similar policies. It directs the Board of Supervisors to identify the companies which have the greatest ties to Apartheid so that the public can also boycott those companies.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to avoid doing business with companies that help maintain Apartheid, and you want a public boycott of those companies.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

“The proposed Declaration of Policy be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “G” Got on Ballot

On November 6, 1985 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for the City to boycott businesses with significant ties to South Africa had qualified for the June ballot.

Arlo Hale Smith, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,546 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on October 11.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,941 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:
It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This measure calls for a public boycott of companies that aid apartheid.

Arguing against the boycott is the claim of "conflict" between Proposition G and existing anti-apartheid legislation is imaginary: It is the legislative intent of supporters of this measure that it can be construed as a directive for making existing law tougher.

Personal attacks have no legitimate place in a ballot measure campaign. As proponent of this measure, I repudiate all such tactics.

Vote NO on apartheid. Vote YES on Proposition G.

*Arlo Hale Smith*

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Boycotts are grassroots politics. They've helped the farmworkers, they've helped win integration, and they can help end the legal racism called "Apartheid".

A Gallup poll found 77% of South Africa's black majority favoring international economic boycotts to force the Apartheid regime to accept reform peacefully.

After the Boycott Initiative made the ballot, the San Francisco Supervisors unanimously passed a similar city purchasing policy. The issue that remains is whether to call on the general public to join in, boycotting companies identified by the Supervisors as the worst offenders in each industry.

The companies that would be targeted consider profits to be the "bottom line". Economic pressure is all they understand.

The AFL-CIO, NAACP, and NOW have called a boycott of Shell Oil because of its profiteering from South Africa's oppressive economic conditions. Proposition G supports that and would put the same pressure on other industries as well.

This proposition is supported by the elected county central committee of the Democratic Party, the Peace-and-Freedom Party and the Humanist Party, and by leading attorneys, such as Terry Francois, Terence Hallinan, Tony Serra, Lewis Hope Lee, Marc Van Der Hout, Abby Ginsberg and Terence Redmond.

If South Africa were a democracy, its majority would long ago have voted to end Apartheid. We need to vote YES — because they can't.

*Arlo Hale Smith, Democratic Party County Central Committee*

Paul Kangas, Peace and Freedom Party
Lois Salisbury, Public Advocates*
Dr. Kevin Danaher, Food First*
Jesse James, Mission Rebels
Terry Collins, Community Activist
Stney Gebert, Election Action
Robert McCull, Hotel & Restaurant Employees
Executive Board Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Attorneys speak out against Apartheid:

South African police can arrest anyone without charge. They can hold you incommunicado — no contacts with family, lawyers or press.

They regularly censor news, books, music. They have banned Christmas caroling, funerals and other peaceful gatherings. Groups which criticize the government are forbidden to hold meetings.

Blacks are subject to legal segregation; their property and employment rights are greatly restricted; often, they are simply murdered.

As attorneys, we help people who have legal rights that are being violated. But what can we do for those who have no legal rights?

Boycotts and other economic sanctions are the only way to make the Apartheid government accept reform peacefully.

In the Court of World Public Opinion, Apartheid has been convicted of crimes against humanity. By imposing a sentence of economic isolation, we can end Apartheid.

Vote YES — take a stand for justice.

Terence Hallinan
Arlo Hale Smith
Terry Francois
Karen Anderson Ryer
Robert R. Bryan
Ann Menasche
Rachel Ginsburg
Leo Paoli
Gabriel Gersner
Ora Prouchovnick

*Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.*
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is a moderate, responsible but effective proposal to bring economic pressure on the South African government to establish constitutional rights for all of its citizens.

Vote Yes.

Terence Faulkner, Republican
Mike Garza, Republican

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

All decent Americans abhor apartheid. However, boycotting U.S. investment in South Africa is counterproductive; it only penalizes the actual victims of apartheid.

U.S. international firms have acted as progressive agents for change through the Sullivan principles. Their investments have improved the social and economic condition of the labor force.

It is improper to penalize their positive contributions.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

We are individuals and organizations working actively to end the racist system of apartheid in South Africa. And we are voting NO on Proposition G.

Why?

(1) Because Proposition G will weaken San Francisco’s present divestment law. This law requires companies doing business with the city to sign affidavits that they will make no new contracts with South Africa.

Proposition G has no such provision.

(2) Proposition G provides no mechanism or funding to carry out its declared purpose of “boycotting” South Africa.

Proposition G will not stop South African products from entering the Port of San Francisco.

Vote against this useless, confusing, and deceptive initiative.

Preserve the stronger divestment law San Francisco already has.

Vote NO on Proposition G!

Yonnee Golden
Geraldine Johnson
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
AFT 2121 Anti-Apartheid Committee
 artists Against Apartheid
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Coalition of Conscience
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club Executive Committee
ILWU 10 and SEIU 250 Southern Africa Liberation Support Committees
National Conference of Black Lawyers
San Francisco Anti-Apartheid Committee
Southern Africa Freedom Committee/All Peoples Congress

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1983 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!

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

PROPOSITION H

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?

YES 303
NO 304

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Several city and private agencies conduct various programs related to AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a declaration of policy that says San Francisco should support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council, consisting of a Committee on Education and a Fund-Raising Committee. The Research Committee would make recommendations on the most useful AIDS research projects and try to prevent duplication of efforts. The Education Committee would inform the public about the latest research and about ways to prevent AIDS. The Fund-Raising Committee would seek donations and grants for AIDS research and education projects.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

“The proposed Declaration of Policy for an AIDS research and education council and the formation of advisory committees of civic leaders would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, additional expenditure of public funds for AIDS research may result, the amount of which cannot be determined.”

How “H” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for AIDS research had qualified for the June ballot.

Stony Gebert, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 10,540 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on December 6, 1985.

A check of each signature on the petition showed that 7,564 of the signatures were valid. This is more than 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We need a council to expose and address major AIDS issues without the impasse of present medical/political bias.

As taxpayers, we are subsidizing a treadmill of continual AIDS casualties. There are major oversights where AIDS is concerned. Only recently was it learned that CDC statistics suggest 79% of early AIDS cases appear drug-related. We hear AIDS is 100% fatal. Perhaps that is because death may also be drug-related in the way of immuno-suppressive antibiotic and radiation overloads to already compromised immunity systems. Prevailing medicine is both tunnel-visioned and high-profit motivated. Also well-funded. This solution may be part of the problem. Some physicians are beginning to feel where AIDS is concerned many current practices are ethically, medically bankrupt.

Remissions occur. Largely through immunity-enhancing, holistic medicine. Significantly, only 1% of AIDS cases occur among people at risk in the Asian community. Perhaps this is due to less drug abuse or use of an unfunded, ignored resource: herbology as part of diet. More options: homeopathy, acupuncture, etc.

If, as anticipated, upwards of 40% of those testing positive come down with AIDS, we may become overburdened. To ignore all of the above becomes part of the problem. Vote Yes on Proposition H.

Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Rich McKirkeby, Former Orderly,
Marketing Associate, Pacific Bell
Joseph P. Clady, AIDS Hospice, Shanti Counselor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There is great need for research and education about AIDS and related conditions.
We need to attack the disease, not its victims.
Knowledge is the only vaccine available today.
Vote Yes.

John Lorenzini, President,
People With AIDS Alliance
Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Jan Beck, Steven Russell, Eugene Ewins, ARC/AIDS Vigil

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There are many possible treatments for AIDS and related conditions which are not being examined by the federal government, especially therapies based on natural substances and processes.
Vote Yes for an AIDS Research Council open to all viewpoints.

Scott Gregory, M.D.
Paul Kangas

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

A tape recording (Talking Book) of the San Francisco Voter Information pamphlet is available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

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

Name___________________________________________________________
Address_________________________________ Apt. #___________
Telephone No. (required)_________________________________________
Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □
Availability:  
I want to work in the following area(s): ____________________________
Second choice locations (if any)____________________________________
Signature_______________________________________________________
PROPOSITION 1
Shall It be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway? YES 307 NO 308

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the Freeway with a surface roadway.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City’s policy to remain as it is, and you want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to change the City’s policy, and you do not want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a policy statement asking whether or not the Embarcadero Freeway should be torn down.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway demolished, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by at least $10.2 million in local funds. Potential private sector financing and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “I” Got on Ballot

On March 3 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy placing the question of demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway before the voters had qualified for the June ballot.

Richard Hongisto, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 11,119 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,720 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

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

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land now under the Broadway ramps is put back on the tax rolls, with low-rise buildings limited by restrictive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when united with Proposition J, recognizes these facts:

1) The Embarcadero Freeway is what is left of a never-completed elevated freeway that would have ringed the City through North Beach and Marina neighborhoods to the Golden Gate Bridge.

2) Today this massive freeway, which separates us from our waterfront, would never be built.

3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.

4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman’s Wharf will be preserved.

5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked for this new system.

6) Only that portion of the Embarcadero Freeway east and north of the Main and Beale Street ramps—basically the portion directly on the waterfront—will be removed to make way for the new system. The removal cost, approximately $10 million to be paid for with privately-generated new revenues, is a relatively small part of the overall new system.

As for Proposition I, vote “YES, let’s tear down the Embarcadero Freeway!” Then turn to Proposition J and support the plan for a beautiful waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Removing the Embarcadero Freeway will allow San Francisco to:

• Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero.

• Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway.

• Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula.

• Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero.

• Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.

• Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won’t benefit San Francisco. Don’t let outsiders determine our future. Vote YES on I.

Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Jack Whidby
Roger Boyer
A. Lee Knight
Robert Bradford
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Donald A. Crosby, AIA
Tai Y. Okamoto
Robert Meyers
Ralph Hurtado
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Douglas G. Wright
Anta Sanchez
Chuck Forester
Fritz Arko
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Dehart, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones
Randall Rossi
Karl Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
Jon Twitchell
Jane Winslow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON I

This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY—VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds — without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city’s fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.

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

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT — VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree — it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests rob San Francisco of its potential.

ABSENT VOTER BALLOT APPLICATION

Applicants must be received by the registrar of voters no later than 5/27/86.

Election Date: June 3, 1986

PLEASE PRINT REGISTERED NAME:

FIRST NAME MIDDLE NAME LAST NAME

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

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

X SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT (DO NOT PRINT) DATE (AREA CODE) DAYTIME TELEPHONE

I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY


Ballot Type/Party Affiliate No.

Signature and Registration Verified as Correct:

Date Deputy Registrar

DATE OF BIRTH

MAIL COMPLETED FORM TO:

Registrar of Voters

Room 155 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT PROPER SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

STREET OR BOX

CITY STATE ZIP

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE.

cars a day whizzing by on this high speed downtown elevated waterfront freeway! Where will they all go?

Aside from the outrageous demolition costs involved, (some engineers estimate $40,000,000 of taxpayer money!), eyeball observation, logic, and just plain “common sense” dictates that ground level “total gridlock” will result if this expensive freeway is now destroyed.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled.

Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

— LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY
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Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I.
In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should which spells out the con eks should be replaced.
The waterfront plan rev visors includes removal of order to make way for go go, will pay for itself as land back on the tax rolls, with tive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when these facts:
1) The Embarcadero completed elevated free through North Beach and Gate Bridge.
2) Today this massive

VOTE YES ON PROJ
Removing the Embar cisco to:
• Create a six-lane, ti improvements to speed traf • Build new on and off ter access to the Bay Br • Remove the unused 2,000 AVE and streamline traffic from the Peninsula.
• Provide bicycle paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero.
• Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.
• Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to im • Proof the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these

FROM:

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?
(FIRM SU APPLICACION?)

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK — VOTE YES ON I
This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY — VOTE YES ON I
Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds — without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city's fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities. DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT—VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to 15.7 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown, Fisherman's Wharf and the financial district would be reduced.

Travel within the city would be slowed down at all hours. Vote no to the destruction of the freeway.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
- Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
- Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
- If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
  - By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
  - Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
  - MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
  - Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Judith Tornese

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Tear it down? The concept is preposterous! There are 70,000 cars a day whizzing by on this high speed downtown elevated waterfront freeway! Where will they all go?

Aside from the outrageous demolition costs involved, (some engineers estimate $400,000,000 of taxpayer money!), eyeball observation, logic, and just plain "common sense" dictates that ground level "total gridlock" will result if this expensive freeway is now destroyed.

Nostalgic individuals must realize that the times have changed! We can't bring the Bay back up to Montgomery Street! On behalf of San Francisco's overburdened taxpayers, we urge a NO vote!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled.
Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

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

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?

YES 310

NO 311

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a policy statement that says that the City would replace the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt a policy statement which says that the Embarcadero Freeway would be torn down if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt a policy statement to replace the Embarcadero Freeway under these conditions.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway replaced with a tree-lined six lane boulevard and other traffic and transit improvements, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by approximately $27.5 million. This includes a one-time freeway demolition cost of $10.2 million plus $17.3 million required to match potential federally-funded transit improvements. Potential financing by the State and private sector and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “J” Got on Ballot

On March 5 a declaration of policy regarding the future of the Embarcadero Freeway was delivered to the Registrar from the Mayor and several supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows the Mayor or four or more supervisors to submit a declaration of policy to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

In addition to Mayor Feinstein, the March 5 document was signed by Supervisors Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker, Molinari, Kennedy and Nelder.

POLLS ARE OPEN
FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans now have a chance to remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with an at-grade, six-lane parkway, which will open our waterfront and restore views blocked for years by this large freeway.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for traffic and transit improvements:

- New, shorter freeway ramps connecting directly with the Embarcadero;
- A tree-lined, at-grade, 6-lane Embarcadero Boulevard, with a new waterfront Muni line, a jogging and bicycle path from Fisherman's Wharf to Mission Bay;
- Extension of Muni Metro south to the Caltrain station at 4th and Townsend;
- New ramps connecting I-280 with The Embarcadero;
- Changes in traffic flow and improvements to existing freeway ramps.

Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf will be preserved and enhanced.

The Board of Supervisors has specified that the Embarcadero Freeway will be torn down only if preliminary engineering during the next two years confirms—as traffic and environmental studies already have—that removal of the freeway will not result in more problems than it solves.

San Francisco became eligible for $88 million in federal highway funds for this new system when the Supervisors approved the plan in 1980. The $10.2 million cost of freeway demolition itself can be paid from revenues from low-rise development of the parcels now under the Broadway ramps and the increased values of nearby properties. Strict waterfront zoning limits the size of any development.

Traffic and environmental studies by the California Department of Transportation since 1980 clearly indicate that the new waterfront transportation system will be vastly superior to the existing situation, and that traffic congestion levels will not be notably different with the elevated structure removed.

Vote Yes on J and let's remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with a parkway and transit system—once again let us see our waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J gives the voters a chance to be heard on an important and timely issue. This issue is the replacement of a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway as one element of a comprehensive package of transportation improvements in the Waterfront area.

Last fall, the Board of Supervisors adopted for further study a set of traffic and transit improvements for the Waterfront. These improvements include:

- a new landscaped surface-level boulevard
- replacement of the Clay/Washington and Broadway on and off ramps with new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom
- removal of the unused stub of I-280 and construction of new ramps connecting the new waterfront boulevard to Route I-280
- a new light rail transit line linking Fort Mason with the Caltrain Depot
- extension of the Muni Metro to the train depot, improving the Peninsula Commute Service

A YES vote on Proposition J does not allocate funds for these projects. It does allow for further design and engineering studies, including cost analysis, assessment of impacts on traffic, and other matters. The studies will then be presented to the Supervisors so that they can make an informed decision on the plan. If the studies prove positive, San Francisco will be able to transform its Waterfront for the benefit of all.

Proposition J will insure that the City will not proceed with the removal of any of the Freeway until all the studies are completed and all potential consequences are assessed. This is the responsible approach. Vote YES on J.

SPUR
League of Women Voters
Embarcadero Citizens Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SAN FRANCISCO'S NEIGHBORHOODS ASK YOU TO VOTE YES ON J.

REDUCE TRAFFIC CONGESTION—YES ON J!

Traffic backed up by the Embarcadero Roadway slows travel and creates congestion in North Beach and other nearby neighborhoods. J will speed traffic flow.

IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION—YES ON J!

Proposition J will provide regular streetcar service along the Embarcadero and extend Muni Metro service to the south, ultimately extending to Bayview-Hunters Point.

PROMOTE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY—YES ON J!

If Proposition J does not pass, San Francisco could lose $88 million in federal funds for traffic improvements.

(continued)
RESTORE THE WATERFRONT—YES ON J!
San Francisco's waterfront could become a focal point for the city, graced by a grand promenade, instead of the dismal, deteriorating eyesore it is now.
San Francisco's neighborhoods join together to ask your support for an improved Embarcadero. We guarantee the freeway will not be removed unless it is replaced by facilities that will assure a smoother, more efficient traffic flow. YES ON J!
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Robert Bradford
Ruth Gravanis
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Anita Sanchez
Nancy Katz
Robert Katz
Beverly Mills
North Beach Neighbors
John Behanna
Herbert D. Kosovitz
Jerry Hurvado
Gregory E. Jones
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors
Dale A. Carlsen
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Ralph Hurvado
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Chuck Forester
David M. Hartley
Donald P. Black
Mrs. Blundt Plan
Richard Reinhardt
James W. Haas
James Ream
Jill M. Jones
Peter J. Locke
Marjorie G. Stern
John R. Lawry
Lawrence Furlonghetti
Nancy Peters
Steven Taber

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J
SUPPORT PUBLIC TRANSIT—VOTE YES ON J.
SAVE SAN FRANCISCO FROM GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON J.
The revitalization of the Northeastern Waterfront...as included in San Francisco's Master Plan and transit plans, as overwhelmingly approved by the Board of Supervisors and as urged by Mayor Feinstein...will allow almost $90 million in unused federal highway funds to be used for vital downtown and waterfront transit and street improvements which will be a key to reducing needless auto congestion in San Francisco.
PROPOSITION J SUPPORTS IMPORTANT TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS TO THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT. It will:
—extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific/CalTrain depot
—create a new rail line (possibly using historic streetcars) to connect the entire waterfront from Mission Bay to the Ferry Building to Fisherman's Wharf and Fort Mason
—set the stage for a possible streetcar line along Third Street
Since the city of San Francisco adopted the Transit First policy in the early 1970's, transit investments in the Muni Metro,
in new electric trolley an articulated bus service, and in BART and Golden Gate Transit, have saved downtown San Francisco from gridlock!
IF you are concerned about the future of transit in San Francisco, IF you are concerned about reducing needless auto congestion, THEN we urge you to join Mayor Feinstein and the majority of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in voting Yes on Proposition J.

NORMAN ROLFE
San Francisco Muni Coalition
California Transit League
Jack Wholey
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Regina Sneed
Tony Kilroy
Hon. Jack Morrison
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Bay Area Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Hon. Amy Meyer, Recreation and Park Commissioner
Alan Lubliner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J
A SOUND BUSINESS PROPOSITION—YES ON J.
Common sense and good business demand we make the most of our resources. San Francisco's waterfront is an economic and civic asset unrivaled anywhere—yet much of it is cut off by an ugly, noisy, elevated roadway. The traffic improvements called for by Proposition J will benefit workers, tourists, property owners, neighborhoods, and business.
—Traffic flow and transit will move quickly on a realigned, reorganized Embarcadero Roadway, allowing easier, more pleasant access to waterfront businesses.
—An improved and beautified Embarcadero will create new commercial opportunities and increase the value of existing property and businesses.
—New jobs and an expanded tax base will generate increased revenue for the city as several lots now covered by freeway ramps return to productive private ownership. Though limited to low rise development (40 to 65 feet), tax revenues from development will more than make up the city's share of the project.

ROBERT MEYERS
Deenis J. Potts
Kenneth R. Lerch
M. Arthur Gensler, Jr., PAA
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones

Randal Gossi
Karl A. Linbich
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halstead
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
John Tischolf
Fritz Ako
Michael J. O'Shea

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J OFFERS RESIDENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO A ONCE IN A LIFETIME OPPORTUNITY TO RECAPTURE THEIR WATERFRONT.

Converting the Embarcadero into a tree-lined boulevard and building a new streetcar line will make the waterfront more pedestrian and transit oriented, that is, more people oriented.

A freeway structure that is a source of objectionable noise and casts a pall over a large part of the waterfront will be removed. The waterfront will be opened up to sunlight and fresh air and made more inviting and cheerful to those who wish to walk on one of the world’s outstanding waterfronts. Air pollution that is now retained by the existing elevated structure will be dissipated.

The transit orientation of the new waterfront will encourage energy conservation. Proposition J will:

— Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero
— Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway
— Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula

— Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero
— Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line
— Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won’t benefit San Francisco. Don’t let outsiders determine our future.

VOTE YES ON J FOR A BETTER SAN FRANCISCO.

Sierra Club
Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage
Willihilda McCrea* Bob Cramer*
Rebecca Evans* Richard Livingston*
Marilyn Clemens* Jennie Law* Jeffrey Henne*
Jane Winslow* Roger Buyer

A. Lee Knight
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Patrick S. Hokin
Monica Halloran
Walter K. Morris
Lisa Klairmoni
Jeffrey Heller
Bob Isaacson
George T. Rockrise, FAIA
Jon Twichell
Marc Kasky

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J GIVES US A CHANCE TO CORRECT A COLOSSAL MISTAKE!

The Embarcadero Freeway should never have been built. The original plan was to build a freeway from bridge to bridge, destroying the Northern Waterfront, Fisherman’s Wharf, Fort Mason, and Marina Green in the process. When the people of San Francisco saw what was happening, they stopped it in mid-air—literally.

Walk under it. Hear the noise. Feel the gloom. See how it cuts out light.

It’s time to remove this mistake.

The new waterfront plan will give us a tree-lined boulevard, a new streetcar line, and a Muni Metro extension to the Southern Pacific/Caltrain depot. It will give us a transit and pedestrian oriented waterfront that will give us pride and pleasure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J!

San Francisco Tomorrow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, with a membership of 1700 working architects in San Francisco, urges a “YES” vote on Proposition J. In 1968 the citizens of San Francisco stopped highway planners from ringing our waterfront with freeways. Today voters have another opportunity to return the waterfront to our citizens. Removal of the Embarcadero Freeway is one part of a carefully researched transit plan for San Francisco. This proposition supplies an unique opportunity to carry out a broad range of transportation improvements that will have many positive effects on the City of San Francisco.

Removal of the freeway will:

1. Return the waterfront to the people by removing this barrier to access and view.
2. Facilitate needed MUNI improvements.
3. Encourage development of the Embarcadero as a grand civic boulevard unifying the City of San Francisco.

The members of the American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition I and “YES” on Proposition J.

Donald Kennedy, FAIA
President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans love their city, the ambiance, the bay, waterfront, the views, the healthy neighborhoods.

Freeway builders did their damnest to destroy the City and divide our neighborhoods.

Now we can remove that damned spot, the concrete dinosaur, the hideous barrier that destroys our scenic views, the fence that keeps us from the bay, the concealer of the ferry building.

Correct a mistake.

VOTE YES ON J.

Miriam Blaustein
Charlene Clark
Marie Cleasby
Zach Cowan
Dick Grosfeld
Rick Hauptman

Tony Kilroy
Jean Kortum
Ira Karlander
Jack Morrison
Andy Nash
Norman Rolfe

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

NO ON PROPOSITION J.

"J" is for JOKE—a cruel joke on us. What will J really do? Add traffic to every street east of Gough. Delay the construction of waterfront streetcar service. Cost millions in local dollars needed to improve MUNI. Create a ground-level freeway on the waterfront as big as Van Ness, with more cars.

I'm a private citizen who's concerned about traffic and what it's doing to our City. If you are too, vote NO on Proposition J.

Steve Colman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:

- Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
- Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
- If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that

— By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—a 161% increase. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.

— Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.

— MUNI buses, trackless trolleybuses and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in passenger hours of travel.

— Person hours of travel for commuters will be 75% greater under the city's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Blair C. Pascoe

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

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

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

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.

2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.

3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.

4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.

5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.

6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION A

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by boldface type.

3.202 Office of Risk Management
There is established under the chief administrative officer an office of risk management which shall review, analyze and report to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the finance committee of the board of supervisors the practices of the several departments, boards and commissions of the city and county regarding loss prevention and risk management, including the insurance requirements of the city and county. The office shall also establish and assist in the implementation of planning and operational guidelines regarding risk management and loss prevention for each department, board or commission. The chief administrative officer may appoint, at his or her pleasure, or contract with, a qualified individual or organization for the operation of the office. The qualifications of the individual or organization operating the office shall include relevant education, training and experience in insurance and risk management.

3.401 City Attorney
(a) The city attorney shall be an elective officer. He shall furnish an official bond in the sum of ten thousand dollars ($100,000). He shall appoint, and at his pleasure may remove, all assistants and employees of his office. He shall devote his entire time and attention to the duties of his office. He must, at the time of his election, be an elector of the city and county, qualified to practice in all the courts of the state, and he must have been so qualified for at least 10 years next preceding his election.

The city attorney must represent the city and county in all actions and proceedings in which it may be legally interested, or, for or against the city and county, or, any officer of the city and county in any action or proceeding, when directed so to do by the supervisors, except where a cause of action exists in favor of the city and county against said officer. Whenever any cause of action exists in favor of the city and county, the city attorney shall commence the same within his knowledge or when directed so to do by the supervisors. He shall give his advice or opinion in writing to any officer, board or commission of the city and county when requested. Except as otherwise provided in this charter, he shall not settle or dismiss any litigation for or against the city and county, unless, upon his written recommendation, he is ordered so to do by ordinance.

The city attorney shall prepare, or approve as to form, all ordinances before they are enacted by the supervisors. He shall approve, by endorsement in writing, the form of all official or other bonds required by this charter or by ordinance before the same are submitted to the proper commission, board or office for final approval, and no such bonds shall be finally approved without such approval as to form by the city attorney. Except as otherwise in this charter provided, he shall prepare in writing the draft or form of all contracts before the same are executed on behalf of the city and county. He shall examine and approve the title of all real property to be acquired by the city and county.

He shall keep on file in his office copies of all written communications and opinions, also all papers, briefs and transcripts used in matters wherein he appears; and books of record and registers of all actions or proceedings in his charge in which the city and county or any officer or board thereof, is a party or is interested.

(b) The duties of the city attorney in connection with the bureau of delinquent revenue collection shall be transferred to and performed by the attorney for said bureau who shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

(c) There is established in the office of the city attorney a bureau of claims investigation and administration which shall have the responsibility of investigating, evaluating and processing for the several boards, commissions and departments all claims for money or damages made upon the city and county pursuant to section 7.603 of this charter or the general law of the State of California. Claim investigation functions of the police department in existence on June 4, 1986, shall continue as an adjunct to the bureau established under this section. Claims functions of the public utilities commission shall remain under that commission unless transferred to the bureau of claims investigation and administration by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the bureau shall also have the power to investigate events and occurrences giving rise to potential civil liability against the city and county and adjust and settle demands, within dollar limits to be established by ordinance, prior to their presentment as claims. There shall be established by ordinance a revolving fund to satisfy such demands adjusted prior to their presentment as claims. The bureau shall be responsible for the investigation of all claims and the analysis of city policies and practices upon which the bureau shall report and advise the several departments.

The city attorney shall appoint a chief of the bureau who shall serve at his or her pleasure. The chief of the bureau may appoint, subject to confirmation by the city attorney, investigators who shall serve at the pleasure of the chief; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of civil claims investigator or any equivalent classification on the date of approval of this amendment by the electorate shall continue to have civil service status to said position under the civil service provisions of this charter.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by boldface type; deletions are indicated by horizontal strikethrough.

7.100 Materials, Supplies and Equipment
The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreements for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchasing head, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof and the approval of the purchasing head, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract. All purchases in excess of one thousand dollars ($1,000) shall be by written contract provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases and a permanent record of all such quotations shall be kept. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) for materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of materials, supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two or more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requested and may advertise for
bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head or any departmental employee recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require department to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall direct the rejection of all articles which may be below standards, specifications or samples furnished. He shall not approve any bill or voucher for articles not in conformity with specifications, or which are at variance with any contract.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall also have charge of central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and radio signal, shall be operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies, and equipment purchased for and in use in all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.

7.103 Requisition, Contract and Payment
All purchases orders and contracts shall be based on written requisitions, or, for materials, or supplies in common use in the various departments, on the purchase's records of average use by all departments. Purchase orders and contracts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) must be approved by the chief administrative officer. Departments operating with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall approve all bids and vouchers for materials, supplies, equipment, and contractual services before the controller shall draw and approve warrants therefor. All contracts for the purchase of materials, supplies and equipment shall be made after inviting sealed bids by publication. All sealed bids received shall be kept on file. When an award of contract is made, notice that the same has been made shall be given by one publication, and any interested persons may examine the bids and records at the purchaser's office.

The purchaser of supplies shall by rules and regulations, approved by the chief administrative officer and the controller, designate and authorize the appropriate personnel in the purchasing department to accept the purchaser's signature authority for purchase orders and contracts ap-

PROVED AS PROVIDED IN THIS CHARTER.

7.200 Public Works and Purchasing Contracts
The construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works for improvements, and the purchase of supplies, materials and equipment, when the expenditure involved in each case shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), shall be done by contract, except as otherwise provided by this charter. It shall constitute official misconduct to split or divide any public work or improvement or purchase into two or more units for the purpose of evading the contract provisions of this section.

In an emergency, provided an actual emergency be declared by the board of supervisors to exist, and when authorized by resolution of said board, any public work or improvement may be executed in the most expeditious manner. Notwithstanding any other provision in this section or this charter contained, upon the approval of the chief administrative officer declaring the work to be in emergency in character, there may be expended by the department of public works the sum not to exceed five hundred dollars ($500) for new construction of any type in or upon unimproved or unencumbered real property.

Any purchase or improvement estimated to cost less than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) may be performed under contract or written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county. Any public work or improvement estimated to cost not more than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or by the heads of departments not under the chief administrative officer, only after detailed estimates have been prepared and submitted by the head of the department concerned. There shall be separate accounting for each work or improvement so executed, which accounting shall include all direct, indirect and supervisory elements of cost chargeable to such work or improvement, and each accounting shall be reported to the chief administrative officer, or to the mayor when such work shall have been performed by employees not under the chief administrative officer. All such accounts shall be reported to the controller. Any public work or improvement costing less than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) and not performed by the use of city and county labor, materials, and supplies, shall, if not performed under contract, be covered by written order or agreement.

If any provision of this section is in conflict with any provision of section 7.100 of the charter, the provision contained in section 7.100 shall govern and control.

Beginning with fiscal year 1985-86, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.

7.201 Public Works Contract Procedure by Ordinance
Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter and, in particular, the provisions of section 7.200, the board of supervisors shall by ordinance determine the monetary limits not to exceed fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), within which the construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements may be done by contract or by written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county, consistent, saved as to monetary limits, with the manner provided for in section 7.200 and section 7.100.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.
point two commissioners to terms of one year each, one commissioner to a term of two years, one commissioner to a term of three years and one commissioner to a term of four years. Thereafter, the terms of the commissioners shall be for four years from the commencement thereof. Not less than one-fourth members of said commission shall be of the same sex, and one member shall have prior experience representing labor and one member shall have prior experience representing management.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am appointed to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of one hundred dollars ($100).

Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of considering and adopting examination questions shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission, after the regular daily working hours of 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Such person or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

In accordance with section 3.590, the commission shall have the power and it shall be its duty to appoint an executive assistant to be the administrative head of the affairs under its control who shall serve at its pleasure; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of assistant secretary to the civil service commission on the effective date of this section shall continue to have civil service status in the position of executive assistant under the civil service provisions of this charter.

3.661 General Powers and Duties

(a) The civil service commission shall be the employment and personnel department of the city and county and shall determine appointments on the basis of merit and fitness, as shown by appropriate tests. The commission shall classify, and from time to time classify, in accordance with duties and responsibilities of the employment, training and experience required, all places of employment in the departments and offices of the city and county not specifically exempted from this charter from the civil service provisions thereof, or which may be created hereunder. The commission may order the abolition of any specific place of employment, so long as such abolition has not been specifically exempted from said civil service provisions. The commission shall likewise classify all other positions or other places of employment in the city and county service not specifically exempted from the civil service provisions of this charter, but which, by the provisions of section 3.401 thereof, are made subject to classification for salary and tenure. The classification of the basis of duties and responsibilities of the employment and training and experience required for the civil service personnel shall be subject to classification.

The commission shall have the power to inquire into the operation of the personnel system of the city and county to ensure compliance with the principles set forth in section 3.310. After such inquiry, the Commission may recommend to the personnel director, as established pursuant to section 3.663, the mayor or to any other officer of the city and county such action as the commission believes necessary to carry out the civil service provisions of this charter. In any hearing conducted by the personnel commission or by any hearing officer it appoints, the commission or the hearing officer shall have the power to subpoena and require the attendance of witnesses and the production of records as provided in section 3.701.

(b) The civil service commission may require periodic reports from the personnel director in a manner and form which it shall prescribe.

(c) The civil service commission may hear appeals from an action of the personnel director with respect to:

1. Allegations of discrimination. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions thereof, the decision of the civil service commission regarding allegations of discrimination shall forthwith be enforced by every officer and employee.

2. Allegations of fraud; and

3. Allegations of conflict of interest, pursuant to section 3.105.

(d) No action by the personnel director which is the subject of any appeal shall be stayed during the appeal process except by the unanimous vote of the civil service commission.

(e) The compensation shall be notified of the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal of personnel regulations and may comment on such proposals. The adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing fraud or allegations of discrimination shall be subject to ratification by the commission.

3.662 Department of Personnel Administration

There is hereby established a department of personnel administration which shall consist of a personnel director and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. Any employee who was a permanent service appointee assigned to the civil service commission and whose job function is placed under the department of personnel administration shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job function had not, by amendment to this charter, been placed under the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration.

The department of personnel administration shall be the personnel department for the city and county and shall provide a means to recruit, select, certify, appoint, train, evaluate, promote career development, classify positions, administer salaries, administer employee discipline, discharge and other related personnel activities in order to maintain an effective and responsive workforce.

3.663 Personnel Director

(a) A personnel director shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the mayor; provided, however, that the personnel director shall be selected from candidates nominated by any civil service commissioner and confirmed by vote of the board of supervisors. The nominee of the mayor may be appointed acting personnel director pending confirmation. The person so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am appointed to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of personnel director in the spirit of this declaration."

(b) The personnel director shall conduct appropriate examinations for employment, establish eligible lists based on their results and provide for certification of eligibles. The action of the personnel director on examination matters including,
but not limited to, announcements, minimum qualifications, classes of applicants, components, construction, weighting, content, type, list length, duration, and other factors shall be final.

c. The personnel director shall adopt personnel regulations which, except as otherwise provided in this charter, shall govern both the administrative matters within the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration and the exercise of the authority granted in this section, including, but not limited to, examinations; applications; examination; eligibility; duration of eligible lists; certification of eligibles; permanent, temporary and provisional appointments; regular performance evaluations; promotions; transfers; reductions; layoffs or reduction in force due to lack of work or lack of funds, reorganization, reemployment or completion of work; and classification. No personnel regulations shall be adopted, amended or repealed without a public hearing upon at least two weeks public notice by the personnel director and after meeting with sessions with recognized employee organizations as required by state law. All civil service commission rules relevant to the foregoing as well as the provisions of former sections 8.302, 8.322, 8.325, 8.326, 8.329, 8.339, 8.343, 8.344 are hereby declared to be affected by this charter shall become personnel regulations on the effective date of this charter amendment.

d. The personnel director shall conduct the salary surveys for the civil service commission as set forth elsewhere in this charter.

e. The personnel director by personnel regulation shall establish procedures to review and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the personnel director shall forthwith be enforced by every employee and office, unless the decision is appealed to the civil service commission in accordance with personnel regulations.

f. The personnel director shall investigate all employee complaints concerning job related conduct of City and County employees and shall promptly report to the source of the complaint.

g. The personnel director by personnel regulation shall establish procedures for efficient and prompt complaint resolution through personnel programs that encourage high productivity and exemplary performance.

h. The personnel director by personnel regulation shall provide a procedure for resolution of employee disputes which shall be consistent with other provisions of this charter and shall be utilized by all department heads and appointing officers upon the expiration of the existing term of any otherwise binding agreements.

i. Consistent with the foregoing and other applicable provisions of this charter, the personnel director shall delegate to the various appointing officers appropriate personnel responsibilities, including but not limited to appropriate disciplinary procedures, and consult with appointing officers with respect to personnel regulations affecting their operations.

j. Personal services contracts shall be reviewed and approved by the personnel director in accordance with the provisions of appropriate personnel regulations. Personal services contracts reasonably expected to involve payment by the city and county in excess of fifty thousand dollars ($52,500) shall also be reviewed and approved by the Commission. Failure of the Commission to act within 30 days of submission of the contract by the personnel director shall be deemed to constitute approval of the commission.

k. The personnel director shall establish a system of job classification. The provisions of section 8.200 shall govern whenever new classifications are created or existing positions are reclassified. The personnel director shall be the judge of such classification determinations.

l. From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the department of personnel administration shall determine whether a position is eligible for a civil service commission examination to be temporary or permanent. Appointments may be made on a permanent, temporary or, where confirmation is required, a provisional basis.

m. Excepting sections 3.500, 3.660, 3.661, 8.105, 8.107, all the second to the last paragraph of section 3.841, section 3.846, the last sentence of section 8.400, all but the last three words in the first sentence of the third paragraph of section 8.401, sections 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.406, 8.407, and this section, wherever the words "civil service commission" or "commission" appear in the personal provisions of this charter, they shall be replaced by the words "department of personnel administration", "department", "personnel director" or "director", as the context permits, with the words "department", "personnel director" or "director" to be replaced by the words "civil service commission" or "commission", the words "general manager", personnel and "secretary of the civil service commission" shall be replaced by the words "personnel director" and the words "section 3.661" shall be replaced by the words "section 3.662" or "section 3.663," as appropriate.

(1) The chair of the board of supervisors, after consultation with the City attorney, is hereby directed to conform the language of the charter as herein amended when next the charter is submitted for republication.

(2) Protest of Written Questions and Answers

—After the written portion of a civil service examination has been held, the questions used and the answers thereto shall be available for review by the participants. This review period shall not apply to questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written test. During the review period, participants shall have an opportunity to protest questions and answers they believe to be incorrect or improper. Any and all protested questions have been acted upon and the file has been reviewed, and the identification sheets have been opened. Further changes in the rating key shall not be made.

(3) Protest of Tentative List of Eligibles

—Following the completion of any examination, a tentative list of eligibles shall be posted for the inspection of the public and of participants. The posting period shall be for a minimum of three (3) working days for the entrance examinations or five (5) working days for the entrance examinations and promotional examinations. During this period, a fee for the inspection of the papers of each eligible shall be charged by the civil service commission. The amount of such fee shall be established by ordinance of the board of supervisors. The fee shall be waived for eligibles who wish to inspect their own papers. Inspection of papers shall include all documents upon which the eligible is rated. Neither the identity of the examiner giving any mark or grade in an oral examination nor the questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written test shall be provided. Only participants in the examination may review the questions used in the examination. If no question is protested within the specified period the eligible list is automatically adopted. If protests are received during the posting period the investigation and action of the general manager, personnel, shall be expedited so that final adoption of the eligible list is not delayed beyond sixty (60) days after the date of protest. When an eligible list is adopted the charter would receive a notice of appointment regardless of the outcome of the protest(s) may be offered employment from adopted lists pending the resolution of any protest(s) and amendment to the adopted eligible list.

(4) Promotions in General

—Except as specifically provided for in section 8.327, the Civil Service Commission shall provide for examinations on an entrance, promotional or combination examination basis. Consideration shall be given to permanent employees in separate and combined examinations which are combined with entrance examinations for city and county service when the passing mark has been attained and may include evaluation of work performance and other credits. When an examination announcement is issued for a civil service examination, promtion, or entrance basis, there shall be one resulting list of eligibles which shall include all successful candidates—both promotional and entrance—in order of relative performance.

—No thing or matter to the contrary in this or any other provision of the charter, an employee who has been certified from a regularly adopted civil service examination shall be permitted to participate in promotional examinations on the same terms and conditions as a person holding a permanent appointment to a position in that same classification, subject only to demonstrating satisfaction of job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the civil service commission. The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to promotional examinations announced after its effective date.

(5) Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave

—Employees under permanent civil service appointment who, because of absence on duty authorized military leave after June 27, 1950, did not participate in a promotional examination held after June 27, 1950, and during time of war as defined in section 8.324 of this charter, and in which examination the employee would have been otherwise eligible to complete had the war not intervened, and which examination is hereinafter referred to as the original promotional examination, shall be given a supplementary examination, have the right to participate in a similar promotional examination. Provided, that persons and employees whose names are on the competitive or promotional eligible lists, shall, for the purpose of this amendment, be deemed to be appointed in their classifications from the time their names were reached for permanent certification while in the military service.

—in order to qualify for participation in a similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section, such employee who desires to participate in such examination, shall make an application to the civil service commissioner within thirty days after the abridgment of his military leave, or within thirty days after the effective date of this amendment. Failure to file such written request to participate in a similar promotional examination as herein provided shall be deemed a waiver of all rights of the employee to participate in such similar promotional examination.

These rules and regulations are intended only to establish such similar promotional examination within a reasonable time after employees eligible to request participation in any such similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section have indicated their desire to so participate and can request to participate, as herein provided.

These rules and regulations are intended only to establish the sole judge of the adequacy of such similar promotional examination. If the employee obtains in the similar promotional examination a score rating equal to or
more than the minimum passing mark established by the civil service commission for inclusion on the list of eligibles resulting from the original promotional examination, the name shall thereupon be entered on the eligible list resulting from the original promotional examination in accordance with the relative excellence obtained by all the qualified participants in the original and similar promotional examinations.

Such employees shall be eligible for appointment from such list in accordance with civil service rules to any vacancy that thereafter comes to be subject to satisfactory completion of a probationary period as provided in section 8.340 of this charter for a period of four years after the date on which their name is entered on the eligible list and before eligibles procuring standing through examinations held subsequent to the original promotional examination.

It is determined by the civil service commission that the name of such person would have been reached for permanent appointment from the list of eligibles established as a result of the original promotional examination during his term of military service had the name of such person appeared thereon, then such employee, upon appointment to a permanent position as herein provided, shall be granted seniority in such appointment from the date of entry of the name of such person as would have been reached had his name appeared thereon, but such seniority shall be used only for the purpose of determining salary increments and calculating city and county service credits in other promotional examinations held subsequent to the similar promotional examination herein authorized. For all other purposes, such seniority shall be based on the date of the appointment as a result of qualifying in the similar promotional examination as herein authorized.

Such employees who qualify for appointment as a result of a similar promotional examination as herein provided, and who are appointed to permanent positions as herein provided, shall be permitted to participate in other promotional examinations for which they are otherwise eligible, while serving in a probationary appointment in the position to which appointed as a result of the similar promotional examination, provided that certification from lists of eligibles established from such other examinations shall not be made until the employee has satisfactorily completed the aforesaid probationary appointment.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules to govern the administration of similar promotional examinations herein authorized, and appointments and other matters resulting therefrom.

8.329 Certification of Eligibles: Rule of Three

Whenever a position controlled by the civil service provisions of this charter is to be filled, the appointing officer shall make a requisition to the civil service commission for a person to fill it. Thereupon, the commission shall certify to the appointing officer the names of one of the persons standing highest on the list of eligibles for such position. In case the position is promotive, the commission shall certify the names of the three persons standing highest on such list. If there are fewer than three names on the list from which certification is to be made, there shall be certified the number thereon.

The appointing officer shall fill the position by the appointment of one of the persons certified. The provisions of this section as herein amended at the election of November 2, 1976, shall be applicable only to lists of eligibles finally adopted by the civil service commission pursuant to the provisions of section 8.323 of this charter on or after the effective date of this amendment. In making such certification, sex shall be considered a separate element when a statute, a rule of the commission, or the appointing officer specifies sex.

From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the commission shall determine whether the position is in character, temporary, seasonal or permanent, and shall notify the candidate in accordance therewith to the end that the candidate may have knowledge of the probable duration of employment. The commission shall provide for such waiver of temporary or seasonal employment as it may deem just to candidates.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this or any other provision of the charter, an employee who has been certified from a regularly adopted eligible list to a non-permanent position in a civil service classification shall be entitled to appointment to a permanent position within that same classification before the commission certifies to the appointing officer the names and addresses of persons standing higher on the list of eligibles who are not then current employees, subject to a demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by the rules of the commission for the section of this article as herein amended shall only be applicable to appointments for permanent positions filled from and after January 1, 1980.

8.330 Duration of Lists of Eligibles

The civil service commission may retain all names from the list of eligibles after they have remained thereon for more than two years and all names thereon shall be removed at the expiration of four years. The commission may, however, provide in the examination announcements that the list of eligibles so secured thereby shall automatically expire at a date not less than two or more than four years after the adoption of such list.

8.331 Limited Tenure Appointments

When in time of war declared by the Congress of the United States eligible persons are not available for appointment from lists registered through the regular examination procedures as provided under Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof, the civil service commission may qualify applicants for wartime appointments to civil service positions through informal and non-competitive tests. Such tests and appointments resulting therefrom shall be governed solely by the provisions of this section and by rule of the civil service commission adopted pursuant thereto and the tests shall be adequate in the judgment of the civil service commission to determine the capacity of applicants to perform the duties of the positions to be filled pending creation of lists of eligibles through the regular examination procedure as provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof. Appointments made under the provisions of this section shall be designated "limited tenure appointments" and may continue only until the registers of eligibles are established through the regular examination procedures provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof but in no event to exceed six months beyond the cessation of hostilities. Limited tenure appointments may be terminated by the appointing officer at any time for lack of work or funds. Limited tenure appointments may be terminated by the appointing officer at any time with the approval of the civil service commission pursuant to the procedures governing removals set forth in Section 8.342 hereof. Persons serving under limited tenure appointments as in this section provided shall be required of such service acquire no right or preference to permanent civil service status as defined elsewhere in this charter or by rule of the civil service commission. Provision is made in the commission to determine the capacity of applicants to perform the duties of positions to be filled pending creation of lists of eligibles through the regular examination procedures provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 of the charter. Service after January 1, 1951 under limited tenure appointments, by platform employees of the municipal railway, shall not be included in the calculation of service of such employees for the purpose of determining assignments of runs when such assignments are made on the basis of seniority of service.

No civil service appointment in the absence of civil service eligibles as provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 of this charter shall not be authorized if applicants qualified for limited tenure appointments are available. The civil service commission shall make every effort consistent with current conditions to maintain adequate registers of eligibles established through the regular examination procedure provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof.

8.332 Civil Service Commission shall adopt rules to carry out the provisions of this section and to govern the administration of limited tenure appointments.

In time of national emergency declared by the President of the United States or by the Congress or while any act authorizing compulsory military service or training is in effect, the provisions of this section may also be made operative upon recommendation of the civil service commission and approval of the board of supervisors by ordinance enacted by the two-thirds vote of the board. Authority for limited tenure appointments, if established pursuant to the authority of this paragraph, shall cease six months after repeal by the board of supervisors of the ordinance which authorized such appointments.

8.332 Temporary and Emergency Appointments

When no list of eligibles exists or no eligible is available from a current list for a position in the class requisitioned by the appointing officer or from the list in the position is required by the appointment officer, and no other list exists which is deemed by the civil service commission to be suitable to provide temporarily the service desired, the commission shall certify for civil service temporary appointment an eligible from such list if no such other list deemed by the commission to be suitable exists. The commission pursuant to its rules may have the authority of the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment thereto for a period not exceeding one hundred and thirty working days. Non-civil service or emergency appointments extended beyond ninety days must be approved by the civil service commission. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall not be prior to the expiration of such one hundred and thirty working days at the time a civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in section 8.329 of this charter.

If a list of eligibles exists for the position requisitioned, but immediate service is deemed necessary by the appointing officer pending the time an eligible from a current list is certify for civil service temporary duty as provided in section 8.329 of this charter, the civil service commission may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment thereto for a period not exceeding thirty working days. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such thirty working days at the time a civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in section 8.329 of this charter.

No person shall be compensated under any non-civil service or emergency appointment or appointment as authorized under the provisions of the foregoing paragraphs of this section for a period not exceeding one hundred and thirty working days in any fiscal or calendar year, notwithstanding any provision to the contrary hereof, shall be approved, allowed or paid for any compensation in excess of such one hundred and thirty working days in any fiscal or calendar year.

If no eligible are available for appointment to a permanent position in the class requested by the appointing officer, the commission shall immediately hold an examination to establish an eligible list for such position. If its annual appropriation is insufficient to meet the cost of said examination, it shall report to the mayor the estimated cost thereof, and the
mayor shall request and the supervisors shall make supplemental appropriation therefor in the manner provided herein for supplemental appropriations.

8.340 Dismissal During Probation Period
Any person appointed to a permanent position shall serve a probationary period. The civil service commission personnel director shall by rule establish a probationary period of not less than six months' service for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed ranks of the police department, fire department, sheriff's department and San Francisco International Airport police force shall be for twelve months except that when the number of the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve months' service from the day following completion of the prescribed department field training officer program, but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment; provided further that probationary members of the uniformed ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in section 8.343 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four months may be established for executive and management personnel. Time during the probationary period the appointing officer may terminate the appointment upon giving written notice of such termination to the employee. and to the civil service commission specifying the reasons for such termination. Except in the case of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments the civil service commission shall review the termination. The civil service commission shall by rule establish the procedures for such review. If the appointment resulted from an entrance examination the commission may declare such person dismissed; or (b) resign the position without prejudice; and the commission may in its discretion order that the employee be paid salary from time of the termination of the appointment; or (c) order the return of such person to a position in the classification from which that person was promoted and may reestablish the employee's eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same promotive classification under such conditions as the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall be final. Immediately prior to the expiration of the probationary period the appointing officer shall report to the civil service commission as to the competency of the probationer for appointment in the permanent service. Nothing in this section shall preclude the civil service commission from reviewing terminations for the purposes of future employability including terminations in the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments.

8.407 Definition of Generally Prevaling Rates of Wages
Notwithstanding any provision of section 8.401 or any provision of any other section of this charter to the contrary, generally prevailing rates of salaries and wages for those employees covered by section 8.401 of this charter shall be determined by the civil service commission as provided in sections 8.405 to 8.409 inclusive.

The civil service commission personnel director shall conduct a comprehensive investigation and survey of basic pay rates and wages and salaries in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment for like work and like service, based upon job classifications as provided in section 3.661 to 3.662 of this charter and shall make its findings, based on facts and data collected, as to what are the generally prevailing basic pay rates for each benchmark class of employment solely in the manner hereinafter provided. A benchmark class is defined as a "key class" within an occupational grouping selected as the class for which a representative sample of data will be collected.

Basic pay rate data for public and private employment shall be collected solely from the Bay Area counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, San Francisco and Santa Clara; provided, however, that for any benchmark class of employment for which the civil service commission personnel director determines there is insufficient data from Bay Area public jurisdictions the commission personnel director shall survey major public agencies in the state employing such class, major public agencies to be defined as those employing more than 3,000 persons.

The commission personnel director shall collect basic pay rate data for like work and like service from Bay Area public jurisdictions as follows:

(a) The cities of Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara.
(b) The ten most populous cities in these five Bay Area counties based on the latest federal decennial census.
(c) Agencies of the state and federal governments and from school districts and other special districts in the six Bay Area counties as determined by the civil service commission personnel director. The commission personnel director shall collect private basic pay rate data from recognized governmental Bay Area salary and wage surveys of private employers in the city and county of San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. The data collected shall be limited to basic rates of pay and salaries actually being paid by public and private employers for like work and like service.

The term "prevailing rates of wages" for employers governed by charter section 8.401 and this section shall be defined as the rate ranges developed from the weighted average of the midpoint of the basic pay rates, excluding fringe benefits, for surveyed public employment and the median of the pay rates for private employment to be determined as follows:
(1) Multiply the medians from the private and the midpoints from public employment data base by the total number of employees in the given classification from each data base;
(2) Add the products of (1);
(3) Divide the sum in (2) by the total number of employees surveyed for that classification; and
(4) Extend this figure by 10 percent to establish the maximum of the range and reduce this figure by 10 percent to establish the minimum.

When fixing rates of compensation the board of supervisors shall fix basic pay rates as close as reasonably possible to prevailing rates, provided, however, that the board of supervisors shall not set the maximum rate of pay for any class in excess of the maximum prevailing rate for that class; provided further, however, that no employee shall have his basic pay rate reduced to conform to prevailing rates except as provided for in section 8.406. For those classifications of employment in which the practice is customary, the schedules of compensation shall provide for minimum salaries not less than the minimum salary steps and for a method of advancing the salaries of employees from minimum to intermediate to maximum with due regard for seniority of service.

The term "basic pay rate" as used in this section is hereby defined as applying only to the basic rate of wages, with included range scales, and does not include any other benefits of employment or working condition benefits.

It is the declared intent of the qualified electors of the city and county that neither the board of supervisors nor any law so passed provide for any benefits of employment except those enumerated already provided for in the charter end. Any addition, deletion or modification of benefits of employment enumerated in the charter shall be submitted, as a charter amendment, to the qualified electors of the city and county. The qualified electors expressly state that they understand that benefits of employment are sometimes referred to as "fringe benefits" of employment and the qualified electors expressly reserve the right to either grant or deny such benefits except those conditions of employment commonly referred to as "working conditions". Any reference to "working conditions" shall mean those compensations which may necessarily be provided in order for the employee to perform his job description duties efficiently and safely, and shall include but not be limited to such working conditions and benefits as are typically included in the administrative provisions of the salary standardization ordinance and the salary schedule.

The board of supervisors may, in its discretion, provide working conditions for employees covered under this section and section 8.401 of this charter only in accordance with the following provisions:
(a) The civil service commission personnel director may, upon recommendation by the board of supervisors, recommend to the board of supervisors that the working condition benefit is equitable or necessary for the efficient and safe performance of the employee's duties as enumerated in his job description.
(b) The working condition benefit, as recommended by the civil service commission personnel director, is substantially for the purpose of providing for work and like service to that provided for the job classification and is provided to not less than 50 percent of the employees of the class in the jurisdiction covered by the salary survey.

9.108 Initiative, Referendum, and Recall
(a) The registered voters shall have power to propose by petition, and to adopt or to reject at the polls, any law or ordinance, as may be presented by the board of supervisors to the electorate, which the board of supervisors shall propose to the electorate by submitting the same to the electorate for referendum purposes. The board of supervisors shall submit to the electorate for referendum purposes any law or ordinance of the board of supervisors which is presented to the electorate by the board of supervisors for the submission of the ordinance; and when approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting on said declaration, it shall thereupon become nongeneral election the duty of the board of supervisors to enact an ordinance or ordinances to carry such policies or principles into effect, subject to the referendum provisions of this charter.

Any ordinance which the supervisors are empowered to enact may be proposed by the voters by a majority of the board at a general election or at a special election called for the purpose, said election to be held not less than thirty days from the date of the call.

Any such ordinance may be proposed by one-third of the supervisors, or by the mayor, when so proposed shall be submitted to the voters at the next following general election. No ordinance passed by the supervisors granting any public utility franchise
or privilege, shall go into effect until the expiration of sixty days from the date it becomes final. At the end of such sixty days such ordinance shall be in force and effect, unless within such period there shall be filed with the registrar a petition signed by registered voters equal in number to five percent of the entire vote cast for mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election, requesting that such ordinance be submitted to the electors. In case such petition is filed, such ordinance shall not go into effect until approved by a majority of the voters voting thereon at a general or special election.

If, before the time any other ordinance involving legislative matters becomes effective, there shall be filed with the board of supervisors a petition signed by qualified electors of the city and county equal in number to at least ten percent of the entire vote cast for all candidates for mayor at the last preceding general municipal election at which a mayor was elected, protesting against the passage of such ordinance the same shall be suspended from going into operation, and it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to reconsider such ordinance, and if the same be not entirely repealed, said board shall submit the ordinance to the vote of said electors either at the next general municipal election or at a special election to be called for that purpose, and such ordinance shall not go into effect or become operative unless and until a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon shall vote in favor thereof. The provisions of section 9.109 and 9.110 of the charter shall apply to and govern the verification and certification of such petition.

Annual budget and appropriation ordinances, supplemental appropriation ordinances, the annual

salary ordinance, or ordinances amending the same, the ordinances levying taxes, any ordinance appropriating money from the emergency reserve fund, ordinances authorizing the city attorney to compromise litigation, and ordinances necessary to enable the mayor to carry out any of the powers vested in him in the case of public emergency as defined in section 3.100 of the charter, ordinances enacted pursuant to section 8.410 of the charter, as well as ordinances relative to purely administrative matters, shall not be subject to referendum.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION E

NOTE: All sections are new.

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

Section 1. This ordinance may be called the “City College Public Lands Preservation Ordinance.”

Section 2. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall disapprove or deny, WITH NO EXCEPTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS, any building permit application for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, located across Phelan Avenue from the presently occupied campus of City College and consisting of Assessor’s Block 3190, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

Section 4. The term “building permit” includes building permits, site permits and any other permits for the performance of construction work.

Section 5. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held invalid pursuant to the construction or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, which consist of Assessor’s Block 3190, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

Section 6. Any person violating the terms of this ordinance shall be subject to the penalties set forth in San Francisco Charter Section 8.145. Such penalties shall include, but not be limited to, removal from office.

Section 7. If any provision of this ordinance, or its application to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, it is the expressed intent of the people of the City and County of San Francisco that the remainder of the ordinance, or the application of such provision, or any other provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION F

NOTE: All sections are new.

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

Section 1. The People of the City and County of San Francisco desire and are entitled to a local government whose officers do not engage in, assist or promote compensated advocacy on behalf of private interests before City and County commissions and boards while serving as City and County officers.

Section 2. No officer of the City and County may, during the term of office, engage in compensated advocacy before any City and County board or commission, or any member of the board or commission or its staff, in order to represent any private interest, for which representation the officer receives, directly or indirectly, any compensation, reward or gift.

Section 3. Officers of the City and County shall not discuss matters pending before their commission or department with other City and County officers or state legislators when those other officers or state legislators are acting as compensated advocates for a private interest.

Section 4. No member of the California State Legislature shall appear before any City and County board, department or commission as a compensated advocate representing a private interest.

Section 5. In the financing of city and county campaigns: (a) No person other than a candidate shall make, and no campaign treasurer shall solicit or accept, any contribution which will cause the total amount contributed by such person with respect to any single election in support of or opposition to such candidate, including contributions to political committees supporting or opposing such candidate, to exceed $500.00. (b) If any person is found guilty of violating the terms of this section, each campaign treasurer who received part or all of the contribution or contributions which constitute the violation shall pay promptly, from available campaign funds, if any, the amount received from such person in excess of the amount permitted by this section to the City and County Treasurer for deposit in the General Fund of the City and County. (c) This section shall not apply to any in-kind contribution of television or radio airtime to any candidate or committee granted to said candidate or committee pursuant to the “Fairness Doctrine” articulated in Fullman Broadcasting, 40 FCC 576 (1963).

Section 6. Any person violating the terms of this ordinance shall be subject to the penalties set forth in San Francisco Charter Section 8.145. Such penalties shall include, but not be limited to, removal from office.

Section 7. If any provision of this ordinance, or its application to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, it is the expressed intent of the people of the City and County of San Francisco that the remainder of the ordinance, or the application of such provision, or any other provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.
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THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION G

We the people of San Francisco declare this to be our policy:
(1) IT IS IMPROPER TO PROFIT FROM OR PROVIDE SUPPORT TO THE RACIST POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SYSTEM IN SOUTH AFRICA, KNOWN AS APARTHEID.
Therefore it is necessary to sever commercial ties to South Africa, until people of all races obtain equal rights in that country, including equal voting rights.
(2) COMPANIES HAVING SUBSTANTIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH APARTHEID MUST BE CONSIDERED IRRESPONSIBLE.
(a) The Board of Supervisors must determine which companies doing or seeking business with the City have the greatest ties to Apartheid. Companies that have a significant involvement in profiting from or maintaining the Apartheid system, may, on that basis, be deemed "irresponsible bidders."
In purchasing goods and services and awarding other contracts, the City must give priority to avoiding such companies; the degree of the preference must be in proportion to the company's complicity with Apartheid, according to the following criteria:
- how much business the company does in or with South Africa;
- how much the company profits from that business;
- how much support the company provides the Apartheid government in taxes, loans, payments or other funding;
- the nature of the company's South Africa business;
- the degree of the company's cooperation with South African political censorship or secrecy agreements;
- the degree to which the company provides the South African government with the technology, materials and other means to maintain and enforce Apartheid.
(b) City funds must not be deposited or invested with any bank or other company which does business in or with, or makes loans to, South Africa.
(c) If any exception to the above policies is found to be necessary or appropriate, the responsible official must promptly and publicly report it to the Board of Supervisors, clearly describing the exception and the reasons for it.
(d) The term "City" includes all agencies, departments, officials, employees, units and subdivisions of the city and county of San Francisco, and all funds administered by or on behalf of the city or county.
(3) WE CALL ON ALL OTHER PUBLIC BODIES AND PRIVATE OR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS TO ADOPT SIMILAR POLICIES.
(4) WE CALL A GENERAL PUBLIC BOYCOT, FOCUSING ON THOSE COMPANIES HAVING THE GREATEST TIES TO APARTHEID.
The Board of Supervisors must determine and announce which company or companies are the worst offenders within each major industry, so that the public can focus its boycott on those companies.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION H

SUMMARY: THIS INITIATIVE STATES THAT THE AIDS EPIDEMIC IS A MAJOR PUBLIC HEALTH PROBLEM OF CONCERN TO EVERYONE, REQUIRING INCREASED SUPPORT FOR RELATED MEDICAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION. IT CALLS FOR A COUNCIL FOR AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION OR SIMILAR UNITED EFFORT TO STOP AIDS.

We the people of San Francisco hereby adopt the following policy:
The AIDS epidemic has rapidly become a major public health problem, costly both in human lives and in general community resources; The first steps in dealing with such a crisis are:
- the scientific research needed to discover and understand the nature, causes, co-factors, prevention, diagnosis and treatment of the disease, and
- the education of the public about the lessons of that research;
A proper program of research and education pays for itself in the long run;
Prompt action is urgent, because of the rapidly growing number of persons affected, increasing not only the suffering but also the difficulty of eradicating the disease;
The leadership and support of such an effort is everyone's responsibility;
While San Francisco's role in the overall effort against AIDS has been viewed as a positive example to other areas, the continued rapid increase in the spread of the disease means that we cannot afford to rest on our laurels or leave further responsibility to others.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:
We call on all appropriate government bodies as well as medical, professional, charitable and community organizations and concerned individuals to join together in an all-out effort to stop AIDS;
We call for support to an organized united effort along the lines of an AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION COUNCIL, including, in some form:
- A COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, to provide informed evaluations as to priorities among research projects and proposals, recommending those which are most cost-effective and most likely to produce early results useful in the prevention or treatment of the disease, to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts or neglect of promising approaches, and to provide the council with complete and up-to-date information regarding comparative results of experimental treatments, prevention programs and other existing research;
- A COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, to inform the public regarding prevention and other research findings, and to inform relevant government officials and the general public, concerning the factual basis for a re-ordering of current public funding priorities toward an increased war against disease, including research and education against AIDS and related conditions;
- A FUND-RAISING COMMITTEE, to solicit donations, lobby for grants, organize benefits and other fund-raising projects spreading the financial burden by appealing to many sources;
We ask the council and committees to be responsive and accessible to public input, to include representation of all interested groups, to consider all viewpoints, and to be capable of prompt action;
We ask appropriate city officials to determine whether a suitable form of such a council already exists; if it does, we wish the city to support it actively; if not, we wish the council to seek to encourage its formation by such means as may appear proper.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION I

SUMMARY: This initiative asks "Shall we tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?" The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated portion of Route 480 known as the Embarcadero Freeway. This initiative declaration of policy will give the voters the opportunity to establish the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco regarding the proposed teardown of the Embarcadero Freeway.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION J

Shall the City replace a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if such replacement would open the Waterfront to its citizens, improve the tax base, and create a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic?
Candidates

FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: The Bill of Rights guarantees that every person accused of a crime shall have the effective assistance of counsel. Whether an individual is rich or poor, that person is entitled to a competent and dedicated attorney.
In San Francisco it is the duty of the Public Defender to uphold this sacred right. In every case, we provide the client with the best defense under the law.
In the last 7 years, my outstanding staff has done this work with the highest degree of professionalism. In the next 4 years, that same strong, professional, independent and ethical representation will continue.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Ernest “Chuck” Ayla, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John D. Bardis, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Sala Burton, 8 Sloan Blvd., Representative In Congress, 5th District
Manuel Caballos, 2872 23rd St., Beer Wholesaler
George Christopher, 170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Clerk
Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Artist/Community Organizer
Brian Geiz, 55 22nd Ave., Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Mattle I. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., International Vice President, ILGWU
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for Children & Youth
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070 26th Ave., Executive Assistant to Sala Burton M.C.
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Community Health Director
Linda Ann Post, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative
Jim Rivaldo, 450 Steiner St., Political Consultant
Julie Tang, 708 18th Ave., Member, SF Community College District Governing Board
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel W. Walter, 562 Campbell Ave., President—Local 250-A Transport Workers Union of America
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hihius Ave., Minister
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor
C. R. Zanca, 1966 Pacific Ave., Auto Repair Proprietor

FOR ASSESSOR

SAM DUCA

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I was elected your Assessor in 1978 and re-elected in 1982. My years in the Assessor’s Office were spent in a professional appraisal capacity personnel and administration. I have two university degrees, the coveted MAI designation, and am the recipient of a special Congressional Advisory Board award from the United States Congress. I have served in an advisory capacity, both nationally and internationally, in property tax administration and will continue to serve the taxpayers of the City and County of San Francisco in dealing with Article XIII A of the State Constitution. My community involvement includes participation in cultural, civic business organizations.

Sam Duca

The sponsors for Sam Duca are:
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
Eugene L. Friend, 2910 Lake St., Investor
Nancy Pelosi, 40 Presidio Ter., Housewife and volunteer in politics
Walter H. Shorenstein, 740 El Camino del Mar, Chairman, Milton Meyer & Co.
Stanley Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Emma W. Louie, 1257 Jackson St., Housewife
Alfred S. Wilsen, 2590 Jackson St., Ch. of Exec. Comm. of Diversified Holding Co.
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hinkleley Walk, Physician
Gerson Bakur, 2310 20th St., Investor
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired
Joseph C. Orenso, Sr., 866 Faxon Ave., Publicity Dept. – S.F. Giants
James A. Scatena, 101 St. Elmo Way, Chairman of the Board, Scatena York Co.
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher
Frances May McAlister, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Recreation & Park Commissioner
Frederick F. Campagnoli, 2609 Larkin St., Attorney
Betty Brooks, 1738 26th St., Field Representative
Jiss Tertul Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Businessman
Cyril J. Magnin, 994 California St., Merchant
Ernest “Chuck” Ayla, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John H. Swanson, 145 Lake Merced Hill South, Bowling Alley Owner
Frances G. Goldman, 743 El Camino Del Mar, Child Guidance
Irma M. Bernardo, 2824 34th Ave., Housewife
Leo J. Murphy, 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Charles M. Cunningham, 475 Connecticut St., Self Employed
Lawrence V. Eppinette, 815 Fell St., Conf. Secretary
Mary M. O’Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Volunteer & Homemaker
Elizabeth R. Duca, 16 Wawona St., Homemaker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Application for Absentee Ballot
is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

Name ____________________________________________
Residence Address __________________________________
Mailing Address ____________________________________
Signature _________________________________________

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

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

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:
The “yes” or “no” on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.
This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
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YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 5, 1986.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
• are a U.S. Citizen,
• are at least 18 years of age on election day,
• are a resident of California, and
• are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, such as this one, you can only choose among the candidates of your party.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Senator, State Assemblymember, County Central Committee, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your polling place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 3, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in”. If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

Q—Can a worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
• Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
• mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see enclosed card).

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

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
• your home address,
• the address where you want the ballot mailed,
• then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail by absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 3, 1986.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS CONCERNING VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS.
**HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER**

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

**STEP 1**

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

**USING BOTH HANDS**

INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

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

B 第一步

翻雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

**STEP 2**

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

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

C 第二步

請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

**STEP 3**

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

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

D 第三步

請把帶鐵之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

**STEP 4**

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

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

E 第四步

投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。

在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO UNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto al nombre del candidato. Cuando hay dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escribe el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SI" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borradoras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuelve al miembro del consejo del precinct y obtenga otra.

請使用在投票記錄器上之打孔針在選票上打孔；千萬不要用鋼筆或鉛筆。

選民須知：

選舉所選擇的任何其他候選人，請在選票上對應所指之候選人名打孔。如有兩名或以上候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上對應所指之所有候選人名；選擇你要投票的候選人打孔，但不超過委選號的限定人數。選舉合格的非候選人，請在非候選人選票信封所提供的預定空間上寫下該候選人所競選的單位30位的姓名。

請選任何候選，請在選票上對應所指之"YES"或"NO"字樣打孔。

選票上如有該著另點或複選者，選票作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔錯了，撕破或弄破了，或撕破了，或附上了非候選人選票信封，應把該選票退還給選區的選舉員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

請在下頁開始投票

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Vote #</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>HUGH G. BAGLEY</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRANK L. THOMAS</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EILEEN ANDERSON</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singer and Dancer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHARLES “CHUCK” PINEDA, JR.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Hearing Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOM BRADLEY</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor, City of Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>LEO T. McCARthy</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicegovernador</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>MARCH FONG EU</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary of State of California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretario de Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Controller

**JOHN GARAMENDI**  
State Senator, Businessman  
Senador Estatal, Hombre de Negocios

**ALISTER McALISTER**  
Assemblyman, 18th District, California Legislature  
Asambleista, Distrito 18, Legislatura de California

**GRAY DAVIS**  
Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature  
Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Legislatura de California

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### Treasurer

**JESSE M. UNRUH**  
California State Treasurer  
Tesorero del Estado de California

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### Attorney General

**JOHN VAN DE KAMP**  
Attorney General, California  
Procurador General, California

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
### Member, State Board of Equalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BERT DE LOTTO, Appraiser/Broker/Farmer</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLIS, Member, State Board of Equalization, Second District</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WRITE-IN**: To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 137

### United States Senator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT, Political Scientist-Teacher</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES GREENE, Member, Senior Legislature</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIAN LANTZ, Business Consultant</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN CRANSTON, United States Senator</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT J. BANUELOS, Communications Technician</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WRITE-IN**: To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 152
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States Representative</td>
<td>ANDREW KLEIN</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MICHAEL MOBERG</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SALA BURTON</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the State Assembly</td>
<td>WILLIE L. BROWN, JR.</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(There is no contest for State Senator in this district)*

*(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal)*

*(Write-in) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CATHARINE DODD</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNE BELISLE DALEY</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RON HUBERMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERENCE HALLINAN</td>
<td>Attorney-at-Law</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESSE J. IVY</td>
<td>Senior Deputy Sheriff</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSAN J. BERMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAR JACKS</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNETH JOHN AZBILL</td>
<td>American Indian Lawyer</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td>Community Service—Attorney</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WADE &quot;SPEEDY&quot; WOODS</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONY KILROY</td>
<td>Neighborhood Environmentalist</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES LEGARE</td>
<td>Motor Truck Operator</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLE MIGDEN</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LULU M. CARTER</td>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Write-in) To vote for candidates not on the ballot, write the name and office title on the long side of your ballot.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>DANIEL NUSBAUM</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Project Advisor</td>
<td>JEANNE BAIRD</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>SAM DUCA</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Veterans Bond Act of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $850,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Community Parklands Act of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for acquiring, developing, improving, rehabilitating, or restoring urgently needed local and regional parks, beaches, recreational areas and facilities, and historical resources.</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Water Conservation and Water Quality Bond Law of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $150,000,000 to provide funds for water conservation, groundwater recharge and drainage water management, and clarifies language in the Clean Water Bond Law of 1984.</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Deposit of Public Moneys in Credit Unions. Authorizes Legislature to provide for deposit of public moneys in any credit union. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect. Legislation already approved implementing measure could result in greater interest income to state and local governments.</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Property Taxation. Provides exception to property tax limit when acquisition or improvement of real property approved by two-thirds of voters. Fiscal Impact: By itself, measure has no fiscal effect. No increase can occur in local property tax rate unless bond issue is approved by two-thirds vote. State costs for tax relief programs could increase. State income tax revenues could decline as taxpayers deduct greater amounts for property tax payments.</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Allocation of Vehicle License Fee Taxes to Counties and Cities. Requires allocation of Vehicle License Fee taxes to local governments. Fiscal Impact: Measure would have no direct fiscal effect. Prevents Legislature from changing the law to take vehicle license fees away from counties and cities. Measure would not prevent state reducing other forms of aid to local governments or changing existing formula for dividing vehicle license fee revenues between counties and cities.</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Legislators' and Judges' Retirement Systems. Limits retirement allowances for persons entering Legislators' and Judges' Retirement Systems after January 1, 1987. Fiscal Impact: Minor savings to state in future years if rate of inflation exceeds increase in salaries paid to current officeholders.</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.°</td>
<td>Acta / Decreto</td>
<td>Sin Promo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1986. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $500,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en la compra de granjas y casas para los veteranos de California.</td>
<td>Sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>ACTA DE TERRENOS DE PARQUES DE LA COMUNIDAD DE 1986. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición, desarrollo, mejoramiento, rehabilitación o la restauración urgentemente necesitada por parques, playas, áreas o instalaciones de recreación, y los recursos históricos locales y regionales.</td>
<td>Sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>LEY DE BONOS PARA LA CONSERVACIÓN DE AGUA Y CONTROL DE LA CALIDAD DEL AGUA DE 1986. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $150,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la conservación del agua, rehabilitación de aguas subterráneas, manejo apropiado del agua de drenaje, y certificación del agua en la Ley de Bonos para Agua Limpia de 1984.</td>
<td>Sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>DEPÓSITO DE FONDOS PÚBLICOS EN COOPERATIVAS DE CRÉDITO. Autoriza a la Legislatura para que disponga el depósito de fondos públicos en cualquier cooperativa de crédito. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. La legislación ya aprochada que pone en efecto la medida podría resultar en mayor ingreso de intereses para los gobiernos locales y estatales.</td>
<td>Sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>FICHA DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD: Dispone exenciones a los impuestos a la propiedad en el caso de adquisición o mejoramiento de la propiedad formada al ser aprochada por dos terceras partes de los votantes. Impacto Fiscal: Por el solo, la medida no tiene ningún impacto fiscal. Ningún aumento en la tasa de los impuestos locales a la propiedad.</td>
<td>Sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>ASIGNACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS POR PAGOS DE LICENCIAS DE VEÍCULOS A LOS CONDADO Y CIUDADES. Requiere la asignación a los gobiernos locales de los impuestos recaudados en pagos por Licencias de Vehículos. Impacto Fiscal: La medida no tendría ningún impacto fiscal directo. Impide que la Legislatura pueda cambiar la forma de los fondos provenientes de licencias de vehículos de las ciudades y condados. La medida no evitaría que el estado pueda reducir otras formas de asistencia a los gobiernos locales o puede cambiar la forma actual de dividir los fondos provenientes del pago por licencia de vehículos entre los condados y ciudades.</td>
<td>Sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>SISTEMAS DE JUBILACIÓN DE LOS LEGISLATORES Y JUECES. Limita las pensiones de jubilación para aquellas personas que se ubican al Sistema de Jubilación de los Legisladores y Jueces después del 1° de enero de 1987. Impacto Fiscal: Aumentar los montos para el estándar en los futuros al la tasa de inflación excede el aumento en los salarios que se pagan a los que actualmente ocupan cargas.</td>
<td>Sin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Measures Submitted to Vote of Voters

#### State propositions

**49**
**Nonpartisan Offices.** Prohibits a political party or party central committee from endorsing, supporting, or opposing a candidate for nonpartisan office. Fiscal Impact: No direct state or local government fiscal impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**50**
**Property Taxation. Disasters.** Base-year value of property damaged or destroyed by disaster transferable to comparable replacement property in same county. Fiscal Impact: Local property tax revenues would decrease by an unknown amount. County assessor and tax collectors would have nonsignificant higher administrative costs. State would replace revenues lost by school and community college districts. State income tax revenues could increase due to lower property tax deductions on replacement properties. These state costs and revenues cannot be estimated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**51**
**Multiple Defendants Tort Damage Liability.** Plaintiff's noneconomic damage recovery limited to defendant's liability based on defendant's percentage of fault. Fiscal Impact: Substantial savings to state and local governments. Savings could be several millions of dollars in a year, varying significantly from year to year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**52**
**County Correctional Facility Capital Expenditure Bond Act of 1986.** This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county correctional facilities and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of four hundred ninety-five million dollars ($495,000,000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### City & County propositions

**A** Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgments against the City?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B** Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C** Proposition C has been removed from the ballot by the Board of Supervisors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>262 SI</strong> 贷成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARGOS NO PARTIDARIOS. Prohíbe a un partido político o a un <em>comité central</em> de un partido político patrocinado, apoyar u oponerse a un candidato a un cargo no partidario. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo a los gobiernos estatal o locales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>266 SI</strong> 贷成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE DESTRUIDA. El valor en base de propiedad inmueble dañada o destruida por un desastre puede ser transferible a propiedad inmueble de reemplazo comparable en el mismo condado. Impacto Fiscal: Los reimpuestos preventivos de impuestos locales a la propiedad dañada o destruida pueden ser transferidos a la propiedad de reemplazo. El impacto fiscal es insignificante.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>273 SI</strong> 贷成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSABILIDAD CIVIL DE MULTIPLES PARTES DEMANDADAS EN JUICIOS DE AGRAVIOS INDEMNIZABLES. Limita la indemnización que puede recibir el demandante por daños no económicos a la responsabilidad del demandado basándose en el porcentaje de la culpabilidad del demandado. Impacto Fiscal: Aumento sustancial para los gobiernos estatal y locales. Los costos podrían ser algunos millones de dólares al año, que variarían significativamente año a año.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>278 SI</strong> 贷成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA DESEMPEÑO DE CAPITAL PARA INSTALACIONES CORRECCIONALES DE CONDADO DE 1998. Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelación, y reemplazo de instalaciones correccionales de los condados y la ejecución del mantenimiento diferido en las mismas en conformidad con una emisión de bonos por custodios noventa y cinco millones de dólares (849,500,000).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONTADO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>A</strong></th>
<th><strong>B</strong></th>
<th><strong>C</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;¿Debería la Ciudad establecer una oficina de administración del riesgo y un despacho de investigación y administración de demandas, para estudiar y reducir el riesgo de plagas y accidentes contra la Ciudad?&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;¿Debería autorizar al Comprador a firmar contratos por menos de 300,000 dólares para la adquisición de los Jefes Administrativos y a permitir que sus agentes firmen contratos en su lugar?&quot;</td>
<td>OFICIALMENTE ELIMINADA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A** 市政厅设立一个风险管理办公室及
一个调查与诉讼行政，并研究减少因子影响和不适当的协议。

**B** 市政厅应授权采购人签订低价合约
或允许其代表签订不超五万美元的
合同，并允许其代理人在签署合
约前要经授权。

**C** 正式撤消
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong> Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong> Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong> Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong> Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong> Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong> Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong> Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPIÓTENES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

288 SI 贷成
289 NO 反对

"¿Debe la Ciudad transferir la administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil a un departamento de administración de personal que tenga poder para cambiar las normas del servicio civil que al presente constan en la Carta Constitucional?"

292 SI 贷成
293 NO 反对

"¿Debe la Ciudad negar o revocar cualquier permiso de construcción para editar en la Reserva Babcock en las Avenidas Ocean y Pihalan en los próximos tres años?"

296 SI 贷成
297 NO 反对

"¿Debe la Ciudad prohibir la defensa remunerada efectuada por oficiales de la Ciudad y legisladores estatales ante cualquier comisión de la Ciudad, y limitar la cantidad con la que una persona puede contribuir para un candidato a una oficina municipal?"

VOTER SELECTION CARD

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR CANDIDATE SELECTION
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

D
Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?

YES 288
NO 289

E
Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?

YES 292
NO 293

F
Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office?

YES 296
NO 297

G
Shall it be the policy of the people to declare a state of war with South Africa?

H
Shall it be the policy of the people to elect a local or county presiding officer?

I
Shall it be the policy of the people to extend the Beltway on the east side of the city?

J
Shall it be the policy of the people to change the name of the city's freeway system to the Peck Freeway, if it would increase traffic?

VOTER SELECTION CARD

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>County Central Committee*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>7.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>8.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate</td>
<td>9.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td>10.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. Public Inst.</td>
<td><strong>Refer to your sample ballot for the number of County Central Committee members to be elected. The number varies with each district.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR PROPOSITIONS.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT — An official list of candidates and propositions.

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

VOTE BY MAIL — See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

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

MEASURE — Another name for proposition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

COMPENSATED ADVOCACY — Compensated means being paid for doing something; Advocacy means speaking or writing on behalf of someone else. Proposition F concerns the issue of compensated advocacy.

RISK MANAGEMENT — This field covers two areas: (1) deciding on when it is better to buy insurance and when it is better to be self insured or uninsured, then shopping for the insurance; (2) identifying hazardous conditions on one's property and seeing that they are corrected so that liability and damage claims will be avoided. Proposition A concerns risk management.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

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

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

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.
PROPOSITION A
Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgements against the City? YES 278

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Consultants hired by the Chief Administrative Officer are available to City departments that have questions about "risk management", such as how to keep damage claims to a minimum and how to find the best insurance rates. In some cases, the departments use these consultants. In other cases, the departments make their own decisions. When damage claims are filed, some are handled by the City Attorney's Office and some are handled by City departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would amend the City Charter to create an Office of Risk Management, under the Chief Administrative Officer. The office would set risk management guidelines for all City departments, boards and commissions. Proposition A would also establish a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration in the City Attorney's Office. The bureau would be responsible for investigating, evaluating and processing all damage claims made against the City, except those claims made against the Public Utilities Commission and the Police Department. The bureau would also have the power to investigate potential suits against the City and to make settlements within dollar limits to be set by ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer and a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want damage claims and risk management decisions to continue to be handled the way they are now.

Controller's Statement on "A"

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not affect the cost of government. However as a result of its potential future application and the exemption of certain employees from the civil service provisions of the Charter, costs may be affected in an amount presently indeterminate."

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On March 10 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted "No."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON A

Last fiscal year, over 6,400 claims and law suits were filed against the City, costing us more than $10 million in settlements. I believe that it is time to change the way we handle our claims, secure insurance, prevent risks and settle legitimate claims against the City.

Last summer, we appointed a task force of citizens, under San Francisco Bar President Jerry Falk, to make recommendations on how to streamline our procedures and save money at the same time. The present system is very slow, costly, and inefficient.

Currently, all claims are investigated by the department involved. The City Attorney cannot act on any claim until the department is ready. This results in delay and duplication of effort and increased costs. A centralized and accountable Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney would be more efficient, cost-effective, and professional.

It would enable the City to settle many claims quickly, before litigation is begun, saving the City the costs of defending itself in court and lowering the average cost of settling a case.

This can be accomplished without creating new jobs by simply moving into one office the city positions presently scattered throughout the government.

Vote “Yes” on A. Reduce the cost of City government.

Adoption of this measure would also formally establish responsibility for Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer, where it has been unofficially since 1978. With this strengthened authority, the Risk Management Office would be responsible for the gathering of claims data on a City-wide basis, the creation of incentives for both reducing the possibility for injuries and damage and the number of claims for each department, the coordination of insurance purchasing and specific suggestions to avoid and reduce risk.

This amendment is presented with the recommendation of the Mayor’s Task Force on Claims and Judgments, the Chief Administrative Officer, City Attorney, the President of the San Francisco Bar Association, and the President of the Lawyers’ Club of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Each year the City spends almost $10 million to settle damage claims. It is estimated that the overall costs to the City for all risk-related activities exceeds $125 million a year. It is time for action to be taken to reduce these huge expenditures. This charter amendment is designed to do just that.

Claims Investigation and Adjustment

Right now, the City claims investigation process is decentralized and largely unorganized. Each department investigates its own claims. Investigators may or may not be specially trained for their duties. There is no uniformity of investigation procedure or claims reporting. In only a few departments do investigators contact injured parties within days of an accident in order to settle the claim quickly and economically.

This amendment will create a claims investigation and adjustment bureau in the Office of the City Attorney. Claims investigation and adjustment activities will be centralized, economized and made much more efficient. The new bureau will be able to respond immediately to accidents and claims, providing quick compensation to deserving persons while at the same time producing a prompt, professional investigation. This reform is greatly needed.

Risk Management

Presently, there is no overall plan for the management of the City’s risk exposure: insurance purchasing, avoidance of industrial accidents, gathering data on accident patterns, etc. Again, risk management as a function is fragmented among the various City departments. As a consequence, departments cannot develop the necessary expertise to manage themselves to reduce risk-related costs.

This measure will establish a risk manager under the Chief Administrative Officer. For the first time, overall City planning will be possible in order to control risk. Departments will be told what activities are producing injuries or damage and advised on corrective measures. Private industry has been utilizing risk managers of this type for years. It is time that the City did the same.

This amendment will reduce the cost of government and insure a more efficient delivery of City services to all San Franciscans. We urge you to give it your unqualified support.

Board of Supervisors

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This charter amendment was proposed by a citizens’ task force appointed by Mayor Feinstein. Its mission was to propose ways of reducing the number and financial costs of claims and lawsuits against the City.

The amendment has two principal features. The first is to centralize within the City Attorney’s office the investigation of claims filed against city departments. This will allow for improved training and supervision of the investigators, who presently are scattered throughout city government. The result will be more efficient, cost-effective and professional investigation of claims. By improving the quality of claims investigation, the City can identify those claims which have merit and attempt to reach early—and less costly—settlements. Meritless claims will be denied with greater confidence that if suit is filed it can be defended successfully.

The second major feature of the amendment will establish a Risk Management office under the Chief Administrative Officer. Risk management is a concept widely used in private business. Risk managers are professionals skilled in reducing the overall cost of claims. The Risk Manager would be responsible for coordinating the City’s insurance program, data collection, and correcting problems within the City which lead to claims. The Risk Manager would review those claims which have been filed against the City. Where it appears that an unsafe condition or practice has led to a claim, the Risk Manager would suggest to the affected department that corrective measures be taken. Reports to the Mayor and to the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors of the recommended corrections and the actions taken would ensure that the various departments will be responsive.

The City cannot eliminate claims and lawsuits against it. But it can limit its exposure by managing the claims process more effectively. This measure will reduce injuries and reduce claims, and that is good for everyone.

Jerome B. Falk, Jr.
Chair, Mayor’s Task Force on Claims and Judgments
Against the City

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, May 31, 1986

12 Noon State Senate, Assembly, Congress and State Propositions
1:00 Proposition A—Risk Management & Claims
1:15 Proposition B—Purchaser & Contracts
1:30 Proposition D—Civil Service
2:15 Proposition E—Balboa Reservoir
2:30 Proposition F—Compensated Advocacy
3:00 Proposition G—Apartheid
3:20 Proposition H—AIDS
3:30 Propositions I, J—Embarcadero Freeway
3:50 Statewide Candidates

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchaser must get the approval of the Chief Administrative Officer before signing certain contracts for more than $15,000. Only the voters may change that dollar limit. The Purchaser must personally sign every contract that comes through his office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would raise the limit on contracts requiring the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval to $50,000. It would also allow the Board of Supervisors to change that limit by ordinance. Proposition B would also permit the Purchaser to name certain people in his office to sign contracts on his behalf.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval only on contracts for more than $50,000. You also want the Purchaser to be able to name certain people in his office to be able to sign contracts on his behalf.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to require the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval on contracts for more than $15,000. You also want him to sign all contracts himself.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 3 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON B!

The City's Charter requires that a permanent, non-elected City official, the Chief Administrative Officer, review all purchases and contracts above $15,000. Of course, CAO approval of major contracts is very important. But, due to inflation, the number of contracts that have to go to the CAO for approval is always increasing. Today there are too many documents requiring CAO approval. This slows down the purchasing process, occupies staff time—and ultimately costs the City money. Proposition B will raise the CAO approval level to $50,000, and help the City to improve the efficiency of its purchasing operations.

The City's budget includes more than $250 million for purchases on tens of thousands of contracts. At the current $15,000 review limit, the CAO must approve thousands of documents every year—a costly, time-consuming process. In the long run the City loses money because of the inordinate length of time required to complete all the paperwork.

An adjustment must be made to remove the smaller contracts from this cumbersome process. Review and approval of contracts under $50,000 should be under the responsibility of the City Purchaser, a highly trained and experienced professional, who reports directly to the CAO. By changing the present $15,000 to $50,000, it will be possible for the CAO to give each document that comes to him the attention it requires. And, by placing its orders and paying its bills faster, both the City and businesses will benefit—especially small business and those owned by minorities and women.

Proposition B will allow future adjustments to the limit to be made by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility will ensure the City's ability to adjust to inflation and changes in the market.

This amendment comes to you with the recommendation of auditors, controllers, bankers, and others who exercise top fiduciary responsibility within their own organizations.

VOTE YES ON B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will make essential changes to update the purchasing and payment procedures under the Chief Administrative Officer. These measures are necessary and desirable because they will save the City money by significantly increasing our management efficiency.

Right now, the City loses because it takes too long for contracts to be reviewed and payments okayed, which means that early payment incentives go unutilized. The CAO has to approve every contract greater than $15,000—and with City purchases last year over $250 million, the paperwork logjam is vast and overwhelming.

An increase in the review limit from $15,000 to $50,000 will make an adequate adjustment for inflation—$50,000 now is only about $15,000 in 1967 dollars. Proposition B will also enable the City Purchaser, who reports to the CAO, to maximize potential savings through early payments by designating appropriate personnel to approve contracts up to $50,000. These "Good Business" amendments are consistent with private sector practices and should be incorporated by the CAO in the City's best interests.

Finally, Proposition B will give the City the ability to respond quickly to changes in the market place by allowing changes in the CAO review limit by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility is necessary to ensure that in the future we will not lose money because of institutional rigidity. Control is maintained with the necessity of Board action and Mayoral approval to adjust the review limit, and this same feature will allow for change when desired.

Vote yes on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

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

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?

YES 288  NO 289

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the civil service system of the City of San Francisco. The structure of the civil service system and certain rules governing its operation are written into the Charter and can only be changed by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would make major changes. A Department of Personnel Administration would run the Civil Service system and would be able to change rules with Commission approval. Major features of Proposition D are described below. The complete charter amendment is printed in this voters' handbook.

Department of Personnel Administration

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Certain civil service rules governing the general operation of the system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs, are written into the Charter and carried out by the Civil Service Commission. Only the voters can change these rules.

THE PROPOSAL: A department of Personnel Administration would be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. A Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor would run the Department. Certain rules governing examination, selection and appointment would be taken out of the Charter. The Personnel Director would be able to change these rules with the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

Civil Service Commission

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the general operation of the civil service system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs. The Commission also hears and decides appeals on civil service matters.

THE PROPOSAL: The Civil Service Commission would no longer be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. The Commission could investigate the operation of the system, approve rule changes proposed by the Personnel Director, and hear and decide appeals only on claims of job discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest.

Employee Relations

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors appoints an Employee Relations Director to negotiate contracts with City employees; the Board approves all contracts.

THE PROPOSAL: The Mayor or his or her agent would negotiate with City employees; the Board of Supervisors would still approve all contracts.

What your vote means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing civil service system.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE
Controller's Statement on "D"

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not directly affect the cost of government, as it removes many civil service policy setting functions from the Charter and an independent Civil Service Commission and transfers responsibility for personnel matters, including labor negotiations, to the Mayor.

"As a product of its inherent flexibility and possible future application, costs could be affected or savings realized in amounts presently indeterminate but probably substantial."

How "D" Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative Charter amendment rewriting the civil service provisions of the Charter had qualified for the June ballot.

Robert Bradford, Jonathan Bulkley, Lee Munsen and Mary Hilton, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 36,049 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 25,027 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 p.m.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partition, political, social or other considerations. Consistent with the City's and County's affirmative action goals, no applicant or employee shall be selected, appointed, reduced in rank, removed or in any way favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, union activities, political affiliation or sexual orientation.

(b) The purpose of the civil service system is to obtain for the city and county the best qualified persons to fill city and county positions in a timely and economical manner, using professional, fair and equitable personnel selection and personnel management practices with consideration of the following merit principles:

1. Recruiting, selecting and advancing employees on the basis of their ability, knowledge, skills and performance relative to the work to be performed.

2. Establishing equitable and adequate compensation, as provided elsewhere in this charter.

3. Training employees, as needed, to promote productivity and high quality performance and to facilitate career development.

4. Retaining employees during good service and separating employees for good cause.

5. Assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration, with proper regard for their privacy and constitutional rights, and assuring equal employment opportunity, based on the person's ability to do the job.

6. Assuring that employees are protected against coercion for political purposes and are prohibited from using their official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the outcome of an election or a nomination for office.

(c) This charter does not limit the power of departments, agencies, or other subdivisions of the city and county in their exercise of management prerogatives including but not limited to:

1. Directing employees in the performance of their duties;

2. Hiring, promoting, transferring and assigning employees from those qualified;

3. Classifying positions in accordance with Section 3.660(b);

4. Disciplining employees;

5. Laying off employees because of lack of work, lack of funds or other reasonable cause; and

6. Determining the mission of its departments and divisions, and its budget, organization, the number of its employees, and the numbers, types, classifications and grades of positions or employees assigned to an organization unit, work project, shift or tour of duty, and the methods and technology of performing its work.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partition, political, social or other considerations. No person shall in any way be favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, age, religion, national origin or other non-merit factors.

(b) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in subsection (a) or any other provision of this charter, it shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, consistent with a policy of acquiring qualified personnel for the service of the city and county, to encourage the hiring of blind persons. It shall further be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that no otherwise qualified blind person shall be discriminated against in examination, re-examination, appointment, re-appointment, waiver of eligibility for appointment or re-appointment, promotion or demotion in any class, subclass or position in the civil service unless eyesight is indispensable for the performance of the duties and responsibilities of the class, subclass or position, and it is the duty of the commission to classify, and from time to time it may reclassify, places of employment in the civil service where blindness is a permissible disability for the performance of the duties of the class, subclass, or position any employment where blindness is a permissible disability for the performance of the duties of the class, subclass, or position the blind may be employed.

8.360 Commission; Composition; Meetings

There is hereby established a civil service commission which shall consist of not more than five members appointed by the mayor, who shall hold office for terms of six years beginning on the last day of July immediately following the expiration of the term for which they were appointed, provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the said members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the term for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the last day of July immediately following the expiration of the term for which they were appointed, provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the last day of July immediately following the expiration of the term for which they were appointed.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON 'D'

Proposition D is a necessary reform to the City's Civil System. As the City's Chief Administrative Officer for almost ten years, I have found that quality employee hiring is difficult and the process causes long delays.

Specifically, Proposition D:
1) Creates a Department of Personnel Administration at no additional cost. Like other U.S. cities, day-to-day administration would be the responsibility of a director, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Supervisors.
2) Makes the Civil Service Commission the oversight body to set policy and hear appeals. Rulings would have to be within 60 days, eliminating endless delays.
3) Moves the office of labor relations from the Supervisors to the Mayor, who must make the tough-minded decisions to balance the budget. Never again could the Board give labor $27 million for "comparable worth."

This reform is the product of years of work with SPUR, League of Women Voters, Chamber of Commerce. Members of the Board of Supervisors could have put the reform on the ballot last year but bowed to some labor leaders, and 34,000 San Franciscans had to do the job for them.

Proposition D will enable City government to work better for you. Vote YES.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON 'D'

Proposition D cuts through the red tape. It creates a modern personnel department, with a director responsible for carrying out rules to ensure fairness and efficiency. Accountable to the Mayor, the director would be selected from a list provided by the Civil Service Commission, and subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.

The Civil Service Commission remains an independent body, with the right to approve new personnel rules and hold hearings on abuses. Also under 'D', negotiations with employee unions would be under the Mayor, subject to approval by the Supervisors, providing checks and balances in balancing our budget.

With greater accountability and continued checks and balances, Proposition D will open the way to more efficient government in our City.

Bill Maher, Supervisor
Louise Renne, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON 'D'

The current system is:
• inflexible. The City cannot hire and promote the most qualified persons.
• inefficiently administered by a commission. Other large
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Frank Jordan, Chief of Police
Emmet Condon, Fire Chief
Don Birrer, Director, Public Works
Mary Burns, General Manager, Recreation & Park
John Franz, City Librarian
Eugene Garland, Director, Port
Marvin Geistlinger, Purchaser
Willard Hamilton, Executive Director, Redevelopment Agency
Claire Isacux, Director, Arts Commission
Ray King, Director, Parking Authority
Dean Macris, Director, City Planning
Grant McKinn, Director, Human Rights Commission
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, PUC
Joyce Ream, Director, Aging
Ed Sarsfield, General Manager, Social Services
Thelma Shelley, Managing Director, War Memorial
Moira So, Executive Director, Community Development
Louis Surpen, Director of Airport
Dr. David Werdegar, Director, Health Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

It's 1986 and we're still trying to manage City business as if it were 1932. As heads of City departments, charged with the daily responsibility of putting out fires, fighting crime, maintaining hospitals, parks, libraries and providing other essential services, we know from bitter experience about shortcomings of the existing Civil Service System.

Enacted with the City Charter in 1932, the system is foundering in red tape. Outdated rules are the subject of endless challenges. Tests are put off; vacancies go unfilled; promotions delayed; any appeal, however groundless, stops the process in its tracks.

Proposition D would take old procedures out of the Charter so they could be changed in an orderly process by the Civil Service Commission, which also would hear appeals.

Day-to-day administration of the tests—the content, scoring, all the myriad details of managing a complex system, would be put into a modern, highly professional personnel office. Tests would be speeded up. Hiring would keep pace with need. Promotions would be on the basis of competence. High performance would be the standard. Discipline could be imposed with working rights fully protected, and women and minorities would be assured equal opportunity.

Proposition D will help improve management and the quality of City services. Vote Yes on D.

The hiring practices outlined in San Francisco City Charter have been virtually unchanged since 1931, a severe handicap in running a modern city. Proposition D is designed to streamline the charter and ensure that the rights of present city employees and candidates for city jobs are protected, while improving the hiring process itself. The initiative also builds management accountability in the city system.

Proposition D Is More Fair, More Efficient, More Economical

The day-to-day personnel functions, including hiring, will be consolidated under a Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. Decisions of the Director of Personnel on examination content and administration are final, unless a decision is stayed during the appeal process by a unanimous vote of the Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D will make it easier to modernize the many archaic Civil Service rules and procedures now included in the Charter, while maintaining a strong and independent Civil Service Commission to safeguard the merit system and protect the rights of city employees. Many detailed rules will come out of the Charter and will become personnel regulations. These regulations can then be modernized, but only through a process which includes public hearings and meet and confer sessions with the union involved. In addition, the Civil Service Commission must approve any changes or new regulations governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointment, promotions, transfer, resignation and terminations.

Proposition D Will Improve Performance And Public Confidence

The openness and fairness of the proposition will benefit everyone. Well-qualified job candidates will have a better chance of being hired, and well-qualified job holders will have a better chance of being promoted. This means generally better job performance in all departments, resulting in higher employee morale and more public confidence in city government.

Submitted by
Louis Hop Lee, President
Civil Service Commission
Lee Munson, Member Civil Service Commission and Treasurer, San Franciscans for Fair and Efficient Government
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D
Cities can survive only with strong management. The greatest budgetary restraint must be exercised to assure that full value is received for each tax dollar spent.

With firm limits on what it can spend and faced with a possible loss of Federal funds next year, the City must be managed with the greatest possible efficiency.

Essential to greater efficiency is the need for Civil Service reform. As members of City Commissions, we constantly confront the torturous delays and confused rules that gridlock the present system. The present system simply can’t respond to the City’s personnel needs.

Qualified applicants become frustrated and seek employment elsewhere. Promotions are blocked. Morale suffers. Temporaries fill in; overtime mounts. The ability to plan is crippled; management is weakened.

Proposition D would put the system on a business-like basis. A personnel department would handle day-to-day administration. The Civil Service Commission would be the watchdog to assure the integrity of the merit system.

This streamlined system would replace what is now inflexible and cumbersome. Testing could be accelerated; hiring made more efficient and promotions made on time. The result would be greater efficiency and elimination of costly waste.

Vote Yes on D.

Jerry E. Berg, President, Board of Permit Appeals
Henry Berman, President, Fire Commission
Mo Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Hector Chinchilla, Rent Board
Rev. Harry Chuck, Housing Authority
Dr. Arthur Coleman, President, Port Commission
Owen Davis, Police Commission
J. Edward Fleishel, Airports Commission
H. Welton Flynt, President, Public Utilities Commission
James Foster, Health Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation & Park Commission
James Fustell, President, Housing Authority
Anne Halsted, Port Commission
Tommy Harris, Recreation & Park Commission
Tom Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Walter Jebe, Public Library Commission
Jeffrey Lee, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Philip Lee, President, Health Commission
Bruce W. Lillenthal, Small Business Advisory Commission
Jacqueline Nemirovski, President, Arts Commission
Toby Rosenblatt, President, Planning Commission
Dr. David Sanchez, President, Police Commission
Joan San Jule, Housing Authority
John Patrick Short, President, Parking Authority
Marjonie G. Stern, President, Public Library Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D contains civil service reform measures urged by the League of Women Voters since 1969.

Proposition D will:
— Modernize the City’s outdated personnel system by creating a Director of Personnel, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors
— Preserve the principles of merit through policies set by the Civil Service Commission
— Create a more responsive Civil Service system at no additional cost to the taxpayer

EFFICIENCY AND FLEXIBILITY
Proposition D transfers authority for day-to-day management of the City’s personnel system from the Civil Service Commission to the Director of Personnel. This will:
— Prevent hiring delays
— Ensure only the most qualified individuals are hired and promoted
— Provide City managers with more administrative flexibility

FAIRNESS FOR EMPLOYEES
Proposition D will:
— Safeguard the rights of City workers
— Protect gains made in hiring women and minorities
— Retain the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit appeals board
— Retain the ability of the City’s unions to negotiate working conditions
— Create a system that can respond quickly and fairly to the needs of City workers

Proposition D will bring the Civil Service system into the 20th century by making the Mayor accountable for the management of a system employing more than 25,000 people. Hiring by merit is still guaranteed by the Charter. Please join us in voting for this Reform!

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
Esther Marks, Past President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote Yes on Proposition D the Civil Service Modernization Initiative.

Prevent abuse of a system that was intended to serve the public and protect against favoritism. Prevent situations like this: an employee failed to report to work for a week without explanation; he was telephoned, notified by certified mail and a message left under his door; he was terminated 13 days later; he did not appeal the termination and the civil service commission up-
Civil Service

held the termination. Two months later, the employee petitioned the commission for reinstatement. The employee got his job back, not because the process of termination was wrong but because the commission had a long standing objection to using "absent without leave" as a reason for firing.

The quality of public services is dependent upon the effectiveness of the staff who deliver them. The primary role of the civil service commission should be to facilitate recruitment and retention of the best available personnel. It must protect against favoritism and must assure that everyone has an equal and fair chance at employment.

The present system does not do that. We feel this initiative will make the system work better, for the managers, for the employees and for the public.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco government is huge, with a budget of more than $1 billion per year and 25,000 employees. It is expected to solve serious problems. This requires that the City have the ability to hire and promote talented people to do the job.

The present civil service system is so tied up in red tape that jobs remain vacant for six months to a year, and all too often someone who is not capable of doing a good job is hired. Your tax dollars are being wasted, and you are not receiving the quality of services you need and deserve.

Proposition D will modernize San Francisco's civil service system. It separates the personnel department from the Civil Service Commission, and puts the department under the Mayor where it belongs. The Mayor is responsible for balancing the budget and delivering city services as efficiently as possible. She cannot do this unless she can find capable people to do the job. That is the task of the personnel department in any organization.

Proposition D will also insure that the independent Civil Service Commission has sufficient authority to require the personnel system to be fair in its treatment of City employees. The Commission will be able to issue subpoenas and require testimony of witnesses on investigations it conducts. Should it find that discrimination has occurred, it can issue orders that must be obeyed.

Most major American cities, and virtually all cities and counties in California, have the kind of civil service system that will be established by Proposition D. San Francisco's present system is still mired in the past. It hobbles the ability of the City to deliver services and spend your tax dollars as efficiently as possible.

SPUR has not placed a statement in the Voter's Handbook for any other issue over the past 15 years. We feel that Proposition D is so vital for San Francisco's future that we are making this appeal for your support.

Vote "YES" on Proposition D.

SPUR—The San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Reform Initiative, will give San Francisco citizens the HIGH PERFORMANCE GOVERNMENT necessary to meet the many challenges of the future. Proposition D corrects the outdated and inflexible requirements originally written in San Francisco's City Charter in 1931. It will eliminate the problems which prevent San Francisco's personnel system from operating with efficiency the City's voters and taxpayers deserve:

Proposition D insures City jobs will be filled from current lists of the most qualified employees.

Proposition D prevents ungrounded appeals from delaying for years the appointment or promotion of qualified employees.

Proposition D eliminates the repetitive tasks currently monopolizing the Civil Service Commission meetings and directs the Commission to serve as an appellate body to protect the City's good employees.

Proposition D centralizes the day-to-day operation of the civil service system and makes the Director of Personnel responsible to the Mayor.

Proposition D simplifies the budgetary process by making the Mayor the City's chief labor negotiator, responsible for setting working conditions within the City's financial capacity.

Proposition D is the result of years of painstaking review by the most experienced, able and respected management experts in San Francisco. It is a plan intended to move City government out of the 1930s and equip San Francisco to enter the twenty-first century without being burdened by the red tape of the past.

After ten years of commitment to improving our City, the Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee is convinced adoption of Proposition D is one of the most important issues facing the voters. CHANGE IS LONG OVERDUE. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by,
The Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee

David Anacher
Jerome Anderson
Richard Blum
Charles Chapman
Arthur Cooke, Jr.
Benton Dial
James Edgar
Ruben Garcia
Robert Hayden
Walter Headley
John Jacobs
Michael McGill
Ellen Newman
Roy Nordman
Frank Tatum
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PERSONNEL MANAGERS SAY YES ON PROPOSITION D

As the personnel managers for City Departments, we are charged with the responsibility of managing the City's personnel system. The activities include examinations, hiring, training, discipline, union-management relations, affirmative action and compensation. No one knows better than we the frustrations experienced in attempting to monitor an unbelievable sequence of overlapping bureaucratic activities in attempting to get the job done.

Proposition D will bring our personnel system into line with most other public personnel systems. The improved system will create the potential for being more responsive to the needs of operating departments. It will improve labor relations by transferring this function to the executive branch of government where it belongs.

Proposition D will streamline certain routine procedures resulting in a reduction of cost and time. Under the current system delays are experienced due to lengthy appeals during which time the departments' objectives are delayed.

Proposition D will create an atmosphere of increased accountability for department managers in the areas of affirmative action, discipline and job performance.

Alvin W. Schaaf
Personnel Director
Recreation and Park Department

Marsha Ramirez
Personnel Officer
San Francisco Port

Edward M. Gaszaro
Personnel Director
Department of Health

James Horan
Senior Personnel Officer
Department of Social Services

James Ilnicki
Personnel Director
San Francisco International Airport

Andrea R. Gourdin
Manager, Bureau of Personnel & Training
Public Utilities Commission

Mori Noguchi
Senior Department Personnel Officer

Mary Smith
Senior Personnel Officer
Laguna Honda Hospital

Thelma Peteet
Senior Personnel Officer
San Francisco General Hospital

John Burke
Personnel Director
Controller's Office

Proposition D has been endorsed by the San Francisco Council of Human Resource Managers, the association of over one hundred personnel managers in City government.

Proposition D strengthens merit system principles. Civil Service commissioners will have more time to enforce and protect these principles rather than being bogged down in the day-to-day activities of administration.

Proposition D will help bring about improved methods and practices in personnel administration and should result in a more competent and effective workforce which the citizens of San Francisco have a right to expect.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will assist the Department of Public Works by streamlining the Civil Service process.

• Under the current system, the duration of eligible lists from 2 to 4 years hampers the Department from hiring graduates of colleges and universities on an annual basis. Consequently, many excellent candidates are not entered into the Civil Service System. Passage of the proposition will improve the quality of the pool of applicants and thereby the quality of public service given by the Department.

• The establishment of a Personnel Director to administer the day-to-day tasks of the system will speed up the decision making process to the advantage of employees and management alike.

• The proposition still calls for checks and balances in that the Commission will continue to hear appeals on discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest. The Commission will act as a watchdog while leaving the general administration to the Personnel Director.

The initiative will make for an improved system for employees, management and the citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Donald Birrer
Director of Public Works

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Passage of this amendment will update our civil service system. These changes will make it comparable to other merit system agencies. Some of these changes are

(A) removal of administrative details from the charter which inhibit timely and effective personnel actions.

The following subjects will be placed in personnel regulations:

• Protests of written questions and answers
• Protests of tentative employment lists
• Promotional examinations

• Examinations for employees on military leave
• Certification of eligibles—Rule of three
• Duration of employment lists
• Temporary employee appointments
(B) allows continuous up-dating of employment lists.
(C) allows equitable treatment of job candidates with same test score.

(D) realigns responsibilities: the Civil Service Commission dealing primarily with compliance and adjudication activities (continued)
while the Personnel Department administers the day-to-day operation of the merit system.

**Equally important** the amendment **retains** important merit system provisions dealing with:
- Employee salary setting procedures
- Positions subject to merit system examinations
- Public hearing and meet and confer requirements
- Penalties for examination fraud
- Seniority, meritorious service and applicable educational credits for promotional examinations in the Police/Fire De-

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D**

Proposition D, the Civil Service Initiative, is a long-overdue reform to streamline antiquated hiring practices in San Francisco’s fifty-year-old charter. Proposition D will ensure that the best and brightest job candidates are chosen to serve our city, thus promoting excellence in job performance and helping to eliminate incompetence. This initiative builds management accountability in the city system, while giving the Civil Service Commission the independence to protect the rights of women and minorities.

**A Better, More Efficient System at Less Cost**

Proposition D consolidates personnel functions, including hiring, under a new Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. The Director has final authority over content of examinations given city job applicants, so more flexibility is possible in finding truly qualified candidates.

Proposition D redefines the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit systems appeals board and policy-setting body. The merit principles are spelled out in the Proposition. This allows the Commission to protect the rights of women and minorities at no cost to the public.

**More Fair to Everyone**

Proposition D greatly improves the city charter. Well-qualified job candidates have a better chance to be hired and well-qualified job holders have a better chance to be promoted. The public is rewarded with the better job performance, efficiency and friendliness one expects from good government employees. All of these improvements are at no additional cost to the taxpayer.

Submitted by

James W. Haas

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D**

For more than a half-century, San Francisco Mayors have abided by the employee examination, hiring and promotion policies administered by a strong and independent Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D is a deceptive and dangerous scheme that would give future Mayors and top-level bureaucrats the power to ignore competence and reward political loyalty.

Proposition D would take key Civil Service employment rules out of the City Charter and make them subject to wheeling and dealing by City Hall politicians.

There's an old saying — "if it ain't broke, don't fix it." Civil Service has worked well for more than 50 years. Proposition D is unnecessary, ineffective and even counter-productive. It's not just deceptive, it's dangerous.

Joseph L. Alioto
Former Mayor of San Francisco
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Time and time again, different groups have put various propositions on the ballot to weaken our Civil Service System and reintroduce political patronage into City employment practices. And every time the voters have wisely rejected these schemes, no matter how cleverly they have been disguised.

Proposition D is just another power grab by bureaucrats at the top in City Hall.

We've said NO! loud and clear in the past. Let's say NO one more time.

Submitted by:
TAXPAYERS FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT
Thomas Scanlon
City Treasurer, Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "D"!!!

During the eight years while a member of the Board of Supervisors, I fought hard to reform the Civil Service Commission and bring working conditions and city workers' pay equitable to both workers and taxpayers. I fought to insure an independent Civil Service Commission that would remain just that — independent and free from political influence and political patronage of particular the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

I am truly saddened by the Mayor's insistence in bringing this disastrous Proposition "D" before the voters. Some of the Supervisors rejected this misguided measure for what it is; an unwise consolidation of authority to hire, fire and promote city workers by the Mayor and newly created personnel officer.

My efforts to bring pay equity to both taxpayers and city workers were continually squashed by then Supervisor Feinstein and Supervisor Molinari. Finally, in 1975, shortly after a disastrous city strike, I was able to place on the ballot, for voter approval, a measure that almost eliminates the power of the Mayor and Supervisors to manipulate the pay of city workers. This measure was overwhelmingly passed by the voters that year and we have not had any labor unrest since that date.

Vote No on "D"!
"D" stands for disaster. It will undo many of these reforms. Also, right now, the City is almost broke, thanks to the manipulation of Mayor Feinstein and her chief ally Supervisor Molinari.

If "D" passes the cost of operating our city government will increase in the next 24 months by not less than $60,000,000. Contrary to the provisions of Proposition 13, property taxes would be increased, thus forcing up rents.

Vote No on "D".

Don't weaken our Civil Service Commission, whereby least deserving city employees could be promoted because of connection or clout.

Vote No on "D".

We now almost have more problems than we can handle. We don't want our city turned into another Chicago, where for nearly half a century a corrupt political system flourished under Mayor Richard Daley.

John Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We join San Franciscans for Fair Employment in opposing the Civil Service Initiative, Proposition D.

This measure will severely hamper the well-being of the San Francisco Fire and Police Departments. These departments are two of the finest in the Country and have consistently protected life and property in a professional manner. They must continue that tradition with a civil service system based on MERIT and not political patronage.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.
Andrew C. Casper
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Keith P. Calden
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

William F. Murray
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Thomas J. Cahill
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired

Donald M. Scott
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Our present Civil Service system was designed to keep corruption out of government. It has generally served that purpose well. This proposition would dismantle that system and in my opinion open the doors to nepotism, favoritism, patronage and corruption. Better a city government that is bureaucratic than one that is corrupt. Vote NO on D.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is an attack on the merit system and an attempt to return patronage to the Mayor’s office by eliminating the authority of the Civil Service Commission and its built in checks and balances.

The present Civil Service system is not perfect, but corrections can be made within the Charter without destroying a system that has worked for over 50 years and has been free from fraud and corruption.

This proposition will do nothing to improve the caliber of police performance and could have the opposite effect. I urge you to vote NO on PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by
The San Francisco Police Supervisors and Investigators
Association

Don Good, Captain SFPD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D could be a dangerous first step toward weakening the independent, impartial administration of our City government.

Proposition D would transfer power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor. The Director’s decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline and certification would be final. The Commission would have no right to hear examinations or disciplinary appeals.

With the transfer of duties and responsibilities from the Commission to the Mayor’s appointed Personnel Director, the Mayor would have control over personnel functions. Currently, commissioners have independent status and can be dismissed for cause. The Personnel Director could be dismissed at will.

The Merit System could be replaced by a patronage system. Proposition D could open the door to rules permitting the Personnel Director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his or her position on the list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Proposition D is NOT a reform package. The checks and balances for efficient City government would be lopsided, with too much power in the hands of unknown future Mayors.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
John L. Molinari, President
Harry G. Britt
Richard HongoSto
Willie B. Kennedy
Wadey Neldor
Nancy Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Beware of PROPOSITION D!

Powerful special interest groups are attempting to remove key City employees from the independent and impartial Civil Service system in the name of “reform”.

They want instead to make these employees answerable directly to future Mayors and politically-appointed Personnel Directors and department heads.

PROPOSITION D got on the ballot because the Chamber of Commerce and such companies as Pacific Bell and PG&E paid a professional southern California campaign firm, $70,000 to collect signatures.

They’re trying to destroy the merit system and replace it with an old-fashioned patronage system.

Department heads will be able to ignore examination scores and reward loyalty rather than competence in promotions and hiring.

Don’t let the Chamber of Commerce, big business and their allies in the City bureaucracy dictate who’s hired, fired and promoted among public employees.

PROPOSITION D is not just deceptive, it’s dangerous! Vote NO on PROPOSITION D!

Libby Denebeim
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Ron Huberman
Vice-Chairman, Democratic Central Committee
Jim Wacob
Democratic Central Committee
Roberto Estevs
President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Rick Pacurar
President, Harvey Milk Lesbian Gay Democratic Club
Walter L. Johnson
Exec. Secty., S. F. Labor Council
Michael Bernick
Sall Roselli
John Mehring
Nancy Walker
Harry Britt
Carole Migden
Jack Morrison
Linda Post
Deborah Stein
Pat Norman
Gwen Craig
Louise Minnick
Agos Jaicks

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D places too much power in the hands of ONE. Proposition D will provide for a personnel director to be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. The Mayor now appoints five members of the Civil Service Commission who also serve at her pleasure.

You work for years to climb the civil service ladder and then somebody comes along with an idea to cut you off at the pockets.

Proposition D will lock in all the employees employed in the Mayor's office and will control the appointments of any new staff by the next Mayor elect in 1987 and years thereafter.

Like controlling your estate from the grave.

Vote NO on D.

Marguerite Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service Merit System has served our City well, giving San Franciscans an equal opportunity. It has helped us obtain employment and earn promotions based on objective examinations.

The Civil Service Merit system replaced the old patronage system that rewarded political loyalty more than competence.

Now the supporters of PROPOSITION D want to create a new Personnel Director, accountable only to the Mayor, and give department heads the absolute power to decide who works for the City and who gets promoted.

If PROPOSITION D passes, equal opportunity would give way to opportunity based on membership in the bureaucratic "establishment".

Keep our Civil Service Merit System strong and free from the political abuses of the past.

Vote NO on D!

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly
Ben Tom
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
JoAnne Miller
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
A. Richard Cerbatos
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Sedonia Wilson
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, President
S. F. Community College Governing Board
Julie Tang
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Alan S. Wang
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Henry Der
Albert Chang
Rudy Meraz
Robert "Bob" Morales
Yori Wada

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Can you imagine studying for a civil service examination, being rated at the top of the eligible list and never receiving the promotion? That's exactly what Proposition "D" will do should the electorate adopt this amendment.

The civil service merit system has defects, but to totally eliminate the system and replace it with a patronage system where promotions are based on who you know, rather than what you know is scandalous.

Civil service was put into place to prevent scandal and the "favor seeking" individual from getting a paid position because he/she happened to support the right elected official.

Proposition "D" will allow one person, chosen by the Mayor, to decide who will be promoted, hired and fired. This is awesome power for one single individual to have at any level of government.

Our current Mayor may choose a fair person for this position, but will future Mayors be as careful? As each new Mayor assumes office, the civil service system will again change. The potential to favor one individual or group over others is great.

Proposition "D" has a great potential to diminish the quality of services we now provide to our citizens, as the future of how people are hired and promoted in the San Francisco Police Department is completely unknown.

It's true our promotional system is fraught with delays and delays frustrate us all, but Proposition "D" is not the answer. Proposition "D" will only add to our existing problems. Several years ago, our citizens elected a Charter Commission to streamline city government and make civil service work more efficiently. The voters eventually rejected those proposals. The checks and balances that make our government stable were no longer present. It simply went too far.

Proposition "D" goes even further. It brings about a system of patronage and should be defeated lest we want to engage in "free-wheeling and dealing" of civil service jobs and promotions.

We urge a strong No vote against Proposition "D"!

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry, President

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

The purpose of the Civil Service Commission is to ensure that the merit system would be the only criteria in any examination process.

If Proposition D passes, all authority concerning examinations would be taken from the Civil Service Commission and given to a Personnel Director, who is appointed by the Mayor. This Personnel Director would have the authority to hire and fire at his discretion, with no appeal available. This proposition is contrary to everything the Fire Department and all City employees have strived for over the years.

The Civil Service Commission in its present form was instituted to prevent any possibility of a patronage system, where one person has complete control.

This proposition would do nothing to improve your Fire Department. If you are satisfied with the work and make up of the San Francisco Fire Department in its present form, "Vote No On Proposition D". You will be doing a service for the San Francisco Fire Department, and the people of San Francisco.

Submitted by the San Francisco Fire Chiefs' Association
John Flaherty, Battalion Chief SFFD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is bad government and bad politics, changing our independent civil service system into a system dominated by the Mayor:

. . . By shortening the six year terms of Civil Service Commission to conform to the Mayor's four year term of office.

. . . By transferring most of the Commission's powers to a Personnel Director who serves solely at the Mayor's pleasure.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D fails to offer enough new and improved procedures to cure the current defects in the civil service system. Charter sections and civil service rules are repealed without specific known replacements.

Proposition D transfers power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created personnel director appointed by, and to serve at the pleasure of, the Mayor. The director's decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline, and certification would be final. The commission would have no right to hear examination or disciplinary appeals.

There are hidden costs with Proposition D because the new Personnel Administration Department will employ a personnel director, and other employees "as may be necessary to carry out (its) functions and duties."

The Merit System could be replaced by an old style Patronage System. Proposition D could open the door to rules which permit the personnel director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his/her position on the civil service testing list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Police and Fire Commissions would lose functions as a result of the personnel director's new power. The director's unlawful employment discrimination policy would be binding upon department administrators. The director's procedure for employee dispute resolution must be used by all department heads and appointing officers.

Proposition D is not the answer. The checks and balances for efficient city government would be lopsided.

I urge a no vote on Proposition D.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, 17th Assembly District
Sala Burton
Congresswoman
Art Agnos
16th Assembly District
Milton Marks
State Senator

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Balboa Reservoir
Development Ban

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit
for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and
Phelan Avenues for the next three years?

YES 292
NO 293

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities
Commission declared Balboa Reservoir
South (located across Phelan Avenue from
San Francisco City College) surplus in
1984 and made the site available for low,
moderate and market rate housing. In July
1985, a City-community advisory commit-
tee chose a developer to build 203 single-
family homes on the 13 acre site. Construc-
tion has not yet begun.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would
prohibit granting new building permits and
would revoke existing building permits for
construction on the Balboa Reservoir site
(Assessor’s Block 3180, Lot 1) between June

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you
want to prohibit granting any new building
permits and you want to revoke existing
building permits for construction on the
Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986
and June 3, 1989.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you
want to continue to allow building permits
to be granted for construction on the Balboa
Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the
following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposi-
tion E:

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be
adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of
government.”

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

How “E” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initia-
tive ordinance calling for a three-year ban on development of the
Balboa Reservoir site had qualified for the June ballot.

Sidney Kass and Jesse David Wall, the proponents of the peti-
tion, had gathered 12,430 signatures which they turned in to the
Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 10,012 of the signa-
tures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed
to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT
OF PROPOSITION E
begins on page 77
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Having been responsible for providing leadership at City College from 1947 to 1977, we cannot stand by and see this site converted to housing. We must speak out. Such a move would preclude forever the logical and much needed campus expansion to what was once our West Campus. We left that site reluctantly to make way for water storage. If it is no longer required for that purpose, let us return it to City College.

Thousands of San Franciscans—high school graduates, dropouts, veterans, re-entering women—representing all of the city’s diverse ethnic groups, have been prepared for transfer to four-year colleges, profitable careers, and have had their lives enriched at the City College of San Francisco. Without City College’s open door and easy access, many would have been deprived of these opportunities.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION ‘E’

We question:
1. Why no EIR was required when the proposed development could have a substantial impact.
2. Whether the future needs of City College for classrooms, housing, and parking have been considered.
3. What the impact on taxpayers is with below market land sale and construction financing by bonds.

This moratorium will permit adequate study of these issues. Vote YES on Proposition ‘E’.

Bruce Bonacker, President
Board of Directors, Glen Park Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don’t let a developer make a mint on land across from the most overcrowded college in the Bay Area! Parking is already an impossibility for residents near City College... adding 200 homes to this land would make the situation much worse.

It’s simple: a college which can’t find room for more students at a time when more people are returning to education doesn’t serve the community.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

You’d probably be upset. We certainly are. Please help us protect our neighborhood. Please vote YES on proposition E.

Westwood Park Residents: Sunnyside Residents:
Edna Toebor Ellen Wall
Minnie Dorwin Melissa Volmont
Eugene Eden David Wall
Donna Nicoletti
Robert Armstrong
Pauline Armangon
Joel Martinez
Richard & Lisa Patterson
David Bean
H. Bozzone
William Burke
Richard Robel
Clyde Theriot
Danace Manus
Enma Manus
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let the greedy developers take this potentially picturesque open space.
A yes vote means you want more time to consider its future use. All we ask is time to think and plan.

John Barbagelata
Former member, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Suppose there was a publicly owned open space across the street from the main U.C. Berkeley Campus.
Can you imagine for one moment that it would be passed into private ownership?
Vote Yes on E for Equality and Excellence in Education

City College Students:
William Lew, Student
Tim McGuire, Student Council Member
Joseph Goldstein, Student Council Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

In 1952, the "Experts" said we needed reservoirs. They felt so strongly that they condemned the City College West Campus, destroyed the buildings, and constructed the reservoirs—all at taxpayer's expense.
Now, in 1986 with more demand for water, the "Experts" say the reservoir is no longer needed. What is the concerned taxpayer to believe?
When in doubt, the city should hold on to the expensive things already paid for.

Stop the reservoir giveaway. Vote YES on E.

Taxpayers for Preserving the Reservoir.
Richard Patterson
Darice Murphy
Lucille Carson
Daniel Gutierrez
Franz Witte
Bernhard Scholander
Ruth Hanson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This is a Planning issue
We have been accused of trying to stop housing for poor people. Not true. In the first place, the price levels are certainly middle income and above, but our main objection is that this badly done plan is damaging to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as to the over-crowded community college across the street.

WHAT WE WANT
Even our critics point out that we originally SUGGESTED housing for that site, but they don't talk about what else we suggested. We want two levels of parking under a City College Library, Bookstore, and Auditorium, with housing on top. Furthermore, let the housing be TRULY affordable—for students and seniors. We are trying to stop the bureaucrats' subsidized middle income housing project because it makes our dream impossible.
We ask for three years to give the neighborhood and the college a chance to produce a better plan.
SNaP (Sensible Neighborhood Planning Committee)

Helen Crizer, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council, representing 17 neighborhood associations in the area of the surplus reservoir property in question has voted to endorse the three-year stop of private construction on the old West Campus of City College.
Dr. Louis Batmale, Chancellor of City College from 1970-1977, has persuaded us that City College needs the lands.

Juanita Raven, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Be a sport.
Give City College a vote of support.
City has 23,000 students and badly needs a library. The only place to put it is in the reservoir site. City College has walked closely with San Francisco for five decades. The reservoir site has always been understood to be reserved for City College.

Until now when someone wants it for housing. Housing is important, but it can be anywhere in town. But a City College library can only be located at the College.

Vote yes to support a book—and a reader.
Reading, studying, writing and research make up our town also.

It is hard to understand criticism of City for wanting to keep this area for a library. Sure, housing sites are at a premium—but even more so a library site for City which is one of the largest schools in the Nation.

Some people blast City for wanting a library because of the need for housing. Housing is needed. But some of those very same people want a big battleship stationed here that will bring in 15,000 new family members.

The Educational and cultural growth of San Francisco mandates living space for the City College library.

If this measure gets a no vote, it means there will be no site for a Library. This is the last chance. Vote YES to help out a book—and a reader.

State financing, when approved, will construct this building.
It is the top building priority at City College.

A YES vote here means there will be time to think about the use of the site. During that three year period, cooler heads may realize this is the only site for a Library. If the housing goes in there will be no library there.

Vote yes for a book, for a good school and a better City.

John Riordan, Board of Governors
San Francisco Community College District.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Sunnyside Neighborhood Association is not against housing, but we are trying to stop a hasty and short-sighted plan. We are asking for this moratorium to get time for a better plan that will answer a variety of needs and benefit the entire city as well as our community.

This is a planning issue.
The release of the reservoir property as surplus by the water department came as a surprise to our neighborhood. The June 1984 "Residence Element" of the city's Master Plan did not even list the land as surplus. By 1985 major decisions were being made for use of the land without adequate neighborhood input.

There were some meetings attended by a few people carefully selected for their zealous pro-housing views or potential financial gain. The resulting plan has gone out of control. Now it benefits only the developer and the lucky few who will get houses on free land.

Proposition E is not an attack on housing.
Please help us save our neighborhood against poor planning by voting YES on Proposition E.

Joe Mahoney, President
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION E

All the talk in the world can't change the fact that City College has fewer acres of land relative to its student population than any college in the Bay Area.

Enrollment at City College is INCREASING, as is the enrollment of the San Francisco public schools from which City College draws most of its students. It is obvious that City College needs and deserves the reservoir land. The three year moratorium will gave time to produce a better plan which will have input by faculty, students and alumni who know the college's needs and want to support it.

Sid Kass
Susie Langdon Kass
Phil Kass
City College Student

Frank Mastro, President
Arnell Rodrigues
Maggie Kroll
Dorothy Evers
B. Sullivan
Dale Jones
Homer Bradford
Kathryn A. Small
Harry Small
Mr. & Mrs. Henry Taylor
Betty Woo Suen
Susan Fischetti
Dale Brown

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The homeowners of Westwood Park, a neighborhood adjacent to the Balboa Reservoir, support the ballot initiative calling for a 3 year development moratorium. We believe that the City and City College should take additional time to determine their needs and how they might be met by using the Reservoir. In the event that City College does not need this property, we support its development as open space or as single family detached housing.

Westwood Park Association
Don C. Swander
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Let's not aggravate the traffic problem around City College before we first develop solutions for the existing problems. A three-year moratorium only buys our neighborhood and elected officials time to find solutions; it doesn't say no to housing. A YES vote is a vote for prudent development. A YES vote helps to preserve the family character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ken Hoegger
Realtor and community Activist

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As representatives of the students of City College, we understand first-hand, the intense need to reserve a site for future school expansion. Preservation of the Balboa Reservoir, a site directly adjacent to the campus, is particularly crucial. The facilities that CCSF requires, such as a library and an auditorium, are essential to the main structure of the campus. Unlike classrooms, it would be unreasonable to build an auditorium or a library on an off-campus site, since these facilities are integral to the main function of the school.

Associated Student Council of City College
Jack Lee, Vice President of Associated Counsel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Local 2121 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, representing City College faculty, urges a yes vote on Proposition E. While this project provides short-term employment for a few, we are more concerned about the thousands of students who would benefit from planning and development that would better serve the community and the college.

Yes on E for continued excellence in community college education.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is twice as crowded as any community college in northern California. It needs a much larger library, bookstore and auditorium, and more parking. The college has always expected to use the empty SOUTH reservoir for educational needs. That land is finally surplus. Neither the college Governing Board nor the Chancellor attended the Mayor's planning sessions for the property and the faculty was not informed. When the 12.3 acre site was offered to a developer for $36,900 for subsidized housing, the Chancellor said, "We are at a crossroad and the correct path is for the Board of Supervisors, with the Mayor's support, to deed this surplus land to City College so that the college may continue to serve the city effectively for the next 50 years as it has for the past half century." The Mayor refused. Now only Board member John Riordan supports the correct path.

The Water Department says it may need the NORTH reservoir now used for student parking. If that crisis occurs, the Chancellor says, "We'll deal with the situation then." How, if the south reservoir is gone?

(continued)
When land is available other community colleges finance large projects through alliances with civic, athletic and cultural organizations, and through property sales. New methods for public funding are being developed.

The faculty would like three years of careful study to unravel misunderstandings and poor management, and to find the best way to be a good neighbor.

Ken Crizer
Lene Johnson
Madeline Mueller
Julia Scholand
Steering Committee,
City College Faculty for Responsible Development

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College needs land now for desperately needed facilities, one of which is a library. City College has an enrollment of 23,000 students but our library has seating for 450. There are other possible locations for new housing, but City College can't be moved. Give us an opportunity to plan a development for the community and the college.

Annie M. Young
City College Library Faculty and Staff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty and staff members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Donald Cunningham
Anne Dowd
Beverly Eigner
David Lofling
Alice Morris
Kevin Nakagawa
Thomas Nesbitt
David Spears
City College Faculty for Responsible Reservoir

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Darlene Atioto
Mary Allen
Mary Amaler
Tom Angeloff
Robert Balestrieri
Don Batani
Diana Bernstein
Joe Berry
Anna Britton
Thomas Brendel
James Bristol
Richard Brongel
Laurent Broussal
Philip Brown
Barbara Cabrini
John Cullen
John Cotts
Frank Cerrato
Rosemary Clark
Perry Close
Kurt Common
Walter Cribbs
George Crippen
Patricia Davis
Guy DePrimo
Edward Diefendorf
Sharon Edwards
Larry Ernst
Mary Erwin
Koei Fang
William Funke
Terry Greenfield
Robert Griffin
Michael Guthrie
Mary Hanna
Yen-Kuang Ho
Peter Hoch
Ronald Hochlea
Myrna Holden
Katharina Hindiaum
Michael Hulbert
Edward Hun
Frank Ingersoll
Elaine Johnson
Wendy Kaufman
Jo Kennedy
Mercedes Row
Rosalind Kwok
Don Lafferty
James Lollas
Steve Levinson
Sue Light
Gary Ling
Amelia Lippi
Dave Lubbert
Leon Lucy
Duane Macaluso
Marion McManus
Patricia Midigan
Michael Maluchowski
Mary Mari
Maria Mariani
Sylvia Marshall
Valerie Meehan
Jose Mejia
Miguel Michelmayr
Deanne Milan
Cindy Moody
Thomas Munro
David Mykhe
Deborah Nagle
Glenn Nance
Herbert Naylor
William Neff
Dennis Fienkowski
Francine Podenski
Therese Pouffet
Solomon Raju
Mary Rietman
Forbort Sanie
Marvin Schinnerer
Fred Schneider
Earl Schriner
Andy Seal
Kris Shen
Robert Struckman
McDuet Tom
Edward Taylor
Pierce Thiry
Barbara Thomas
Clare Thompson
Willie Thompson
Mary Tharber
Robert Tricaro
James Triner
Joanne Timmings
George VonBoszy
Cherie Wetzel
Austin White
Joes Wilson
Rosalee Wolf
Christina Yee
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Water Department has begun a resource study of water use, due for completion in two or three years. The study may well indicate that one or both reservoirs will be needed. The American Water Works Association states that reservoirs should be used in pairs. This is particularly important because it is the only reservoir at an elevation of 305 feet.

The Mayor twisted the arm of the Water Department to declare one of these reservoirs surplus before the water resource study is completed. Don't let her get away with this kind of political manipulation. Vote YES on Proposition E

Kurt Common
Ken Crizer
Ed Dierauf
Herb Naylor
CCSF Engineering Professors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The South Balboa Basin has been unused since college leased buildings, including a large auditorium, were torn down on that site thirty years ago. We hope that three years of thorough planning would explore the possibility of returning a part of that property to the college for the development of a multi-purpose medium-sized auditorium which could be shared with community groups.

Robert Bezina
Mack Crooks
Bob Davis
Helen Dilworth
Franz Enciso
Richard Eisenman
Richard Fennner
Lawrence Ferrara
Ted Fleming
Peggy Garham
William Grothkopp
David Handman

Judy Hubbell
Charles Hudson
Steiglitz Isham
Baruch Klein
John Kongsmark
Joshua Law
Steven Lopez
Jerry Mueller
Madeline Mueller
Marvin Tarrant
Frank Townsell
City College Music Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition E. This moratorium is necessary because there are too many worthy uses for this land to make a hasty and potentially very costly decision. Only through careful planning can the limited land available for development be best used.

Nicolas Alexander
Paul Hewitt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, as Physical Education Instructors, have always been committed to a diversified program for our students and community. The reservoir space is a natural land resource for a Multi Educational and Cultural Center.

Your YES vote on E will allow us the freedom to explore ways that this property could most constructively benefit all.

Gail Baron
Curtis Decker
Brad Doggen
Takako Hagihara
John Hahn
Daniel Hayes

Lene Johnson
Grover Klemmer
Paula McCallum
Art Octavio
Louise Scouries

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, full-time faculty of the Computer and Information Science Department of City College, urge a YES vote to postpone the decision until additional planning and surveys can be conducted. The current proposal would negatively impact the College's enrollment.

William Beaver
Ronald Cerruti, Chairman
Kirk Gibson
Howard Granger
Frank Holden
Michael Kelly

George Lany
Norbert Ludkey
Charles Metzler
Charles Miller
Marilyn Schnake

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

A YES vote on Proposition E helps STOP a scheme to GIVE AWAY $12,300,000 worth of City land for $1,800,000 (or less) to a Redwood City real estate developer.

A YES vote will SAVE taxpayers $550,000 per year. The housing project will produce $240,000 in taxes, but supplying City services will cost $790,000 per year.

The Controller’s cost estimate does NOT account for the $12,300,000 land value, since land sale below value is NOT technically a cost of government. The Controller also is NOT permitted to assume that the housing project will be constructed, since construction has NOT yet been ordered by the Board of Supervisors.

The plan does NOT restrict housing sales to moderate-income first-time buyers. The plan only restricts use of tax-subsidized funds. Any person favored by the developer or politicians can buy these dwellings and get the benefits of the public land giveaway.

The houses are made “affordable” by giving away the land far below market value, by City-backed low interest, and by cutting construction corners.

The real beneficiaries of the subsidized housing project are the financiers (NOT the project dwellers). Bondholders receive 9.6% average tax-free interest, which is equivalent to 24.6% taxable interest at 61% maximum tax. The developer and bond establishment receive $5,340,000; this is $26,300 (or 22.40%) for each $117,400 unit.

The City loses $51,700 worth of land GIVEN AWAY for each unit.

Vote YES on Proposition E for good fiscal management.

William Marquardt
Financial Analyst, SNaP
Helen Crizer, Treasurer, SNaP

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of College</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Campus (acres)</th>
<th>Area/1000 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City College of SF</td>
<td>22,624</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laney College, Oakland</td>
<td>9,805</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot College, Hayward</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa College</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of San Mateo</td>
<td>13,820</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>11.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Marin</td>
<td>6,663</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given these facts, why does the Governing Board not try to get the old West Campus back? Why don’t they support this moratorium to delay the land grab?

The Governing Board is under political pressure from City Hall. They have been threatened with the loss of the north reservoir parking lot and funding for special projects. Forgive them.

Vote Yes on E.

Friends of City College
David Newton
Glen Simpson
Jack Baker
Thomas Velasquez
Tillie McCullough

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The student population at City College is increasing. This semester’s enrollment is up 1,265 students over last semester.

The enrollment in the San Francisco public schools has been increasing by 1,218 per year for the last three years. City College draws most of its enrollment from public schools in San Francisco.

Obviously, City College will have a larger enrollment in the future years, and will be in desperate need of space if we do not give it back its old West Campus.

Please reserve this public land for the college.

Please vote YES on E.

Barbara Holman
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON E

In 1981, I launched a six-point program to expand San Francisco’s housing supply and the voters had approved a City policy to add 20,000 new housing units within five years. This Proposition would destroy a major portion of the effort to build affordable, single-family housing in our city.

The Balboa Reservoir Site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now a site for development of 203 new single-family homes, most with three bedrooms and two baths. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed as other homes built under the City’s program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom could not afford homeownership. It is believed that these new homes will sell rapidly.

The Balboa Reservoir site is one of the few sites large enough to accommodate a substantial number of new homes. Please do not let a few people stop a major opportunity for new housing. Vote no on Prop E.

Not only would Proposition E halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site, but the 9.8% fixed-rate, 30-year mortgage money set aside for the housing would also be lost.

Nothing constructive is accomplished by this measure—it does not provide additional land or facilities for City College. As a matter of fact, City College has neither plans nor money to use the property. Further, the Community College Board of Directors, the governing body for City College, has voted overwhelmingly to oppose the initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting "No on E.”

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the site of the unused Balboa Reservoir and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost.

These homes are desperately needed for San Franciscans who can’t afford to buy in the city where the average house is selling for over $160,000. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

The homes would be built on land that belongs to the City. Over two years ago, it was declared surplus and available for housing. It is not part of City College, and City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

We urge you to vote no on Proposition E if you want more affordable housing for San Franciscans.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Harry G. Brit

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

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

The 203 affordable owner occupied single family units slated for the southern portion of Balboa Reservoir are part of the 1988 total. Our progress in addressing the City’s housing shortage will be curtailed if this ill-advised initiative is approved. SUPPORT OWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Housing production is essential to check rising prices and to maintain our social, economic, and ethnic population diversity. AS A SAN FRANCISCO VOTER, YOU CAN BE PART OF OUR HOUSING PROGRESS BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

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

WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT THE CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY HOUSING BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

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

Proposition E would halt construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. We need more housing in San Francisco, not less. Please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.

Doris M. Ward, Member
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

A critical issue facing San Francisco today is the lack of housing middle class San Franciscans can afford.

That is why I have joined these neighborhood associations to support the Balboa Reservoir neighborhood housing proposal. Those participating in the development of the proposal includes:

O.M.I. Community Association
Dorado Terrace Association
Outer Mission-Ingleside
Political Action Committee
Greater Ingelside Community
Mount Davidson Manor
Ocean Avenue Merchants Association
Ingleside Terrace Association
The San Francisco Open Space Committee
City College of San Francisco

From early in 1985 I worked closely with these neighborhood groups in the discussions between city government and community leaders concerning the development plans for this desperately needed new housing at the unused Balboa reservoir site.

THESE ARE THE REASONS YOU SHOULD VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

1. The neighborhood housing proposal that this initiative seeks to stop is the result of months of hard work by the largest coalition of neighborhood associations ever to join together to plan a housing development in San Francisco.

2. The housing at the Balboa Reservoir site was designed with the involvement of the coalition of neighborhood associations to enhance the surrounding community.

3. The governing Board of the Community College District has made clear that they have no plans for the site and no ownership rights to it. City College does not oppose the construction of this development and opposes this initiative.

4. Self-proclaimed “Friends” of City College want to stop the proposal in order to preserve the site for future faculty parking. A clique of City College staff involved in a neighborhood association pose as community opposition to this development even though a representative from this organization, the Sunny-side Neighborhood Association, had helped plan and support the proposal.

5. By masquerading as concerned neighbors these self-appointed “friends” of City College hopes to prevent the construction of 204 critically needed units of housing and pull off one of the biggest land grabs in San Francisco’s history.

DON’T BE FOOLED. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Residence Element of the Comprehensive Plan of the City and County of San Francisco assesses the City’s housing needs and lays out specific steps to meet those needs. This document was adopted by the City Planning Commission in 1984 after extensive public review at neighborhood meetings and public hearings, and consideration of the detailed Environmental Impact Report.

The first objective of the Housing Element is “to provide new Housing for all income groups” in locations appropriate for residential development. To meet this goal, development of housing is to be aggressively pursued and encouraged on surplus, underused and vacant public land.

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

If you want more affordable housing in San Francisco, vote no on Proposition E.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Susan J. Bierman, City Planning Commissioner

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

Vote NO on E.
Proposition E deprives San Franciscans of one of their last real chances to become homeowners at an affordable price. At the South Balboa Reservoir we have City-owned land on which 203 units of three-bedroom, two-bath homes can be built at low prices which average San Franciscans can afford to pay. These homes need to be built now, not in three years. In three years the low interest rates on mortgages and the bond financing will be gone. Two hundred families will have lost the opportunity to become homeowners, and the City will have lost the opportunity to ease the tight market in rental housing.

Bill Maher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Balboa Reservoir site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now planned for development of 203 new single family homes. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed — other homes built under this program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom would not otherwise be able to afford home ownership.

San Francisco has the most expensive housing in the nation where last year the average home sold for over $160,000. Housing is difficult to produce because the obstacles are great—little land on which to build, high construction costs and uncertain interest rates.

John L. Molinari

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

In 1980, the voters of the City and County of San Francisco approved a measure making it City policy to add 20,000 new units of housing within five years. In 1984 in an effort to satisfy this objective, the Board of Supervisors adopted a policy encouraging the expansion of the City’s housing supply. Making surplus City-owned land, such as the site at Balboa Reservoir, available for affordable housing was an important part of that policy. A proposal to build 203 homes on the unused Balboa Reservoir site was advanced to help implement the pro-housing policy.

Approval of Proposition E would HALT construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.

The Balboa Reservoir homes would be built on land currently belonging to the City and County of San Francisco. The property IS NOT part of the City College, and City College has neither plans or money to buy the property and convert it for City College use.

Willie B. Kennedy

The only debatable issue is the future of affordable housing on the Balboa Reservoir site.
As we are all aware, San Francisco has the most expensive homes in the United States. The average cost of a home is $152,000. Not many can afford such prices. However, the housing proposed for the Balboa Reservoir will give many more citizens the opportunity to become homeowners. The homes to be built will be sold to first-time buyers at prices ranging from $83,000 to $145,000.

Other homes built in San Francisco under the direction of similar affordable housing programs have been snapped up quickly by San Franciscans. Without the program, most would not have been able to purchase the home and become homeowners.
Again, if you desire to preserve the construction of more affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site, vote “NO” on Proposition E.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

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

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

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

Stop these self-serving no-growth obstructionists! Please vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Prop E would halt affordable housing construction at the Balboa Reservoir site. Many gay people need affordable housing, too, and we join with other community groups urging you to vote NO on Prop E.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Robert Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E, if approved, would block the construction of 203 badly needed single-family homes on the south portion of the Balboa Reservoir in San Francisco. Sixty percent of these homes would be available for purchase by moderate and middle income families at purchase prices between $80,000 and $120,000. They would be constructed on surplus public land and financed by the sale of mortgage revenue bonds to enable the developer to sell the homes at below market prices.

A neighborhood group headed by two city college faculty members is responsible for placing Proposition E on the ballot. The group contends that the land which is intended to be used for the project should be made available instead to City College for the construction of new teaching facilities even though enrollment at City College is declining and the City College Board has voted 6 to 1 to oppose the initiative.

Like many other areas of the country, San Francisco suffers from a shortage of housing. Purchase prices here are among the highest in the nation. The use of surplus public lands and revenue bond financing provide a means for making single family homes available to a broad spectrum of families at affordable prices.

The Balboa Reservoir project is supported by the leaders of 8 neighborhood groups in the area surrounding the location of the proposed project and by a majority of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, as well as by Mayor Dianne Feinstein. We urge you to encourage the construction of this type of housing in San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition E.

San Francisco Board of Realtors
William L. Jansen, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

SAVE OUR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS!
BERNAL HEIGHTS SAYS, "VOTE NO ON PROP E!"

We are residents of Bernal Heights in San Francisco. We've worked hard to build affordable family and senior citizen homes in our neighborhood.

We need more affordable housing in our City to survive. The real issue in Prop E is affordable family housing—a "yes" vote prevents the construction of 203 family homes. That's crazy!

Join us in preserving what's best in our City.

Vote "no" on Prop E!

Sylvia M. Yee, Bernal Heights Community Foundation Board of Directors***
Frank Hutchins, BHCF Board*
Mary Lou Bertoletti, BHCF Board*
Lela Havenier, BHCF Board*
Elizabeth Egger, BHCF Board*
Sister Janet Simons, BHCF Board*
Stephen Antonaras, BHCF Board*
Lorenzo R. Dill, BHCF Board*
Barbara Bagot, BHCF Board*
Margaret C. Randolph, Northwest Bernal Block Club*
Maureen Lamb, NWBBC*
Tim Molinaro, BHCF Planning & Dev't Committee*
Buck Bagot, BHCF P & D Committee*
***Organization for identification purposes only.

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

San Francisco Needs Affordable Housing—
Vote No on Proposition E

Everyone agrees that San Francisco needs affordable housing. The questions are how and where that affordable housing can be built.

The Balboa Reservoir housing development, to be built on the site of a reservoir built thirty years ago and unused since that time, answers those important questions for more than 200 San Francisco first-time homebuying families by providing:

— 203 new affordable three-bedroom, single family homes
— 9.8% fixed-rate financing
— A mix of 30% low-income, 30% moderate-income and 40% market-rate first time buyers
— A convenient site that has been declared "surplus" by the City and "available for development of affordable housing"

The Balboa Reservoir housing development is a small but significant step in the effort to generate affordable housing in our City.

Thousands of San Franciscans from every community, neighborhood group and viewpoint agree that the Balboa Reservoir development is good for San Francisco. Virtually every elected official, including the Governing Board of City College also agree.

All these San Franciscans ask you to say "yes" to affordable housing and "NO" to Proposition E.

San Francisco Coalition for Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar, Executive Director

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The viable plan for affordable single family housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site is being threatened by Proposition E. If Proposition E passes, 203 single family homes will be lost to the citizenry of San Francisco at a time when they are greatly needed.

The facts about the proposed housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site argue strongly against Proposition E. All 203 homes will be for first time home buyers. One-third of the homes will be available to households earning $27,000. Another third of the homes will be available to households earning $36,000. Adequate parking will be provided within the development itself, thus answering any concerns that traffic in the area will be congested.

City College has no need or plan to use South Balboa Reservoir for its facilities. City College's priority is to develop its existing campus. South Balboa Reservoir should therefore be used for one of the City's greatest needs: increased and affordable housing which is available to lower and middle income families.

As homeowners who live in the vicinity of South Balboa Reservoir, we welcome its planned use for single family housing and feel it will become an integral and contributing part of the community. We therefore urge you to vote "NO" on Proposition E.

Submitted by:
Stephen Graham, Chairman of the Housing Sub-committee of the Citizen's Committee for Community Development
Roderick A. McLeod, Vice-Chairman of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing is a group of neighbors which consists of many of the renters of Westwood Park and Sunnyside neighborhoods as well as owners and renters of Ingleside which are the closest neighbors to the Balboa Reservoir along with some of the students and teachers of City College.

We strongly support the Balboa Reservoir for housing. We believe that the Balboa Reservoir is an ideal spot for housing.

- Our neighborhood wants homes in the South Balboa Reservoir.
  Vote No On Prop. E.

Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughney
Submitted by Patricia Vaughney

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

As Merchants as well as residents of Ocean Avenue, Greater Ingleside and San Francisco, we support the Development of the Balboa Reservoir as housing.

A Traffic Survey has stated that there will be minimal impact on the existing patterns of traffic by this development.

Additional City College Parking is being considered on another location off I-280 to keep the college congestion away from the neighborhood's streets.

City College has 44 more acres in which to expand and existing buildings at City College have viable means to expand.

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

Proposition E would stop construction on much-needed affordable, single-family housing at the long vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. This proposition would also block a major housing development that would bring jobs into an area of the city that has little industry or private business.

Sale prices for these units are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the San Francisco housing market, where the average home is selling for $160,000. Construction of these homes will help all young, first-time home buyers and will require only 5% down, instead of the 20% down payment on houses bought with conventional home mortgages.

This plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by nine nearby neighborhood organizations. If Proposition E is approved and this project is blocked, more young adults will purchase their first home in Vallejo or some other outlying area, further draining San Francisco of the young families that every growing community needs.

San Francisco residents will gain apprenticeships, jobs, contracts and subcontracts from this development.

This plan calls for 2 and 3 bedroom, family-sized houses, with space for another bedroom which can be finished when needed.

Each house will have 2½ parking spaces in front and would not cause parking problems in the area. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

City College of San Francisco has no plans to buy the property, has no money for institutional expansion, nor any mention of this land in any master plan. Some supporters of this proposition are motivated by racist notions and have said they fear that this development will become another "Geneva Towers." This type of thinking is similar to support for apartheid practiced in South Africa and must be defeated by progressive San Francisco voters. Property values will increase, instead of a decrease as a result of this project.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition E.

Larry Lipani Johnson-Redd — President, O.M.I. Pilgrim Community Center Inc.
Maria Campbell-Casey — Program Director, Bay Area Engineering Societies Committee for Manpower Training, Inc.
Clara Mills-Bradford — Program Director, O.M.I. Senior Center
John C. Jackson
Linda Rose-Gipson
Jon Still — Secretary, Young Adult Committee
Kenneth Butler

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote "No" on Proposition E.

Affordable Housing Alliance — Mitchell Omerberg, Director
Bay Area Urban League — Gregory Best, Field Representative
Bernal Heights Community Foundation — Andre Lennell Daye
Community Educational Services — Dorothy Chen, Executive Director
Japanese Community Youth Council St. Francis Square Apartments, Inc. —
Sandra Mayor-Jenkins, Secretary
Minority Contractors Association of Northern California — James Haagaban, Secretary, Board of Directors
National Community Congress — Dr. Eddie C. Welban
Parkmerced Residents Organization, Inc. — Ricardo A. Callejo, Esq.
Potrero Hill Neighborhood House — Erola Maxwell
San Francisco Bullding Trades Council — Stan Smith
San Francisco Housing & Tenants Council — Joseph Lacey
San Francisco Tenants Union — Jim Faye
Rev. Amos C. Brown — Local Pastor & Community Servant
Greg Day — Chairman, Citizens Committee on Community Development
Polly V. Marshall — Commissioner, San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
Regina A. Sneed
Jan Wachtel — San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Michael E. Willis, AIA — Fleming Corporation
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $428,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing productive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Greater Ingleside Political Club — Frank Noto, Treasurer
Housing Conservation and Development Corporation — Lonnie Lawson, Board of Directors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $428,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing productive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Bayview Baptist Minister Fellowship — Rev. N. B. Mills, President
Bread of Life Missionary Baptist Church — Rev. S. A. Bailey
Cosmopolitan Baptist Church — Rev. A. Bay Gentle
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Raymond M. Howard Sr.
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Carrie Nelson
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Cornelius O'Reilly
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Paul G. Theiss
Old St. Mary's Housing Committee — Charles Gale, Chairman
St. Peters Housing Committee — Tessa Rouvel
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: With certain exceptions, City officers, including elected officials and commission members, may represent clients before City boards and commissions other than their own, and be paid for their services. State legislators may represent clients before City boards and commissions, and be paid for their services. Any person may contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would prohibit City officers from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay. This proposition would prohibit State legislators from appearing before City boards, commissions and departments on behalf of clients for pay. City officers would be prohibited from discussing with these officers and legislators matters that the City is deciding. Proposition F would also prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit City officers and State legislators from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to allow City officers and State legislators to represent clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to allow any person to contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 77

How “F” Got on Ballot

On February 26 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for limitations on compensated advocacy and campaign contributions had qualified for the June ballot.

Quentin Kopp, Marth Gillham and Cheryl Arenson, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 9,400 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,986 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The purpose of Proposition F is to cut campaign contributions by large contributors (and thus reduce campaign spending) and eliminate undue influence by officeholders retained as paid lobbyists for projects requiring City approval.

Let's take a minute to analyze the untrue arguments against Proposition F.
- The opponents claim that Proposition F will force half the City's Commissioners to resign. In fact, Proposition F does not force any Commissioners to resign. It simply says they can't be a paid lobbyist and a City Commissioner at the same time. Does a commissioner value making money by lobbying more than public service?
- Some have also alleged that Proposition F will prevent duly-elected union leaders from serving as City Commissioners. No it won't. Proposition F prohibits "compensated advocacy"—that means lobbyists hired by an organization, not members of the organization itself. Proposition F does not apply to salaried employees of labor unions, corporations, or non-profit agencies. Moreover, Section 8.105 of the Charter precludes it specifically from applying to any member serving as a representative of any profession, trade, business, union or association on any board or commission which requires membership of representatives of specific professions, trades, businesses, unions or associations.
- Another untrue argument against Proposition F is that it prohibits City officials only from discussing pending issues with other City officers or State Legislators who are also acting as paid lobbyists in a matter and doesn't stop those officeholding lobbyists from writing City officials about their clients' objectives. That's not so. Proposition F applies to all such lobbying, written or oral. (The dictionary defines "discuss" as "to examine by means of speech or writing.")

End government decision-making by "insiders" and reduce the influence of money on local campaigns.

VOTE YES ON F.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
San Franciscans for Good Government

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

In all our years of observing San Francisco City government, we have found one maxim to be true time after time: a good idea gets copied, especially among politicians.

For no sooner did Quentin Kopp promise to bring Proposition F to the voters than did Mayor Feinstein come up with an informal, administrative version of her own. Fine, you say (and the Mayor says), then why vote Yes on Proposition F?

(1) The Mayor's remedy of asking City Commissioners who also act as lobbyists before City agencies to resign is nothing more than a hand slap, and is good only as long as she is mayor. It's not binding on future mayors and could be changed without any vote of the Board of Supervisors, let alone the people of San Francisco. Proposition F prohibits this kind of conflict-of-interest, and it will be the law, no matter who is mayor.

(2) The Mayor's action did nothing to state legislators who can also act as lobbyists before City Boards and Commissions, nor did her action stop the law or business partners of City Commissioners from picking up the slack in big-money lobbying. Proposition F will stop these practices in their tracks.

(3) What about the other half of Proposition F, which reduced the campaign contribution limit to $500 so that all San Franciscans can enjoy equal access to City officials, not just the ones with the big bucks? The Mayor can't do anything about this, and she hasn't. Only a Yes vote on Proposition F will reduce the weight of big money and ensure our full voice in City elections and City government.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. If it's important enough for the Mayor to copy part of it administratively, it's important enough to do the job right and make it a law.

John J. Barbogliata
Harry Alem
June Cahn
Dorothy Partridge

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The worst and most persistent problem in American politics is that politicians and political races can be "bought". Reducing the size of campaign contributions will be a step forward in reducing the role of money in elections. Vote yes for more honest government.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

RESTORE to the people their rightful and equal power as individual voters by reducing the monetary clout and influence of private interests who make the laws and the policies as City officials and Commissioners or State legislators.

TELL the special interests that their money and influence can no longer interfere with representative government.

TELL the special interests that the voters will no longer tolerate the influence-buying which comes with large campaign contributions.

TELL the special interests that this measure will encourage highly talented citizens to serve San Francisco honestly and responsibly.

VOTE YES ON F.

Cheryl Arenson
Anne Renfrew
David Facheco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

"Government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

These noble words from Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, cast in bronze at the entrance to City Hall, seem to have escaped the attention of some City officials who pass by them every day. For in San Francisco City government, Lincoln's simple formula for representative government would read quite differently: "Government of the powerful, by the lobbyists, and for the wealthy."

Government of, by, and for the privileged few is bad government. Government of, by, and for all the people is good government. It's as simple as that—as simple as Lincoln first put it.

Proposition F, the Good Government Initiative, will help San Franciscans maintain control of their government and will prevent undue influence by City officeholders.

To reduce undue influence, Proposition F outlaws the practice of City Commissioners and State Legislators representing special interests for pay before City Commissions and Boards. City Commissions should render their decisions deliberately and impartially, not be swayed by the political clout of the lobbyists appearing before them, or by any political favors those lobbyist/politicians might promise. "I'll scratch your back if you scratch my back" bargains do not belong in government. And until such backroom bargains are made illegal, City government will not belong to the rest of us either.

Proposition F also reduces the maximum amount that anyone can give to a local candidate from $1,000 to $500. If large contributors and other special interests can't give as much money, they can't buy as much influence with elected officials. And the lower the contribution limit, the less campaign spending and the more City government will be responsive to all San Franciscans.

You can "buy back" City government from the privileged and powerful with the most precious of all political commodities: your vote.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Mary Lohneis
Peter Fatool
Judith Thorson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F, an initiative of the people, is needed to protect the voters and the integrity of the legislative process from being corrupted by the power of money and influence. It prevents City officials and State Legislators from lobbying the City on behalf of high-powered special interests. It also lowers the campaign contribution limit from $1,000 to $500, thus reducing the influence of those same special interests over our elections and elected officials.

The bogus argument that the Mayor won't be able to find qualified people to serve on City commissions if Proposition F is adopted ignores the plain fact that there are 700,000 people in San Francisco, a pool of civic-minded citizens more than large enough to accommodate the 250 commission appointments available in our City government. For example, there are plenty of architects to fill the one architectural appointment on the Art Commission, just as there are plenty of non-lobbyist business people and lawyers available to serve on other commissions.

Thousands of San Franciscans, not just the "insiders", are ready, willing, and able to serve the public.

Proposition F deserves your vote. Restore integrity to City government. Restore the confidence of the citizens of San Francisco in that government. Let's have no more Wilkes Bashford situations.

VOTE YES ON F.

Oscar Satro
Martha Gilham
Marguerite Warren

Oscar Satro
Anne Renfrew
David Facheco

Mary Lohneis
Peter Fatool
Judith Thorson
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE "NO" ON F
This proposition disguises itself as "good government" but, in reality, would drive good people out of government. It is so crudely drawn—so sweeping in its implications—that it would bar from government almost anyone with even a remote business or community tie to government.

It would purge from City commissions anyone who "directly or indirectly" receives compensation from any "interests" with an issue before any City agency. Effectively, this could discriminate against employees from community and neighborhood groups, civil rights organizations, non-profit corporations, labor unions, merchant and business groups, as well as architects, lawyers and other professionals.

Actually, there currently are no commissioners who represent any clients before any City agency. All who are appointed in my administration sign a statement saying they will not advocate for any paying client before any official body of the City while they are commissioners. This proposition simply is not necessary.

Proposition F also would lower the limit for any individual campaign contribution from $1000 to $500. Although this sounds good, it would permit a wealthy person with various businesses and numerous family members to contribute many thousands of dollars through different sources. This would encourage "hidden" contributions. We must strive for disclosure of contributions, not a system which drives contributions underground. Candidates must be able to raise funds enough to put their message before the voters. Reducing the contribution limit can be a tactic to discourage persons from challenging incumbents.

Vote no on Proposition F.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F
Proposition F purports to achieve a noble objective: The removal of "influence peddling" from City Hall. In fact, Proposition F is so poorly-crafted, it may have exactly the opposite effect on City government. It is not a "good government" initiative. It is bad legislation.

Proposition F provides no definitions and no standards for the public to judge whether City officials comply with its restrictions. Its uncertainties will be chaotic and lead to endless, needless lawsuits.

A measure similar to Proposition F was rejected by the Board of Supervisors because no public hearings were ever held on the legislation. If the public had had a chance to comment on this initiative, it might not have the critical shortcomings, deficiencies and uncertainties that now warrant its rejection by responsible San Franciscans.

In the coming months, the Board will review good government measures that are comprehensible, effective and, most important, certain. Proposition F is a misguided disaster.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

This should properly have been titled the "SINK WILLIE BROWN ORDINANCE"! The "meat of the coconuts" is in Section 4.

Supervisor Kopp's intentions are good, however this sloppily drafted and incomprehensible measure succeeds in "burning down the barn" to eliminate a couple of rats!

Under this proposal, to avoid any potential INDIRECT conflict of interest, (which is undefined!), one would have to be a destitute, unemployed welfare recipient to qualify for service on any City Board or Commission! The Mayor has already solved this "hired advocacy" problem with the "conflict of interest" affidavits she demands IN ADVANCE from any prospective appointee.

Quentin's proposed $500.00 campaign contribution limit is an "inside joke" and he, of all people, knows it! It merely obliges a heavy contributor to have his wife, children, business associates, or friends send in SEPARATE $500.00 checks if he wants to contribute more than $500.00 to a politician's campaign.

These proposals require additional City employees for enforcement and wind up doing far more harm than good. Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr., President
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Union members and labor officials have legitimate reasons for meeting with City officers. It is unfair and wrong to lump them in the same category as special interest lobbyists, yet that's exactly what Proposition F does. Working people deserve representation on City boards and commissions. VOTE NO!

Hon. Amy Meyer  Hon. Susan Berman  Jeff Greendorfer
Hon. Walter Jebe  Hon. Bruce Lilienthal  Stan Smith
Hon. Doris Kahn  Hon. Yoshio Nakashima  Larry Griffin
Hon. Jean Korun  Hon. Thomas Horn  Steve Rubissa
Hon. Henry Berman  Hon. Robert McCarthy  Terrence Ryan
Hon. Richard Guggenheim  Hon. Toby Rosenblatt  Jack Beggs
Hon. Patrick McGrew  Hon. Jerry Berg  Tony Marovich
Hon. Melvin Lee  Hon. Bonnie Gibson  Donald Disler
Hon. Jerry Berg  Hon. Mary Noel Pippy  Anne Daley
Hon. Bonnie Gibson  Hon. Mark Buell  Linda Post
Hon. Terry Otto  Hon. Kevin Malone  Lynne Williams
John Stanger  Walter McGuire  Todd Dickinson
Tom Moore  Sharon Duval  Peter Hanson
Hon. Douglas Engemann  Hon. Eugene Friend  Herbert Karlan
Hon. Charlotte Berk  Hon. Phyllis Lyon  William Scovoris
Van Hart  Iris Flowers  Noam Rand
Noah Goldberger  John Schmidt
James Mack  Thomas Karpinski  Wendy Goldberg
Joseph Schwartz  Belle Lazarus  Antonio Barrios
Bruce Barrett  Charles Howell  Walter McGuire
Walter McGuire  Sharon Duval  Joyce Mauriello

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

If you want to ban business owners and executives from serving on City boards and commissions, then vote for Proposition F.

If you think board members of non-profit corporations and employees of community agencies have nothing to contribute to City government, then vote for Proposition F.

If you believe union members and labor officials should not have a voice at City Hall, then vote for Proposition F.

But if you share our belief that these individuals have legitimate concerns and expertise that is valuable in running major City departments, then join us in voting NO on Proposition F.

Proposition F is a simplistic, sloppily-drafted, meat-axe approach to a problem already resolved by Mayor Feinstein's ban on commissioners lobbying on behalf of private clients.

Proposition F is not a good government and it is not reform. Proposition F is bad legislation. VOTE NO.

Hon. Douglas Engemann  Hon. Eugene Friend
Hon. Charlotte Berk  Hon. Phyllis Lyon

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

We're sympathetic to the need for political reform. But it's a complicated problem, and Proposition F just isn't the way to go.

Frankly, we can't call who is and isn't affected by this measure. While a handful of people sometimes might abuse their positions, that's no reason to question the integrity of so many solid citizens who give tirelessly to public service. Proposition F is simply the wrong approach. Please join us in voting NO.

William E. McDonnell  Frances M. McAtee  Martin D. Murphy
N. A. Sapunar  Caroline and Michael Figoni  Eugene C. Payne III

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Concerned about elected officials spending $400,000 to run for supervisor and $1 million on a mayor's race? Then vote NO on Proposition F.

That's right. NO.

Proposition F isn't going to do anything about campaign spending. Prop F simply limits the size of contributions, reducing the current limit from $1,000 to $500. Supervisors can and will continue spending outrageous sums on their re-election campaigns. With Proposition F they'll just spend twice as much time raising money from twice as many sources, and that makes special interests even more powerful. They can always find ways around campaign limits.

We need campaign spending reform, but Proposition F doesn't provide it. Please join us in voting NO on F.

District 8 Democratic Club  Linda Chapman
Stephen L. Taylor  Dale Carlton
Ruth Gravani  James Firth
Alan Raznick  Debra Barnes
Mitoom Baassteln  Lew Serbin
Debra Stein
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

When campaign contributions are limited, political freedom suffers. Your right to free speech includes not only your right to express your views, but also your right to support as much as you want, any candidate who speaks for you.

Minority viewpoints depend heavily on the contribution of a few dedicated supporters to get your message out. To limit your financial support of your beliefs is to silence your political voice.

Only incumbents, who have many opportunities for free media exposure benefit from this assault on free speech. The dangers of a campaign contribution limit far outweigh any possible benefit from this proposition. Defeat Proposition F!

San Francisco Libertarian Party
Michael R. Fowler, Secretary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

You may think Prop F only applies to big-time lawyers and a few legislators who represent developers. Think again!

Prop F would prohibit many community leaders from public service. If it passes, board members and employees of community and charitable organizations could be banned from serving on City boards and commissions.

We appreciate the public need for a government free of “influencing peddling.” But restrictions on “compensated advocacy” ought to be clearly and carefully crafted to protect the voices of community leaders who argue on behalf of the public interest, not private special interests.

Vote No.

Hon. Juanita Del Carlo
Mission Hiring Hall

Bob Ross
Publisher, Bay Area Reporter

Hon. Jeffrey Ken Mori
Japanese Community Youth Council, Inc.
Bill O’Callahan
American Red Cross
Hon. George Sungin
Horizons Unlimited
Hon. Jean Rita Alviar
Mission Education Project
Hon. Greg Day
Pork Street Town Hall
Hon. Naomi Grey
Hon. James Foster
Carol Wong
Marlena Marselle
Lee Woods
Jo Daly
Dennis Collins
Hon. H. Welton Flynn
(Organizations listed only for purposes of identification.)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will have no effect on developers’ lawyers. None.

It won’t make any difference to state legislators either.

Don’t kid yourself. This is not “reform” and it isn’t “good government.” Proposition F will allow the special interests and influence peddlers to continue exercising influence over our elected officials. It has so many loopholes, lobbying will actively continue, untouched, in the back rooms of City Hall.

And developers will always find ways around campaign contribution limits. As Common Cause has noted, Prop F simply makes tracing their dollars more difficult for the public.

Real reform would directly attack the source of huge contributions—the developers and other special interests that employ the lobbyists to peddle their influence.

VOTE NO.

Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
David Looman
Michael Mason
Rich Waller
Susan Klugerman
Rene Cazenave
Murgie O’Driscoll
South Africa Boycott

PROPOSITION G

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?

YES 300

NO 301

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has adopted an ordinance prohibiting the City, with certain exceptions, from purchasing goods or services from companies doing business with South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a declaration of policy that says the City must try to avoid doing business with companies that significantly profit from or help maintain the Apartheid system in South Africa. It calls on other public bodies and private groups to adopt similar policies. It directs the Board of Supervisors to identify the companies which have the greatest ties to Apartheid so that the public can also boycott those companies.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to avoid doing business with companies that help maintain Apartheid, and you want a public boycott of those companies.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

“The proposed Declaration of Policy be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “G” Got on Ballot

On November 6, 1985 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for the City to boycott businesses with significant ties to South Africa had qualified for the June ballot.

Arlo Hale Smith, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,546 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on October 11.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,941 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:
It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This measure calls for a public boycott of companies that aid apartheid.
Any claim of "conflict" between Proposition G and existing anti-apartheid legislation is imaginary: It is the legislative intent of supporters of this measure that it can be construed as a directive for making existing law tougher.

Personal attacks have no legitimate place in a ballot measure campaign. As proponent of this measure, I repudiate all such tactics.
Vote NO on apartheid. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Arlo Hale Smith

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Boycotts are grassroots politics. They've helped the farmworkers, they've helped win integration, and they can help end the legal racism called "Apartheid".

A Gallup poll found 77% of South Africa's black majority favoring international economic boycotts to force the Apartheid regime to accept reform peacefully.

After the Boycott Initiative made the ballot, the San Francisco Supervisors unanimously passed a similar city purchasing policy. The issue that remains is whether to call on the general public to join in, boycotting companies identified by the Supervisors as the worst offenders in each industry.

The companies that would be targeted consider profits to be the "bottom line". Economic pressure is all they understand.

The AFL-CIO, NAACP, and NOW have called a boycott of Shell Oil because of its profiteering from South Africa's oppressive economic conditions. Proposition G supports that and would put the same pressure on other industries as well.

This proposition is supported by the elected county central committee of the Democratic Party, the Peace-and-Freedom Party and the Humanist Party, and by leading attorneys, such as Terry Francois, Terence Hallinan, Tony Serra, Lewis Hope Lee, Marc Van Der Hout, Abby Ginsberg and Terence Redmond.

If South Africa were a democracy, its majority would long ago have voted to end Apartheid. We need to vote Yes — because they can't.

Atty. Arlo Hale Smith, Democratic Party County Central Committee
Paul Kangas, Peace and Freedom Party
Lois Salisbury, Public Advocates*
Dr. Kevin Danaher, Food First*
Jesse James, Mission Rebels
Terry Collins, Community Activist
Stony Gerber, Election Action
Robert McCall, Hotel & Restaurant Employees
Executive Board Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Attorneys speak out against Apartheid:
South African police can arrest anyone without charge. They can hold you incomunicado — no contacts with family, lawyers or press.

They regularly censor news, books, music. They have banned Christmas caroling, funerals and other peaceful gatherings. Groups which criticize the government are forbidden to hold meetings.

Blacks are subject to legal segregation; their property and employment rights are greatly restricted; often, they are simply murdered.

As attorneys, we help people who have legal rights that are being violated. But what can we do for those who have no legal rights?

Boycotts and other economic sanctions are the only way to make the Apartheid government accept reform peacefully.

In the Court of World Public Opinion, Apartheid has been convicted of crimes against humanity. By imposing a sentence of economic isolation, we can end Apartheid.

Vote Yes — take a stand for justice.

Terence Hallinan
Arlo Hale Smith
Terry Francois
Karen Anderson/Ryer
Robert R. Bryan

Ann Menasche
Rachel Ginsburg
Leo Paoli
Gabriel Gesmer
Orn Prouchkovnick
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is a moderate, responsible but effective proposal to bring economic pressure on the South African government to establish constitutional rights for all of its citizens. Vote Yes.

Terence Faulkner, Republican
Mike Garza, Republican

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

All decent Americans abhor apartheid. However, boycotting U.S. investment in South Africa is counterproductive; it only penalizes the actual victims of apartheid.

U.S. international firms have acted as progressive agents for change through the Sullivan principles. Their investments have improved the social and economic condition of the labor force. It is improper to penalize their positive contributions.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

We are individuals and organizations working actively to end the racist system of apartheid in South Africa. And we are voting NO on Proposition G.

Why?

(1) Because Proposition G will weaken San Francisco's present divestment law. This law requires companies doing business with the city to sign affidavits that they will make no new contracts with South Africa.

Proposition G has no such provision.

(2) Proposition G provides no mechanism or funding to carry out its declared purpose of "boycotting" South Africa.

Proposition G will not stop South African products from entering the Port of San Francisco.

Vote against this useless, confusing, and deceptive initiative.

Preserve the stronger divestment law San Francisco already has. Vote NO on Proposition G!

Yvonne Golden
Geraldine Johnson
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
AFT 2121 Anti-Apartheid Committee
Arts Against Apartheid
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Coalition of Conscience
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club Executive Committee
ILWU 10 and SEIU 250 Southern Africa Liberation Support Committees
National Conference of Black Lawyers
San Francisco Anti-Apartheid Committee
Southern Africa Freedom Committee/All Peoples Congress

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1983 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!
AIDS Research

PROPOSITION H

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Several city and private agencies conduct various programs related to AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a declaration of policy that says San Francisco should support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council, consisting of a Committee on Education and a Fund-Raising Committee. The Research Committee would make recommendations on the most useful AIDS research projects and try to prevent duplication of efforts. The Education Committee would inform the public about the latest research and about ways to prevent AIDS. The Fund-Raising Committee would seek donations and grants for AIDS research and education projects.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

“The proposed Declaration of Policy for an AIDS research and education council and the formation of advisory committees of civic leaders would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, additional expenditure of public funds for AIDS research may result, the amount of which cannot be determined.”

How “H” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for AIDS research had qualified for the June ballot.

Stony Gebert, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 10,540 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on December 6, 1985.

A check of each signature on the petition showed that 7,564 of the signatures were valid. This is more than 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We need a council to expose and address major AIDS issues without the impasse of present medical/political bias.

As taxpayers, we are subsidizing a treadmill of continual AIDS casualties. There are major oversights where AIDS is concerned. Only recently was it learned that CDC statistics suggest 79% of early AIDS cases appear drug-related. We hear AIDS is 100% fatal. Perhaps that is because death may also be drug-related in the way of immuno-suppressive antibiotic and radiation overloads to already compromised immunity systems. Prevailing medicine is both tunnel-visioned and high-profit motivated. Also well-funded. This solution may be part of the problem. Some physicians are beginning to feel where AIDS is concerned many current practices are ethically, medically bankrupt.

Remissions occur. Largely through immunity-enhancing, holistic medicine. Significantly, only 1% of AIDS cases occur among people at risk in the Asian community. Perhaps this is due to less drug abuse or use of an unfunded, ignored resource: herbology as part of diet. More options: homeopathy, acupuncture, etc.

If, as anticipated, upwards of 40% of those testing positive come down with AIDS, we may become overburdened. To ignore all of the above becomes part of the problem. Vote Yes on Proposition H.

Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Rich McKirkeby, Former Orderly,
Marketing Associate, Pacific Bell
Joseph P. Clady, AIDS Hospice, Shanti Counselor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There is great need for research and education about AIDS and related conditions.

We need to attack the disease, not its victims.

Knowledge is the only vaccine available today.

Vote Yes.

John Lorenzini, President,
People With AIDS Alliance
Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Jan Beck, Steven Russell, Eugene Ewins, ARC/AIDS Vigil

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There are many possible treatments for AIDS and related conditions which are not being examined by the federal government, especially therapies based on natural substances and processes.

Vote Yes for an AIDS Research Council open to all viewpoints.

Scott Gregory, M.D.
Paul Kangas

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

A tape recording (Talking Book) of the San Francisco Voter Information pamphlet is available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

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

Name________________________________________

Address________________________________________ Amt. #______

Telephone No. (required)________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any)________________________

Signature________________________________________
PROPOSITION I
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway? YES 307 NO 308

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the Freeway with a surface roadway.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City’s policy to remain as it is, and you want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to change the City’s policy, and you do not want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a policy statement asking whether or not the Embarcadero Freeway should be torn down.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway demolished, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by at least $10.2 million in local funds. Potential private sector financing and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “I” Got on Ballot

On March 3 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy placing the question of demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway before the voters had qualified for the June ballot.

Richard Hongisto, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 11,119 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,720 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

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

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land now under the Broadway ramps is put back on the tax rolls, with low-rise buildings limited by restrictive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when united with Proposition J, recognizes three facts:
1) The Embarcadero Freeway is what is left of a never-completed elevated freeway that would have ringed the City through North Beach and Marina neighborhoods to the Golden Gate Bridge.
2) Today this massive freeway, which separates us from our waterfront, would never be built.
3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.
4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman’s Wharf will be preserved.
5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked for this new system.
6) Only that portion of the Embarcadero Freeway east and north of the Main and Beale Street ramps — basically the portion directly on the waterfront — will be removed to make way for the new system. The removal cost, approximately $10 million to be paid for with privately-generated new revenues, is a relatively small part of the overall new system.

As for Proposition I, vote “YES, let’s tear down the Embarcadero Freeway.” Then turn to Proposition J and support the plan for a beautiful waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Removing the Embarcadero Freeway will allow San Francisco to:

• Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero.

• Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway.

• Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula.

• Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero.

• Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.

• Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won’t benefit San Francisco. Don’t let outsiders determine our future. Vote YES on I.

Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Jack Whaley
Roger Bayer
A. Lee Knight
Robert Bradford
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Donald A. Crosby, AIA
Rai Y. Okamoto
Robert Meyers
Ralph Hurnado
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Douglas G. Wright
Anita Sanchez
Chuck Forester
Fritz Arko
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Delhart, AIA, AICP
Bonne B. Jones
Randall Rossi
Karl Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsed
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
Jon Twitchell
Jane Winslow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK — VOTE YES ON I

This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY — VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds — without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city’s fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.

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

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT—VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to 15.7 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown,

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

MAIL COMPLETED FORM TO:
Registrar of Voters
Room 155 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

PLEASE PRINT REGISTERED NAME:

FIRST NAME ___________ MIDDLE NAME ___________ LAST NAME ___________
RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX NUMBER)

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

X

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT (DO NOT PRINT) DATE (AREA CODE) DAYTIME TELEPHONE

I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.

(AREA CODE) RESIDENCE TELEPHONE

THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT PROPER SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

STREET OR BOX

CITY ___________ STATE ___________ ZIP ___________

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Prec. No. _______________________
A.V. Prec. No. _______________________
Ballot Type/Party _______________________
Affidavit No. _______________________
Signature and Registration Verified as Correct:

Date ___________ Deputy Registrar ___________

DATE OF BIRTH ___________

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled. Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land now under the Broadway ramps is put back on the tax rolls, with low-rise buildings limited by restrictive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when these facts:

1) The Embarcadero completed elevated free through North Beach and Gate Bridge.
2) Today this massive

FROM:

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION? (¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON I

This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront. MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY—VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds—without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city’s fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT — VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree — it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

---

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to $22.9 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown, Fisherman's Wharf and the financial district would be reduced.

Travel within the city would be slowed down at all hours. Vote no to the destruction of the freeway.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
- Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
- Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
- If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that — By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.

— Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
— MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 63% increase in person hours of travel.
— Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Judith Tornese

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Nostalgic individuals must realize that the times have changed! We can't bring the Bay back up to Montgomery Street! On behalf of San Francisco's overburdened taxpayers, we urge a NO vote!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled. Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

— LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

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

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a policy statement that says that the City would replace the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt a policy statement which says that the Embarcadero Freeway would be torn down if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt a policy statement to replace the Embarcadero Freeway under these conditions.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway replaced with a tree-lined six lane boulevard and other traffic and transit improvements, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by approximately $27.5 million. This includes a one-time freeway demolition cost of $10.2 million plus $17.3 million required to match potential federally-funded transit improvements. Potential financing by the State and private sector and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “J” Got on Ballot

On March 5 a declaration of policy regarding the future of the Embarcadero Freeway was delivered to the Registrar from the Mayor and several supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows the Mayor or four or more supervisors to submit a declaration of policy to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

In addition to Mayor Feinstein, the March 5 document was signed by Supervisors Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker, Molinari, Kennedy and Nelder.

POLLS ARE OPEN
FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J
San Franciscans now have a chance to remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with an at-grade, six-lane parkway, which will open our waterfront and restore views blocked for years by this large freeway.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for traffic and transit improvements:
• New, shorter freeway ramps connecting directly with The Embarcadero;
• A tree-lined, at-grade, 6-lane Embarcadero Boulevard, with a new waterfront Muni line, a jogging and bicycle path from Fisherman's Wharf to Mission Bay;
• Extension of Muni Metro south to the Caltrain station at 4th and Townsend;
• New ramps connecting I-280 with The Embarcadero;
• Changes in traffic flow and improvements to existing freeway ramps.

Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf will be preserved and enhanced.

The Board of Supervisors has specified that the Embarcadero Freeway will be torn down only if preliminary engineering during the next two years confirms— as traffic and environmental studies already have—that removal of the freeway will not result in more problems than it solves.

San Francisco became eligible for $88 million in federal highway funds for this new system when the Supervisors approved the plan in 1980. The $10.2 million cost of freeway demolition itself can be paid from revenues from low-rise development of the parcels now under the Broadway ramps and the increased values of nearby properties. Strict waterfront zoning limits the size of any development.

Traffic and environmental studies by the California Department of Transportation since 1980 clearly indicate that the new waterfront transportation system will be vastly superior to the existing situation, and that traffic congestion levels will not be notably different with the elevated structure removed.

Vote Yes on J and let's remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with a parkway and transit system—once again let us see our waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J gives the voters a chance to be heard on an important and timely issue. This issue is the replacement of a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway as one element of a comprehensive package of transportation improvements in the Waterfront area.

Last fall, the Board of Supervisors adopted for further study a set of traffic and transit improvements for the Waterfront. These improvements include:
• a new landscaped surface-level boulevard
• replacement of the Clay/Washington and Broadway on and off ramps with new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom
• removal of the unused stub of I-280 and construction of new ramps connecting the new waterfront boulevard to Route I-280
• a new light rail transit line linking Fort Mason with the Caltrain Depot
• extension of the Muni Metro to the train depot, improving the Peninsula Commute Service

A YES vote on Proposition J does not allocate funds for these projects. It does allow for further design and engineering studies, including cost analysis, assessment of impacts on traffic, and other matters. The studies will then be presented to the Supervisors so that they can make an informed decision on the plan. If the studies prove positive, San Francisco will be able to transform its Waterfront for the benefit of all.

Proposition J will insure that the City will not proceed with the removal of any of the Freeway until all the studies are completed and all potential consequences are assessed. This is the responsible approach. Vote YES on J.

SPUR
League of Women Voters
Embarcadero Citizens Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SAN FRANCISCO'S NEIGHBORHOODS ASK YOU TO VOTE YES ON J.
REDUCE TRAFFIC CONGESTION—YES ON J!
Traffic backed up by the Embarcadero Roadway slows travel and creates congestion in North Beach and other nearby neighborhoods. J will speed traffic flow.

IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION—YES ON J!

Proposition J will provide regular streetcar service along the Embarcadero and extend Muni Metro service to the south, ultimately extending to Bayview-Hunters Point.

PROMOTE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY—YES ON J!
If Proposition J does not pass, San Francisco could lose $88 million in federal funds for traffic improvements.

(continued)
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RESTORE THE WATERFRONT—YES ON J!
San Francisco's waterfront could become a focal point for the city, graced by a grand promenade, instead of the dismal, deteriorating eyesore it is now.
San Francisco's neighborhoods join together to ask your support for an improved Embarcadero. We guarantee the freeway will not be removed unless it is replaced by facilities that will assure a smoother, more efficient traffic flow. YES ON J!
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Robert Bradford
Ruth Greaves
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Anita Sanchez
Nancy Katz
Robert Katz
Beverly Mills
North Beach Neighbors
John Behanna
Herbert D. Kosovitz
Jerry Hurtado
Gregory E. Jones
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors
Dale A. Carters
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Ralph Hurtado
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Chuck Forester
David M. Harley
Donald P. Black
Mrs. Bland Platt
Richard Reinhart
James W. Haas
James Ream
Jill M. Jones
Peter J. Locke
Marjorie G. Stirn
John B. Lowry
Lawrence Ferringhetti
Nancy Peters
Steven Tabor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SUPPORT PUBLIC TRANSIT— VOTE YES ON J.
SAVE SAN FRANCISCO FROM GRIDLOCK— VOTE YES ON J.
The revitalization of the Northeast Waterfront...as included in San Francisco's Master Plan and transit plans, as overwhelmingly approved by the Board of Supervisors and as urged by Mayor Feinstein...will allow almost $90 million in unused federal highway funds to be used for vital downtown and waterfront transit and street improvements which will be a key to reducing needless auto congestion in San Francisco.

PROPOSITION J SUPPORTS IMPORTANT TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS TO THE NORTHERN WATERFRONT. It will:
—extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific/CalTrain depot
—create a new rail line (possibly using historic streetcars) to connect the entire waterfront from Mission Bay to the Ferry Building to Fisherman's Wharf and Fort Mason
—set the stage for a possible streetcar line along Third Street
Since the city of San Francisco adopted the Transit First policy in the early 1970's, transit investments in the Muni Metro, in new electric trolley an articulated bus service, and in BART and Golden Gate Transit, have saved downtown San Francisco from gridlock!

IF you are concerned about the future of transit in San Francisco, IF you are concerned about reducing needless auto congestion, THEN we urge you to join Mayor Feinstein and the majority of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in voting Yes on Proposition J.

Norman Rolfe
San Francisco Muni Coalition
California Transit League
Jack Wholey
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Regina Sneed
Tony Kilroy
Hon. Jack Morrison
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Bay Area Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Hon. Amy Meyer, Recreation and Park Commissioner
Alan Lubliner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A SOUND BUSINESS PROPOSITION—YES ON J!
Common sense and good business demand we make the most of our resources. San Francisco's waterfront is an economic and civic asset unrivaled anywhere—yet much of it is cut off by an ugly, noisy, elevated roadway. The traffic improvements called for by Proposition J will benefit workers, tourists, property owners, neighborhoods, and business.

—Traffic flow and transit will move quickly on a realigned, reorganized Embarcadero Roadway, allowing easier, more pleasant access to waterfront businesses.

—An improved and beautified Embarcadero will create new commercial opportunities and increase the value of existing property and businesses.

—New jobs and an expanded tax base will generate increased revenue for the city as several lots now covered by freeway ramps return to productive private ownership. Though limited to low rise development (40 to 65 feet), tax revenues from development will more than make up the city's share of the project.

Robert Meyers
Dennis J. Potts
Kenneth R. Lerch
M. Arthur Gensler, Jr., FAIA
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones
Randall Boasi
Karl A. Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Bark
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
Jon Twichell
Fritz Arko
Michael J. O'Shea

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J OFFERS RESIDENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO A ONCE IN A LIFETIME OPPORTUNITY TO RECAPTURE THEIR WATERFRONT.

Converting the Embarcadero into a tree-lined boulevard and building a new streetcar line will make the waterfront more pedestrian and transit oriented, that is, more people oriented.

A freeway structure that is a source of objectionable noise and casts a pall over a large part of the waterfront will be removed. The waterfront will be opened up to sunlight and fresh air and made more inviting and cheerful to those who wish to walk on one of the world's outstanding waterfronts. Air pollution that is now retained by the existing elevated structure will be dissipated.

The transit orientation of the new waterfront will encourage energy conservation. Proposition J will:

—Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero
—Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway
—Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula

—Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero
—Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line
—Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won't benefit San Francisco. Don't let outsiders determine our future.

VOTE YES ON J FOR A BETTER SAN FRANCISCO.

Sierra Club
Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage
Willinda McCrea*
Bob Cramer*
Rebecca Evans*
Richard Livingston*
Marilyn Clemens*
Jennie Lev*
Jeffrey Henne*
Jane Winslow*
Roger Boyer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J GIVES US A CHANCE TO CORRECT A COLOSSAL MISTAKE!

The Embarcadero Freeway should never have been built. The original plan was to build a freeway from bridge to bridge, destroying the Northern Waterfront, Fisherman's Wharf, Fort Mason, and Marina Green in the process. When the people of San Francisco saw what was happening, they stopped it in mid-air — literally.

Walk under it. Hear the noise. Feel the gloom. See how it cuts out light.

It's time to remove this mistake.

The new waterfront plan will give us a tree-lined boulevard, a new streetcar line, and a Muni Metro extension to the Southern Pacific/Caltrain depot. It will give us a transit and pedestrian oriented waterfront that will give us pride and pleasure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J!

San Francisco Tomorrow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, with a membership of 1700 working architects in San Francisco, urges a "YES" vote on Proposition J. In 1968 the citizens of San Francisco stopped highway planners from ringing our waterfront with freeways. Today voters have another opportunity to return the waterfront to our citizens. Removal of the Embarcadero Freeway is one part of a carefully researched transit plan for San Francisco. This proposition supplies an unique opportunity to carry out a broad range of transportation improvements that will have many positive effects on the City of San Francisco.

Removal of the freeway will:

1. Return the waterfront to the people by removing this barrier to access and view.
2. Facilitate needed MUNI improvements.
3. Encourage development of the Embarcadero as a grand civic boulevard unifying the City of San Francisco.

The members of the American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, urge you to vote "YES" on Proposition J and "YES" on Proposition J.

Donald Kennedy, FAIA
President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans love their City, the ambiance, the Bay, waterfront, the views, the healthy neighborhoods.

Freeway builders did their damnest to destroy the City and divide our neighborhoods.

Now we can remove that damned spot, the concrete dinosaur, the hideous barrier that destroys our scenic views, the fence that keeps us from the Bay, the conceiver of the Ferry Building.

Correct a mistake.

VOTE YES ON J.

Miriam Blaustein
Charlene Clark
Marie Cletsby
Zack Cowan
Dick Grosholl
Rick Hauptman

Tony Kilroy
Jean Kortum
Ira Kurlander
Jack Morrison
Andy Nash
Norman Rolfe

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

NO ON PROPOSITION J.

"J" is for JOKE—a cruel joke on us. What will J really do?

Add traffic to every street east of Gough. Delay the construction of waterfront streetcar service. Cost millions in local dollars needed to improve MUNI. Create a ground-level freeway on the waterfront as big as Van Ness, with more cars.

I'm a private citizen who's concerned about traffic and what it's doing to our City. If you are too, vote NO on Proposition J.

Steve Colman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:

• Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.

• Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.

• If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that

— By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 37 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.

— Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.

— MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.

— Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Blair C. Pascoe

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

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

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

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.

2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.

3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.

4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.

5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.

6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION A

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by boldface type; deletions are indicated by horizontal strikethrough.

3.202 Office of Risk Management

There is established under the chief administrative officer an office of risk management which shall review, analyze and report to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the finance committee of the board of supervisors the practices of the several departments, boards and commissions of the city and county regarding loss prevention and risk management, including the insurance requirements of the city and county. The office shall also establish and assist in the implementation of planning and operational guidelines regarding risk management and loss prevention for each department, board or commission. The chief administrative officer may appoint, at his or her pleasure, or contract with, a qualified individual or organization for the operation of the office. The qualifications of the individual or organization operating the office shall include relevant education, training and experience in insurance and risk management.

3.401 City Attorney

(a) The city attorney shall be an elective officer. He shall furnish an official bond in the sum of ten thousand dollars ($10,000). He shall appoint, and at his pleasure may remove, all assistants and employees of his office. He shall devote his entire time and attention to the duties of his office. He must, at the time of his election, be an elector of the city and county, qualified to practice in all the courts of the state, and he must have been so qualified for at least 10 years next preceding his election.

The city attorney must represent the city and county in all actions and proceedings in which it may be legally interested, or, for against the city and county, or, any officer of the city and county in any action or proceeding, when directed so to do by the supervisors, except where a cause of action exists in favor of the city and county against said officer. Whenever any cause of action exists in favor of the city and county, the city attorney shall commence the same when within his knowledge or when directed so to do by the supervisors. He shall give his advice or opinion in writing to any officer, board or commission of the city and county when requested. Except as otherwise provided in this charter, he shall not settle or dismiss any litigation for or against the city and county, unless, upon his written recommendation, he is ordered so to do by ordinance.

The city attorney shall prepare, or approve as to form, all ordinances before they are enacted by the supervisors. He shall approve, by endorsement in writing, the form of all official or other bonds required by this charter or by ordinance before the same are submitted to the proper commission, board or office for final approval, and no such bonds shall be finally approved without such approval as to form by the city attorney. Except as otherwise provided in this charter, he shall prepare in writing the draft or form of all contracts before the same are executed on behalf of the city and county. He shall examine and approve the title of all real property to be acquired by the city and county.

He shall keep on file in his office copies of all written communications and opinions, also all papers, briefs and transcripts used in matters wherein he appears; and books of record and registers of all actions or proceedings in his charge in which the city and county or any officer or board thereof, is a party or is interested.

(b) The duties of the city attorney in connection with the bureau of delinquent revenue collection shall be transferred to and performed by the attorney for said bureau who shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

(c) There is established in the office of the city attorney a bureau of claims investigation and administration which shall have the responsibility of investigating, evaluating and processing for the several boards, commissions and departments all claims for money or damages made upon the city and county pursuant to section 7.03 of this charter or the general law of the State of California. Claim investigation functions of the police department in existence on June 4, 1986, shall continue as an adjunct to the bureau established under this section. Claims functions of the public utilities commission shall remain under that commission unless transferred to the bureau of claims investigation and administration by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the bureau shall also have the power to investigate events and occurrences giving rise to potential civil liability against the city and county and adjust and settle demands, within dollar limits to be established by ordinance, prior to their presentment as claims. There shall be established by ordinance a revolving fund to satisfy such demands adjusted as provided in this subsection as claims. The bureau shall be responsible for the investigation of all claims and the analysis of civil policies and practices upon which the bureau shall report and advise the several departments.

The city attorney shall appoint a chief of the bureau who shall serve at his or her pleasure. The chief of the bureau may appoint, subject to confirmation by the city attorney, investigators who shall serve at the pleasure of the chief, provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of civil claims investigator or any equivalent classification on the date of approval of this amendment by the electorate shall continue to have civil service status to said position under the civil service provisions of this charter.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by boldface type; deletions are indicated by horizontal strikethrough.

7.100 Materials, Supplies and Equipment

The purchase of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreements for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract. All purchases in excess of one thousand dollars ($1,000) shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases and a permanent record of all such quotations shall be kept. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) to fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) for materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) to fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of materials, supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two or more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning equipment by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requested and may advertise for
bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departmental departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall direct the rejection of all articles which may be below standards, specifications or samples furnished. He shall not approve any bill or voucher for articles not in conformity with specifications, or which are at variance with any contract.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall also have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental equipment and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for and in use in all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.

7.103 Requisition, Contract and Payment

All purchase orders and contracts shall be based on written requisitions, or, for materials, or supplies in common use, in the various departments, on the purchaser's records of average use by all departments. Purchase orders and contracts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), must be approved by the chief administrative officer. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall approve all bids and vouchers for materials, supplies, equipment, and contractual services before the controller shall draw and approve warrants therefor. All contracts for the purchase of materials, supplies and equipment shall be made after inspection of sealed bids by publication. All sealed bids received shall be kept on file. When an award of contract is made, notice that the same has been made shall be given by one publication, and any interested person may examine the bids and records at the purchaser's office.

The purchaser of supplies shall be authorized to order and regulate supplies approved by the chief administrative officer and the controller, designate and authorize appropriate personnel within the purchasing department to exercise the purchaser's signature powers for purchase orders and contracts approved as provided in this charter.

7.200 Public Works and Purchasing Contracts

The construction, design, or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements, and the purchasing of supplies, materials and equipment, when the expenditure involved in each case shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), shall be done by contract, except as otherwise provided by this section. In the event of a misnomer or a split or divide any public work or improvement or purchase into two or more units for the purpose of evading the contract provisions of this section. In an emergency, provided an actual emergency is declared by the board of supervisors to exist, and when authorized by resolution of said board, any public work or improvement may be executed in the most expedient manner. Notwithstanding any other provision in this section or this charter continued, upon the approval of the chief administrative officer declaring the work to be emergency in character, there may be expended by the department of public works the sum not to exceed five hundred dollars ($500) for new construction of any type in or upon an improvement.

Any public work or improvement estimated to cost less than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), may be performed under contract or written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county. Any public work or improvement executed by the city, other than routine repair work, shall be authorized by the chief administrative officer when the cost exceeds fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or by the heads of departments not under the chief administrative officer, only after detailed estimates have been prepared and submitted by the head of the department concerned.

There shall be separate accounting for each repair or improvement as done, which accounting shall include all direct, indirect and supervisory elements of cost chargeable to such work or improvement, and each cost accounting shall be reported to the chief administrative officer, or to the mayor when such work shall have been performed by departments not under the chief administrative officer. All such accounts shall be reported by the controller. Any public work or improvement costing less than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) and not performed by the use of city and county labor, materials, and supplies shall, if not performed under contract, be covered by written order or agreement which shall be based on not less than three bids, notice of which shall be given by three days' posting. Records of such bids shall be kept by the department.

When the expenditure for any public work or improvement shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), the same shall be done by contract, except as otherwise provided in this charter. The head of the department in charge of or responsible for the work for which a contract is to be let, or the purchaser of supplies in the case of purchases of materials, supplies and equipment, shall let such contract to the lowest and most reliable and responsible bidder not less than ten days after advertising by one publication for sealed proposals for the work, improvements or purchase contemplated. Each such advertisement shall contain the reservation of the right to reject any and all bids. The officer responsible for the awarding of any such contract shall require from all bidders information concerning their experience and financial qualifications, as provided by general law relative to such investigations authorized by department of public works.

The purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer for bids in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or the department head concerned, with the approval of the board or commission to which he is responsible, may reject any and all bids and readvertise for bids.

The department head or the purchaser of supplies, as the case may be, shall have power to sign such contract for the estimated expenditures thereunder not in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000). Any contract involving the expenditure of more than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), requires the joint approval of the purchasing officer and the chief administrative officer. If such contract is for any public work or improvement, it shall require the joint approval of the department head and the chief administrative officer for amounts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), relative to departments under his jurisdiction, or the signature of the department head and the approval by resolution of the board or commission concerned for departments under the chief administrative officer.

The board of supervisors, by ordinance, shall establish the procedure whereby appropriate city and county departments may file sealed bids for the execution of any work to be performed under contract. If such bid is the lowest, the contract shall be awarded to the department. Accurate units costs shall be kept of all direct and indirect charges incurred by the department under any such contract, which unit costs shall be reported to and audited by the controller monthly and on the completion of the work.

In any case where the lowest gross price or unit cost bid is not accepted, and a contract is entered into with another bidder, written report shall be made to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the controller, by the officer authorized to execute the contract, with the reasons for failure to accept such lowest bid.

If any provision of this section is in conflict with any provision of section 7.100 of the charter, the provision contained in section 7.100 shall govern and control.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.

7.200 Public Works Contract Procedure by Ordinance

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter and, in particular, the provisions of section 7.200, the board of supervisors shall by ordinance determine the monetary limits not to exceed fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), within which the construction, repair or improvement of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements may be done by contract or by written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county, consistent, save as to monetary limits, with the manner provided for in section 7.200 and section 7.100.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.
point two commissioners to terms of one year each, one commissioner to a term of two years, one commissioner to a term of three years and one commissioner to a term of four years. The terms of the commissioners shall be for four years from the commencement thereof. Not less than more than one four members of said commission shall be of the same sex, and one member shall have prior experience representing labor and one member shall have prior experience representing management. The person or persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of one hundred dollars ($100).

Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of considering and adopting examination questions shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission, after the regular daily working hours of 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Such person or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

In accordance with section 3.500, the commission shall have the power and it shall be its duty to appoint an executive assistant to be the administrative head of the affairs under its control who shall serve at its pleasure; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of assistant secretary to the civil service commission on the effective date of this section as announced and shall continue to have civil service status in the position of executive assistant under the civil service provisions of this charter.

3.661 General Powers and Duties
(a) The civil service commission shall have the employment and personnel department of the city and county and shall determine appointments on the basis of merit and fitness, as shown by appropriate tests. The commission shall classify, and from time to time, may reclassify, in accordance with duties and responsibilities of the employment, and training and experience required, all places of employment in the departments and offices of the city and county not specifically exempted by this charter from the civil service provisions thereof, or which may be created hereafter by general law and not specifically exempted from said civil service provisions. The commission shall likewise classify all other positions or other places of employment in the city and county, service specifically exempted from the civil service provisions of this charter, but which, by the provisions of Section 4.401, thereof, are made subject to classification for salary standardization purposes on the basis of duties and responsibilities of the employment and training and experience required. The civil service commission shall be the judge of such classification.

(b) The civil service commission shall be the judge of such classification.

(c) The civil service commission may hear appeals from an action of the personnel director with respect to:
1. Allegations of discrimination. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the civil service commission regarding allegations of discrimination shall forthwith be enforced by every officer and employee;
2. Allegations of fraud; and
3. Allegations of conflict of interest, pursuant to Section 8.105.
(d) No action by the personnel director which is the subject of any appeal shall be stayed during the appeal process except by the unanimous vote of the civil service commission.
(e) The commission shall be notified of the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal of personnel regulations and may comment on such proposals. The adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing fraud or allegations of discrimination shall be subject to ratification by the commission. In addition, the adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfers, resignations and terminations shall be subject to ratification by the commission. The commission shall ratify or reject any such regulation within 60 days of receipt. The commission's failure to act shall be deemed approval.

3.662 Department of Personnel Administration
There is hereby established a department of personnel administration which shall consist of a personnel director and such other personnel as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the civil service commission and whose job function is placed under the department of personnel administration shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job function had not, by amendment to this charter, been placed under the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration.

The department of personnel administration shall be the personnel department for the city and county and shall provide a means to recruit, select, certify, appoint, train, evaluate, promote career development, classify, classify, administer employee discipline, discharge and other related personnel activities in order to maintain an effective and responsive work force.

3.663 Personnel Director
(a) A personnel director shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the mayor; provided, however, that the personnel director shall be selected from candidates nominated by any civil service commissioner and confirmed by vote of the board of supervisors. The nominee of the mayor may be appointed acting personnel director pending confirmation. The person so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of personnel director in the spirit of this declaration."

(b) The personnel director shall conduct appropriate examinations for employment, establish eligible lists based on their results and provide for certification of eligibles. The action of the personnel director on examination matters including,
but not limited to, announcements, minimum qualifications, classes of applicants, components, construction, weighting, content, type, list length, duration and certification shall be final.

(c) The personnel director shall adopt personnel regulations which, except as otherwise provided in this charter, shall provide with the administrative machinery within the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration and the exercise of the authority granted in this section, including, but not limited to, recruitment; applications; examinations; eligibilities; duration of eligible lists; certification of eligibles; permanent, temporary and provisional appointments; regular performance evaluations; temporary transfers; resignations; layoffs or reduction in force due to lack of work or lack of funds, reorganization, reclassification or completion of work; and classification. No personnel regulations shall be adopted, amended or repealed without a prior public hearing upon at least two weeks written notice, by the personnel director and following the meet and confer sessions with recognized employee organizations as required by state law. All civil service commission rules relevant to the foregoing as well as the provisions of former sections 8.322, 8.323, 8.326, 8.328, 8.329, 8.330, 8.331, 8.332 and 8.340 of this charter shall become personnel regulations on the effective date of this charter amendatory.

(d) The personnel director shall conduct the salary surveys for the civil service commission as set forth elsewhere in this charter.

(e) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall establish procedures to review and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the personnel director shall forthwith be binding on all employees; unless the decision is appealed to the civil service commission in accordance with personnel regulations.

(f) The personnel director shall investigate all employee complaints concerning job related conduct of City and County employees and shall promptly report to the source of the complaint. The personnel director shall cooperate with, and be subject to, the internal personnel regulation on the efficient and efficient management through personnel programs that encourage high productivity and exemplary performance.

(g) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall provide a procedure for resolution of employee disputes which shall be consistent with other provisions of this charter and which shall be limited by all department heads and appointing officers upon the expiration of the existing term of any otherwise binding agreements.

(h) Consistent with the foregoing and other applicable provisions of this charter and the personnel director shall delegate to various appointing officers appropriate personnel offices and shall be limited to appropriate disciplinary procedures, and consult with appointing officers with respect to personnel regulations affecting their operations.

(i) Personal services contracts shall be reviewed and approved by the personnel director in accordance with the provisions of the general personnel regulations. Personal services contracts reasonably expected to involve payment by the city and county of more than twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000) shall also be reviewed and approved by the Commission. Failure of the Commission to act within thirty days of submission of the contract by the personnel director shall be deemed to constitute approval by the commission.

(k) The personnel director shall establish a system of Job classification. The provisions of section 8.200 shall govern whenever new classifications are created or existing classifications are reclassified. The personnel director shall be the judge of such classification determinations.

(l) From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the department of personnel administration shall determine whether a position within a classification is, "in character," temporary or permanent. Position statements may be made on a temporary position, temporary or, where confirmation is required, a provisional basis.

(m) Excepting sections 3.500, 3.660, 3.661, 8.105, 8.107, all but the second to the last paragraph of section 8.341, section 8.346, the last sentence of section 8.400, all but the last three words in the first sentence of the third paragraph of section 8.403, sections 8.404, 8.405, 8.406, 8.407 and this section, wherever the words "civil service commission" or "commission" appear in the personnel provisions of this charter, they shall be replaced by the words "department of personnel administration," "department," "personnel director," or "director," as the case may be, permits, the word "rule" or "rules" shall be replaced by the words "personnel regulation" or "regulations," the words "general manager, personnel" and "secretary of the civil service commission" shall be replaced by the words "personnel director" and the words "section 3.661" shall be replaced by the words "section 3.662" or "section 3.663," as appropriate.

The clerk of the board of supervisors, after consultation with the city attorney, is hereby directed to conform the language of the charter as herein amended when next the charter is submitted for republication.

8.322 Protest of Written Questions and Answers

After the written portion of a civil service examination has been held, the questions used and the answers thereto shall be available for review by the participants. This review period shall not apply to questions and answers on any continuous or standard-entrance or concurrent-entrance and promotive-written test. During the review period, participants shall have an opportunity to protest questions or answers as incorrectly or improperly. After all protested items have been acted on and after the official rating key has been adopted, and the identification sheets have been opened, further changes in the rating key shall not be made.

8.323 Protest of Tentative List of Eligibles

Following the completion of any examination, a tentative list of eligibles shall be posted for the inspection of the public and of participants. The posting period shall be for a minimum of three (3) working days for the entrance examinations or five (5) working days for promotional or combined entrance and promotional examinations. During this period a fee for the inspection of the papers of each eligible shall be charged by the civil service commission. The amount of such fee shall be established by ordinance of the board of supervisors. The fee shall be waived for eligibles who wish to inspect their own papers. Inspection of papers shall include all documents supporting the eligibles rank and score except the identity of the examiner giving any mark or grade in an oral examination or the questions and answers on any continuous or standard-entrance or concurrent-entrance and promotive-written test. Only participants in the examination may review the questions used in the examination. If no protests are received during the posting period the eligible list is automatically adopted. If protests are received during the posting period the investigation and action of the general manager, personnel shall be expedited so that final adoption of the eligible list is not delayed beyond sixty (60) days after the date of posting. Eligibles whose positions of rank are changed as a result of a notice-of-appointment regardless of the outcome of the protest(s) may be offered employment from adopted lists pending the resolution of any protest(s) and amendment to the adopted eligible list.

8.326 Promotions in General

Except as specifically provided for in section 8.327, the civil service commission shall provide for examinations on an appointment to a prospective or combination entrance-and-promotive basis. Consideration shall be given to permanent employees in separate promotional examinations in and in promotional examinations which are combined with entrance examinations for city and county service. When the passing mark has been attained and may be shown to be the work performance and the marking. When an examination announcement is issued for a class on both a promotive-and-entrance basis, there shall be one resulting list of eligibles which shall include all successful candidates both promotive and entrance in order of relative performance.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this or any other provision of this charter, an employee who has been certified from a regularly adopted eligible list to a non-permanent position in a civil service classification shall be permitted to participate in promotional examinations on the same terms and conditions as a person holding a permanent appointment to a position in that classification subject to a demonstration of ability and job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the civil service commission.

The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to promotional examinations announced after its effective date.

8.328 Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave

Employees under permanent civil service appointment who, because of absence on duly authorized military leave after June 27, 1950, did not participate in a promotional examination held after June 27, 1950, and during time of war as defined in section 8.324 of this charter, and in which examination the employee would have been otherwise eligible to compete had the war not intervened, shall be given the opportunity to participate in a promotional examination to a demonstration of their ability and job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the civil service commission.

The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to promotional examinations announced after its effective date.

8.343 Examination for Employees on Permanent Leave

The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to examinations announced after its effective date.
more than the minimum passing mark established by the civil service commission for inclusion on the list of eligibles resulting from the original promotional examination, his name shall thereafter be entered on the eligible list resulting from the original promotional examination in accordance with the relative excellence obtained by all the qualified participants in the original and similar promotional examinations.

Secondly, an employee, eligible for appointment from such list of eligibles in accordance with civil service rules to any vacancy thereafter occurring, and subject to satisfactory completion of a probationary period as provided in section 8.340 of this charter for a period of four years after the date on which their name is entered on said eligible list and before eligibles placed on said list have the benefit of the regular examination procedure established for such examination, is entitled to appointment to a permanent position in a civil service classification of a permanent duration and shall have the qualifications necessary to be appointed to such position in accordance with the rules and regulations of the civil service commission promulgated in accordance with the provisions of this section.

If it is determined by the civil service commission that the name of such person would have been reached for permanent appointment from the list of eligibles established as a result of the original promotional examination during his term of military service the name of such person appeared thereon, then such employee, upon appointment to a permanent position as herein provided, shall be granted seniority in such appointment from the date his name would have been reached had his name appeared thereon, but such seniority shall be used only for the purpose of determining salary increments and calculating city and county contributions to the retirement systems and shall not affect seniority as held subsequent to the original promotional examination.

If it is determined by the civil service commission that the name of such person would have been reached for permanent appointment from the list of eligibles established as a result of the original promotional examination during his term of military service the name of such person appeared thereon, then such employee, upon appointment to a permanent position as herein provided, shall be granted seniority in such appointment from the date his name would have been reached had his name appeared thereon, but such seniority shall be used only for the purpose of determining salary increments and calculating city and county contributions to the retirement systems and shall not affect seniority as held subsequent to the original promotional examination.

The civil service commission may, by appointment, remove any name from the eligible list. Names removed therefrom for two years and all names thereon shall be removed at the expiration of four years. The commission may, however, provide in the examination announcement that the list of eligibles secured thereby shall automatically expire at a date not less than two or more than four years after the adoption of said list.

8.334 Limited-Tenure Appointments—When in time of war declared by the Congress of the United-States-eligible are not available for appointment from registers established through the regular examination procedure as provided under Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof, the civil service commission may appoint eligible for wartime appointments to positions through informal and non-competitive tests. Such tests and appointments resulting therefrom shall be governed solely by the provisions of this section and by rule of the civil service commission adopted pursuant thereto and the tests shall be adequate in the judgment of the civil service commission to determine the capacity of applicants to perform the duties of the positions to be filled.

8.329 Certification of Eligibles; Rule of Three—When a list of eligibles is controlled by the civil service commission pursuant to section 8.323 this list is to be filled, the appointing officer shall make a requisition to the civil service commission for a person to fill it. Thereupon, the commission shall certify to the appointing officer the names of the persons standing highest on the list of eligibles for such position. In case the position is not ready for filling, the commission shall certify the names of the persons standing highest on such list. If there are fewer than three names on the list from which certification is to be made, there shall be certified the number therein.

The appointing officer shall fill the position by the appointment of one of the persons certified. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any appointment made under the provisions of this charter or any other law of the State of Oregon or the United States, if such appointment is made under the provisions of this section.

When a list of eligibles is controlled by the civil service commission pursuant to the provisions of section 8.323 of this charter or after the effective date of this amendment, the eligible list is controlled by the commission in accordance with the provisions of this section.

8.323 Certification of Eligibles; Rule of Three—When a list of eligibles is controlled by the civil service commission pursuant to the provisions of section 8.323 of this charter or after the effective date of this amendment, the eligible list is controlled by the commission in accordance with the provisions of this section.

8.329 Certification of Eligibles; Rule of Three—When a list of eligibles is controlled by the civil service commission pursuant to section 8.323 this list is to be filled, the appointing officer shall make a requisition to the civil service commission for a person to fill it. Thereupon, the commission shall certify to the appointing officer the names and addresses of the persons standing highest on the list of eligibles for such position. In case the position is not ready for filling, the commission shall certify the names and addresses of the persons standing highest on such list. If there are fewer than three names on the list from which certification is to be made, there shall be certified the number therein.

The appointing officer shall fill the position by the appointment of one of the persons certified. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any appointment made under the provisions of this charter or any other law of the State of Oregon or the United States, if such appointment is made under the provisions of this section.
governmental jurisdictions and private employment for like work and like service, based upon job classifications as provided in section 3566.3662 of this charter and shall make its findings, based on facts and data collected, as to what are the generally prevailing basic pay rates for each class of employees in the city and county that is the maximum of twenty-four months and up to the maximum of twelve months' service for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed ranks of the police department, fire department, sheriff's department and San Francisco International Airport police force shall be for twelve months except that, with respect to members of the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve months' service from the day following completion of the prescribed department field training officer program, but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment; provided further that probationary members of the uniformed ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in section 8.343 for such charges. Probationary period of twelve months may be extended up to a maximum of twenty-four months may be established for executive and management classifications. At any time during the probationary period the appointing officer may terminate the appointment upon giving written notice of such termination to the employee. and to the civil service commission specifying the reasons for such termination. Except in the case of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments the civil service commission shall review the termination. The civil service commission shall by rule establish the procedures for such review. If the appointing officer should fail to provide the written notice to the civil service commission the commission may declare such person dismissed or may return the name to the list of eligibles under such conditions for further appointment as the commission may deem just. If the appointment resulted from a competitive examination or employment by the right of appeal and hearing before the civil service commission. The commission shall render a decision within thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person dismissed; or (b) order such person reinstated to the position with current pay. The decision may be reviewed by the civil service commission in its discretion and order the employee be paid salary from time of the termination of the appointment; or (c) order the return of such person to a position in the classification from which such person was promoted and may reestablish the employee's eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same or a similar classification under such conditions as the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall be final immediately prior to the expiration of the probationary period the appointing officer shall report to the civil service commission as to the competence of the probationer for the position and if competent shall recommend permanent appointment. Nothing in this section shall preclude the civil service commission from reviewing terminations for the purpose of future employability including terminations in the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments.

8.407 Definition of Generally Prevailing Rates of Wages

Notwithstanding any provision of section 8.401 or any provision of any other section of this charter to the contrary, generally prevailing rates of salaries and wages for those employees covered by section 8.401 of the charter shall be determined by the civil service commission as set forth below.

The civil service commission personnel director shall conduct a comprehensive investigation and survey of basic pay rates and wages and salaries in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment for like work and like service, based upon job classifications as provided in section 3566.3662 of this charter and shall make its findings, based on facts and data collected, as to what are the generally prevailing basic pay rates for each class of employees in the city and county that is the maximum of twenty-four months and up to the maximum of twelve months' service for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed ranks of the police department, fire department, sheriff's department and San Francisco International Airport police force shall be for twelve months except that, with respect to members of the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve months' service from the day following completion of the prescribed department field training officer program, but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment; provided further that probationary members of the uniformed ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in section 8.343 for such charges. Probationary period of twelve months may be extended up to a maximum of twenty-four months may be established for executive and management classifications. At any time during the probationary period the appointing officer may terminate the appointment upon giving written notice of such termination to the employee, and to the civil service commission specifying the reasons for such termination. Except in the case of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments the civil service commission shall review the termination. The civil service commission shall by rule establish the procedures for such review. If the appointing officer should fail to provide the written notice to the civil service commission the commission may declare such person dismissed or may return the name to the list of eligibles under such conditions for further appointment as the commission may deem just. If the appointment resulted from a competitive examination or employment by the right of appeal and hearing before the civil service commission. The commission shall render a decision within thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person dismissed; or (b) order such person reinstated to the position with current pay. The decision may be reviewed by the civil service commission in its discretion and order the employee be paid salary from time of the termination of the appointment; or (c) order the return of such person to a position in the classification from which such person was promoted and may reestablish the employee's eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same or a similar classification under such conditions as the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall be final immediately prior to the expiration of the probationary period the appointing officer shall report to the civil service commission as to the competence of the probationer for the position and if competent shall recommend permanent appointment. Nothing in this section shall preclude the civil service commission from reviewing terminations for the purpose of future employability including terminations in the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments.

8.407 Definition of Generally Prevailing Rates of Wages

Notwithstanding any provision of section 8.401 or any provision of any other section of this charter to the contrary, generally prevailing rates of salaries and wages for those employees covered by section 8.401 of the charter shall be determined by the civil service commission as set forth below.

The civil service commission personnel director shall conduct a comprehensive investigation and survey of basic pay rates and wages and salaries in other
or privilege, shall go into effect until the expiration of sixty days from the date it becomes final. At the end of such sixty days such ordinance shall be in force and effect, unless within such period there shall be filed with the registrar a petition signed by registered voters equal in number to five percent of the entire vote cast for mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election, requesting that such ordinance be submitted to the electors. In case such petition is filed, such ordinance shall not go into effect until approved by a majority of the voters voting thereon at a general or special election.

If, before the time any other ordinance involving legislative matters becomes effective, there shall be filed with the board of supervisors a petition signed by qualified electors of the city and county equal in number to at least ten per centum of the entire vote cast for all candidates for mayor at the last preceding general municipal election at which a mayor was elected, protesting against the passage of such ordinance the same shall be suspended from going into operation, and it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to reconsider such ordinance, and if the same be not entirely repealed, said board shall submit the ordinance to the vote of said electors either at the next general municipal election or at a special election to be held for that purpose, and such ordinance shall not go into effect or become operative unless and until a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon shall vote in favor thereof. The provisions of section 9.109 and 9.110 of the charter shall apply to and govern the verification and certification of such petition.

Annual budget and appropriation ordinances, supplemental appropriation ordinances, the annual salary ordinance, or ordinances amending the same, the ordinances levying taxes, any ordinance appropriating money from the emergency reserve fund, ordinances authorizing the city attorney to compromise negotiation, and ordinances necessary to enable the mayor to carry out any of the powers vested in him in the case of public emergency as defined in section 3.100 of the charter, ordinances enacted pursuant to section 8.410 of the charter, as well as ordinances relative to purely administrative matters, shall not be subject to referendum.

Any elective official, the chief administrative officer, the controller or any member of the board of education or public utilities commission may be recalled by the electors. The procedure to effect such recall shall be as follows: A petition demanding the recall from office of any such elective official shall be filed with the registrar. Said petition shall contain a statement of the grounds on which the recall is sought. Any insufficiency of form or substance in such statement shall in no way affect the validity of the election and proceedings held thereunder. No recall petition shall be filed against any officer until he has held his office for at least six months.

(b) In the event the representative of the board of supervisors mayor and the representatives of recognized employee organizations do not reach an agreement through the meet-and-confer process on matters contained in the annual salary standardization ordinance by March 15 of any year, the mayor shall recommend and the board shall adopt approve or reject a schedule of compensation which reflects current prevailing rates for the classifications covered by Section 8.410 of this Charter. The last good faith offer presented by the mayor or his or her representative.

In any year when an agreement on matters contained in the salary standardization ordinance has not been achieved, the civil-service commission personnel director, upon receipt of a written demand from a recognized employee organization made upon the mayor and the personnel director shall prepare, prior to April 1, a schedule of compensation and administrative provisions which reflect additional rates that would be payable, and working conditions, based upon the last demands made by the recognized employee organization(s) which participated in the meet-and-confer process.

said schedule shall be transmitted to the registrar of voters for submission to the electors of the city and county at a general election or a special election called for the purpose, and said special election shall be held no less than sixty (60) days from the date of the call. No such schedule shall be withdrawn after it has been received by the registrar of voters. At said election, the ballot shall contain the following two alternatives:

(1) Approval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

(2) Disapproval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

If a majority of the valid votes cast in the election favor paying the additional rates set forth in the schedule of compensation based upon the last demands of the recognized employee organizations, the city shall engage in the meet-and-confer process, it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to amend the salary standardization ordinance to reflect said increased rates. Continued on page 78

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION E

NOTE: All sections are new.

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

Section 1. This ordinance may be called the "City College Public Lands Preservation Ordinance."

Section 2. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall declare by ordinance or exceptions, any building permit application for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, located across Phelan Avenue from the presently occupied campus of City College and consisting of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

Section 3. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall revoke or rescind, WITH NO EXEMPTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS, any building permit application previously granted for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, which consist of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

Section 4. The term "building permit" includes building permits, site permits and any other permits for the performance of construction work.

Section 5. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of the ordinance shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. No provision of this ordinance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent implementation of the policy stated above.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION F

NOTE: All sections are new.

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

Section 1. The People of the City and County of San Francisco desire and are entitled to a local government whose officials do not engage in, assist or promote compensated advocacy on behalf of private interests before City and County commissions and boards while also serving as City and County officers.

Section 2. No officer of the City and County may, during the term of office, engage in compensated advocacy before any City and County board or commission or any member of the board or commission or its staff, in order to represent any private interest, for which representation the officer receives, directly or indirectly, any compensation, reward or gift.

Section 3. Officers of the City and County shall not discuss matters before their commission or department with other City and County officers or state legislators when those other officers or state legislators are acting as compensated advocates for a private interest.

Section 4. No member of the California State Legislature shall serve before any City and County board, department or commission as a compensated advocate representing a private interest.

Section 5. In the financing of city and county campaigns: (a) No person other than a candidate shall make, and no candidate or treasurer shall solicit or accept, any contribution which will cause the total amount contributed by such person with respect to a single election in support of or opposition to such candidate, including contributions to political committees supporting or opposing such candidate, to exceed $500.00. (b) If any person is found guilty of violating the terms of this section, each campaign treasurer who received part or all of the contribution or contributions which constitute the violation shall pay promptly, from available campaign funds, if any, the amount received from such person in excess of the amount permitted by this section to the City and County Treasurer for deposit in the General Fund of the City and County. (c) This section shall not apply to any in-kind contribution of television or radio airtime to any candidate or committee granted to said candidate or committee pursuant to the "Fairness Doctrine" articulated in Callman Broadcasting, 40 FCC 576 (1963).

Section 6. Any person violating the terms of this ordinance shall be subject to the penalties set forth in San Francisco Charter Section 8.185. Such person shall include, but not be limited to, removal from office.

Section 7. If any provision of this ordinance, or its application to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, it is the expressed intent of the people of the City and County of San Francisco that the remainder of the ordinance, or the application of such provision, or any other provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.
rates and the same shall be in lieu of said annual compensation, and notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, said rates shall become effective and be payable as if adopted prior to April 1, of any year.

The provisions of sections 3.100 and 3.100-l, relating to the emergency powers of the mayor, shall not be applicable to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

11.105 Effective Date of Amendments
The effective date of the amendments, additions and deletions to the civil service provisions of the charter shall be ninety (90) days after the acceptance and filing thereof with the Secretary of State.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED
PROPOSITION G

We the people of San Francisco declare this to be our policy:

1) IT IS IMPROPER TO PROFIT FROM OR PROVIDE SUPPORT TO THE RACIST POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SYSTEM IN SOUTH AFRICA, KNOWN AS APARTHEID.

Therefore it is necessary to sever commercial ties to South Africa, until people of all races obtain equal rights in that country, including equal voting rights.

2) COMPANIES HAVING SUBSTANTIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH APARTHEID MUST BE CONSIDERED IRRESPONSIBLE.

(a) The Board of Supervisors must determine which companies doing or seeking business with the City have the greatest ties to Apartheid. Companies that have a significant involvement in profiting from or maintaining the Apartheid system, may, on that basis, be deemed “irresponsible bidders.”

In purchasing goods and services and awarding other contracts, the city must give priority to avoiding such companies; the degree of the preference must be in proportion to the company’s complicity with Apartheid, according to the following criteria:
— how much business the company does in or with South Africa;
— how much the company profits from that business;
— how much support the company provides the Apartheid government in taxes, loans, payments or other funding;
— the nature of the company’s South Africa business;
— the degree of the company’s cooperation with South African political censorship or secrecy agreements;
— the degree to which the company provides the South African government with the technology, materials and other means to maintain and enforce Apartheid.

(b) City funds must not be deposited or invested with any bank or other company which does business in or with, or makes loans to, South Africa.

If any exception to the above policies is found to be necessary or appropriate, the responsible official must promptly and publicly report it to the Board of Supervisors, clearly describing the exception and the reasons for it.

(c) The term “city” includes all agencies, departments, officials, employees, units and subunits of the city and county of San Francisco, and all funds administered by or on behalf of the city or county.

3) WE CALL ON ALL OTHER PUBLIC BODIES AND PRIVATE OR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS TO ADOPT SIMILAR POLICIES.

4) WE CALL A GENERAL PUBLIC BOYCOTT, FOCUSING ON THOSE COMPANIES HAVING THE GREATEST TIES TO APARTHEID.

The Board of Supervisors must determine and announce which company or companies are the worst offenders within each major industry, so that the public can focus its boycott on those companies.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED
PROPOSITION H

SUMMARY: THIS INITIATIVE STATES THAT THE AIDS EPIDEMIC IS A MAJOR PUBLIC HEALTH PROBLEM OF CONCERN TO EVERYONE, REQUIRING INCREASED SUPPORT FOR RELATED MEDICAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION. IT CALLS FOR A COUNCIL ON AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION OR SIMILAR UNITED EFFORT TO STOP AIDS.

We the people of San Francisco hereby adopt the following policy:

The AIDS epidemic has rapidly become a major public health problem, costly both in human lives and in general community resources;

The first steps in dealing with such a crisis are:
— the scientific research needed to discover and understand the nature, causes, co-factors, prevention, diagnosis and treatment of the disease, and
— the education of the public about the lessons of that research;

A proper program of research and education pays for itself in the long run;

Prompt action is urgent, because of the rapidly growing number of persons affected, increasing not only the suffering but also the difficulty of eradicating the disease;

The leadership and support of such an effort is everyone’s responsibility;

While San Francisco’s role in the overall effort against AIDS has been viewed as a positive example to other areas, the continued rapid increase in the spread of the disease means that we cannot afford to rest on our laurels or leave further responsibility to others.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:
We call on all appropriate government bodies as well as medical, professional, charitable and community organizations and concerned individuals to join together in an all-out effort to stop AIDS;

We call for support to an organized united effort along the lines of an AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION COUNCIL, including, in some form:
— A COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, to provide informed evaluations as to priorities among research projects and proposals, recommending those which are most cost-effective and most likely to produce early results useful in the prevention or treatment of the disease, to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts or neglect of promising approaches, and to provide the council with complete and up-to-date information regarding comparative results of experimental treatments, prevention programs and other existing research;
— A COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, to inform the public regarding prevention and other research findings, and to inform relevant government officials and the general public, concerning the factual basis for a re- ordering of current public funding priorities toward an increased war against disease, including research and education against AIDS and related conditions;
— A FUND-RAISING COMMITTEE, to solicit donations, lobby for grants, organize benefits and other fund-raising projects spreading the financial burden by appealing to many sources;

We ask the council and committees to be responsive and accessible to public input, to include representation of all interested groups, to consider all viewpoints, and to be capable of prompt action;

We ask appropriate city officials to determine whether a suitable form of such a council already exists; if it does, we wish the city to support it actively; if not, we wish the city to seek to encourage its formation by such means as may appear proper.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED
PROPOSITION I

SUMMARY: This initiative asks “Shall we tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?” The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated portion of Route 480 known as the Embarcadero Freeway. This initiative declaration of policy will give the voters the opportunity to establish the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco regarding the proposed teardown of the Embarcadero Freeway.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED
PROPOSITION J

Shall the City replace a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if such replacement would open up the Waterfront to its citizens, improve the tax base, and create a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic?
Candidates

FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER
JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: The Bill of Rights guarantees that every person accused of a crime shall have the effective assistance of counsel. Whether an individual is rich or poor, that person is entitled to a competent and dedicated attorney.

In San Francisco it is the duty of the Public Defender to uphold this sacred right. In every case, we provide the client with the best defense under the law.

In the last 7 years, my outstanding staff has done this work with the highest degree of professionalism. In the next 4 years, that same strong, professional, independent and ethical representation will continue.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John D. Bardis, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Sala Burton, 8 Stow Blvd., Representative In Congress, 5th District
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
George Christopher, 170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Clerk
Linda T. Fries, 330 35th Ave., Artist/Community Organizer
Brian Getz, 55 22nd Ave., Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson, Sheriff of San Francisco
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., International Vice President, ILGWU
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for Children & Youth
Suzan Kelly Kennedy, 3070 26th Ave., Executive Assistant to Sala Burton M.C.
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Community Health Director
Linda Ann Post, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative
Jim Rivaldo, 430 Steiner St., Political Consultant
Julie Tang, 788 86th Ave., Member, SF Community College District
Governing Board
Yori Wada, 364 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel W. Walker, 562 Campbell Ave., President — Local 250-A Transport Workers Union of America
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilmar Ave., Minister
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor
C. R. Zanca, 1966 Pacific Ave., Auto Repair Proprietor

FOR ASSESSOR
SAM DUCA

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I was elected your Assessor in 1978 and re-elected in 1982. My years in the Assessor’s Office were spent in a professional appraisal capacity personnel and administration. I have two university degrees, the coveted MAI designation, and am the recipient of a special Congressional Advisory Board award from the United States Congress. I have served in an advisory capacity, both nationally and internationally, in property tax administration and will continue to serve the taxpayers of the City and County of San Francisco in dealing with Article XIIIA of the State Constitution. My community involvement includes participation in cultural, civic business organizations.

Sam Duca

The sponsors for Sam Duca are:
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
Eugene L. Friend, 290 Lake St., Investor
Nancy Poirot, 40 Presidio Ter., Housewife and volunteer in politics
Walter H. Shorenstein, 740 El Camino Del Mar., Chairman, Milton Meyer & Co.

Stanley Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Emma W. Louie, 1257 Jackson St., Housewife
Alfred S. Wilney, 2590 Jackson St., Chr. of Exec. Comm. of Diversified Holding Co.
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arthur H. Coleman, II Hinckley Walk, Physician
Gerson Bakar, 2310 Hyde St., Investor
Melvin M. Swig, 208 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2225 Washington St., Retired
Joseph C. Orongo, St., 866 Faxon Ave., Publicity Dept. — S.F. Giants
James A. Scatena, 101 St. Elmo Way, Chairman of the Board, Scatena York Co.
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher
Frances May McAtee, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Recreation & Park Commissioner
Frederick F. Campagnaoli, 2609 Larkin St., Attorney
Betty Brooks, 1728 26th St., Field Representative
Jesse Teruel Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Businessman
Cyril I. Maggin, 394 California St., Merchant
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, 9402 20th St., Youth Director
John H. Swanston, 45 Lake Merced Hill South, Bowling Alley Owner
Francois G. Goldman, 745 El Camino Del Mar, Child Guidance
Irma M. Bernardo, 2828 34th Ave., Housewife
Loo J. Murphy, 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Charles M. Cunningham, 475 Connecticut St., Self Employed
Lawrence V. Eppienne, 815 Full St., Conf. Secretary
Mary M. O’Connor, 72 Mordax Ave., Volunteer & Homemaker
Elizabeth R. Duca, 16 Wawona St., Homemaker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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BALLOT TYPE
D401

DEMOCRATIC
17th Assembly District
3rd Senate District
5th Congressional District

PRECINCTS APPLICABLE:
4400's, 4500's,
4800's, 5700's,
5900's.

Application for Absentee Ballot
is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

Name _____________________________________________

Residence Address __________________________________

Mailing Address ____________________________________

Signature _________________________________________

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

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

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

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

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

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
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Sam Duca, Assessor | 79 |
Jeff Brown, Public Defender | 79 |

Propositions

Proposition A
Would centralize the City's risk management and claims investigation functions.
Analysis | 19 |
Arguments | 20, 21 |
Legal Text | 71 |

Proposition B
Would make technical changes in the role of the Purchaser regarding contracts.
Analysis | 22 |
Arguments | 23 |
Legal Text | 71, 72 |

Proposition C
Proposition C was removed from the ballot by the Board of Supervisors on April 22.

Proposition D
Would re-write the civil service provisions of the City Charter.
Analysis | 24, 25 |
Arguments | 26, 35 |
Legal Text | 25, 73-77 |

Proposition E
Would ban development of the Balboa Reservoir site (near Ocean & Phelan Avenues) for three years.
Analysis | 36 |
Arguments | 37-50 |
Legal Text | 77 |

Proposition F
Would ban "compensated advocacy" by City officials and legislators and would place a lower limit on campaign contributions.
Analysis | 51 |
Arguments | 52-56 |
Legal Text | 77 |

Proposition G
Would declare it to be City policy that businesses with ties to South Africa be boycotted.
Analysis | 57 |
Arguments | 58, 59 |

Proposition H
Would declare it to be City policy that an AIDS research council be established.
Analysis | 60 |
Arguments | 61 |

Proposition I
Would declare it to be City policy that the Embarcadero Freeway be torn down.
Analysis | 63 |
Arguments | 64, 65 |

Proposition J
Would declare it to be City policy that a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway be torn down, subject to certain conditions.
Analysis | 66 |
Arguments | 67-70 |

Credits

The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The active members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Suzanne Guyette, Mary Ann Aronson, Mary Martin and Tom Owen.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 5, 1986.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
- are a U.S. Citizen,
- are at least 18 years of age on election day,
- are a resident of California, and
- are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, such as this one, you can only choose among the candidates of your party.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Senator, State Assemblymember, County Central Committee, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your polling place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 3, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in”. If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

Q—Can a worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
- mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see enclosed card).

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

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
- your home address,
- the address where you want the ballot mailed,
- then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail by absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 3, 1986.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS CONCERNING VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

STEP 1

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

Using both hands, insert the ballot card all the way into the Votomatic.

STEP 2

Be sure the two slots in the stub of your card fit down over the two red pins.

STEP 3

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

STEP 4

After voting, withdraw the ballot card and place it inside the envelope pocket, with the stub showing.

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

PUT RED PINS IN HOLE
INSERT CARD THIS SIDE UP
TURN OVER FOR NEXT PAGE VOTE ALL PAGE

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

After voting, withdraw the ballot card and place it inside the envelope pocket, with the stub showing.

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

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

Step 4

在投票后，将选票取出放入信封内，票尾朝外。

In the envelope, place the ballot in the designated slot.
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate’s name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person’s name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the “YES” or after the word “NO”.

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORA LA TARETA DE VOTO UNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perforar la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes el dist se desee votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra “SI” o después de la palabra “NO”.

Todas las marcas o borradoras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvase al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

請勿在投票記錄薄上之打孔針在選票上打孔；千萬不要用鋼筆或鉛筆。

選民須知:

投票時所選擇的任何其他候選人，請在選票上箭頭所指之候選人名打孔。如果有兩個或以上候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上箭頭所指之所有候選人中，選擇你要投票的候選人打孔，但不要超過要選舉的候選人數。

投票合併的非候選的候選人，請在非候選候選人選舉信封所提供的預定空位上打下數候選人所候選的職位及他的姓名。

投票任何提案，請在選票上箭頭所指“YES”或“NO”字樣打孔。

選票上若有顛倒或紙損壞，選票作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔錯了，撕壞或弄破了，或損壞了、撕破了非候選候選人的選舉信封，要把該選票退還給選區的選舉員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PRÓXIMA PÁGINA
## Governor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HUGH G. BAGLEY</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK L. THOMAS</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EILEEN ANDERSON</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singer and Dancer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantante y Bailarina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES &quot;CHUCK&quot; PINEDA, JR.</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Hearing Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oficial de Audiencias Estatales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM BRADLEY</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor, City of Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcalde, Ciudad de Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

## Lieutenant Governor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEO T. McCARTHY</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicegobernador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

## Secretary of State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARCH FONG EU</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretario de Estado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election</th>
<th>Demoratic Party</th>
<th>Primary Election</th>
<th>June 3, 1986</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controller</strong></td>
<td>State Senator, Businessman</td>
<td>JOHN GARAMENDI</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALISTER MCALISTER</strong></td>
<td>Assemblyman, 18th District, California Legislature</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAY DAVIS</strong></td>
<td>Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treasurer</strong></td>
<td>California State Treasurer</td>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attorney General</strong></td>
<td>Attorney General, California</td>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: (WRITE-INs) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BERT DE LOTTO</td>
<td>Appraiser/Broker/Farmer</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLIS</td>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN)</td>
<td>To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SENADOR DE ESTADOS UNIDOS)</td>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT</td>
<td>Political Scientist-Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Profesor-Especialista en Ciencias Politicas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES GREENE</td>
<td>Member, Senior Legislature</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro, Legislatura Superior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIAN LANTZ</td>
<td>Business Consultant</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultor de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN CRANSTON</td>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senador de Estados Unidos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT J. BANUELOS</td>
<td>Communications Technician</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Técnico de Comunicación</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The positions and names are listed in both English and Spanish.*
**United States Representative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW KLEIN</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL MOBERG</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALA BURTON</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 164

**State Senator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOUIS J. PAPAN</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM GONZALEZ</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 173

**Member of the State Assembly**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WILLIE L. BROWN, JR.</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 180
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CATHERINE DODD</td>
<td>Incumbent En posesion del cargo</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>Incumbent En posesion del cargo</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNE BELISLE DALEY</td>
<td>Incumbent En posesion del cargo</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RON HUBERMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent En posesion del cargo</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERENCE HALLINAN</td>
<td>Attorney-at-Law Abogado</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESSE J. IVY</td>
<td>Senior Deputy Sherriff</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSAN J. BIERMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent En posesion del cargo</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAR JAICKS</td>
<td>Incumbent En posesion del cargo</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNETH JOHN AZBILL</td>
<td>American Indian Lawyer</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td>Community Service — Attorney Ayuda a la Comunidad — Abogado 社區服務－律師</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WADE &quot;SPEEDY&quot; WOODS</td>
<td>Consultant Consultant 問事員</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONY KILROY</td>
<td>Neighborhood Environmentalist Especialista en el Medio Ambiente de los Vecindarios 環境保護擔當者</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES LEGARE</td>
<td>Motor Truck Operator</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLE MIGDEN</td>
<td>Incumbent En posesion del cargo</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent Nombro para el cargo 任命候選中央委員</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LULU M. CARTER</td>
<td>Educator Educadora 教育家</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN: To vote for candidates not on the ballot, write the name and office title on the long side of your ballot.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SUPERINTENDENTE ESTATAL DE INSTRUCCION PUBLICA)</td>
<td>DANIEL NUSBAUM</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEANNE BAIRD</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor (ASESOR)</td>
<td>SAM DUCA</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender (DEFENSOR PUBLICO)</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $850,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td>YES 236</td>
<td>NO 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>COMMUNITY PARKLANDS ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for acquiring, developing, improving, rehabilitating, or restoring urgently needed local and regional parks, beaches, recreational areas and facilities, and historical resources.</td>
<td>YES 239</td>
<td>NO 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>WATER CONSERVATION AND WATER QUALITY BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $150,000,000 to provide funds for water conservation, groundwater recharge and drainage water management, and clarifies language in the Clean Water Bond Law of 1984.</td>
<td>YES 242</td>
<td>NO 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>DEPOSIT OF PUBLIC MONEYS IN CREDIT UNIONS. Authorizes Legislature to provide for deposit of public moneys in any credit union. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect. Legislation already approved implementing measure could result in greater interest income to state and local governments.</td>
<td>YES 246</td>
<td>NO 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. Provides exception to property tax limit when acquisition or improvement of real property approved by two-thirds of voters. Fiscal Impact: By itself, measure has no fiscal effect. No increase can occur in local property tax rate unless bond issue is approved by two-thirds vote. State costs for tax relief programs could increase. State income tax revenues could decline as tax relief programs could increase.</td>
<td>YES 249</td>
<td>NO 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>ALLOCATION OF VEHICLE LICENSE FEE TAXES TO COUNTIES AND CITIES. Requires allocation of Vehicle License Fee taxes to local governments. Fiscal Impact: Measure would have no direct fiscal effect. Prevents Legislature from changing the law to take vehicle license fees away from counties and cities. Measure would not prevent state reducing other forms of aid to local governments or changing existing formula for dividing vehicle license fee revenues between counties and cities.</td>
<td>YES 254</td>
<td>NO 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>LEGISLATORS' AND JUDGES' RETIREMENT SYSTEMS. Limits retirement allowances for persons entering Legislators' and Judges' Retirement Systems after January 1, 1987. Fiscal Impact: Minor savings to state in future years if rate of inflation exceeds increase in salaries paid to current officeholders.</td>
<td>YES 258</td>
<td>NO 259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPÓSITOS ESTATALES

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1985.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $850,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en la compra de graneles y casas para los veteranos de California.

236 SI 贷成
237 NO 反对

**ACTA DE TERRENOS DE PARQUES DE LA COMUNIDAD DE 1983.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $1000,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición, desarrollo, mejoramiento, rehabilitación o la restauración urgentemente necesitada por parques, playas, áreas e instalaciones de recreación, y los recursos históricos locales y regionales.

239 SI 贷成
240 NO 反对

**LEY DE BONOS PARA LA CONSERVACIÓN DE AGUA Y CONTROL DE LA CALIDAD DEL AGUA DE 1985.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $150,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la conservación de aguas subterráneas, manejo sostenible del agua de drenaje, y clarificación del lenguaje en la Ley de Bonos para Agua Limpia de 1984.

242 SI 贷成
243 NO 反对

**DEPÓSITO DE FONDOS PÚBLICOS EN COOPERATIVAS DE CRÉDITO.** Autoriza a la Legislatura para que disponga el depósito de fondos públicos en cualquier cooperativa de crédito. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. La legislatura ya aprobada que pese en efecto la medida podría resaltar en mayor ingreso de intereses para los gobiernos locales y estatales.

246 SI 贷成
247 NO 反对

**FUERZA DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD.** Dispone exenciones a los límites de impuestos a la propiedad en el caso de la adquisición o mejoramiento de la propiedad inmueble al ser aprobado por día tres terceras partes de los impuestos locales a la propiedad. Ningún aumento en la tasa de los impuestos locales a la propiedad. La medida no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo. Implica que la Legislatura pueda cambiar la ley para tomar los fondos provenientes de licencias de vehículos de las ciudades y condados. La medida no evitaría que el estado pueda reducir otros tipos de existencias a los gobiernos locales o que pueda cambiar la fórmula actual de dividir los ingresos provenientes del pago de licencias de vehículos entre los condados y ciudades.

249 SI 贷成
250 NO 反对

**ASIGNACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS POR PAGOS DE LICENCIA DE VEHÍCULOS A LOS CONDADOS Y CIUDADES.** Requiere que la legislatura asigne a gobiernos locales los impuestos recaudados en pagos por Licencias de Vehículos. Impacto Fiscal: La medida no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo. Implica que la Legislatura pueda cambiar la ley para tomar los fondos provenientes de licencias de vehículos de las ciudades y condados. La medida no evitaría que el estado pueda reducir otros tipos de existencias a los gobiernos locales o que pueda cambiar la fórmula actual de dividir los ingresos provenientes del pago de licencias de vehículos entre los condados y ciudades.

254 SI 贷成
255 NO 反对

**SISTEMAS DE JUBILACIÓN DE LOS LEGISLADORES Y JUECES.** Limita las pensiones de jubilación para aquellas personas que se afilien al Sistema de Jubilación de los Legislativos y Jueces después del 1 de enero de 1987. Impacto Fiscal: Algunos aumentos para el estado en años futuros si la tasa de inflación excede el aumento en los salarios que se pagan a los que actualmente ocupan cargos.

256 SI 贷成
259 NO 反对

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1985.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $850,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en la compra de graneles y casas para los veteranos de California.

42

**ACTA DE TERRENOS DE PARQUES DE LA COMUNIDAD DE 1983.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $1000,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición, desarrollo, mejoramiento, rehabilitación o la restauración urgentemente necesitada por parques, playas, áreas e instalaciones de recreación, y los recursos históricos locales y regionales.

43

**LEY DE BONOS PARA LA CONSERVACIÓN DE AGUA Y CONTROL DE LA CALIDAD DEL AGUA DE 1985.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $150,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la conservación de aguas subterráneas, manejo sostenible del agua de drenaje, y clarificación del lenguaje en la Ley de Bonos para Agua Limpia de 1984.

44

**DEPÓSITO DE FONDOS PÚBLICOS EN COOPERATIVAS DE CRÉDITO.** Autoriza a la Legislatura para que disponga el depósito de fondos públicos en cualquier cooperativa de crédito. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. La legislatura ya aprobada que pese en efecto la medida podría resaltar en mayor ingreso de intereses para los gobiernos locales y estatales.

45

**FUERZA DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD.** Dispone exenciones a los límites de impuestos a la propiedad en el caso de la adquisición o mejoramiento de la propiedad inmueble al ser aprobado por día tres terceras partes de los impuestos locales a la propiedad. Ningún aumento en la tasa de los impuestos locales a la propiedad. La medida no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo. Implica que la Legislatura pueda cambiar la ley para tomar los fondos provenientes de licencias de vehículos de las ciudades y condados. La medida no evitaría que el estado pueda reducir otros tipos de existencias a los gobiernos locales o que pueda cambiar la fórmula actual de dividir los ingresos provenientes del pago de licencias de vehículos entre los condados y ciudades.

46

**ASIGNACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS POR PAGOS DE LICENCIA DE VEHÍCULOS A LOS CONDADOS Y CIUDADES.** Requiere que la legislatura asigne a gobiernos locales los impuestos recaudados en pagos por Licencias de Vehículos. Impacto Fiscal: La medida no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo. Implica que la Legislatura pueda cambiar la ley para tomar los fondos provenientes de licencias de vehículos de las ciudades y condados. La medida no evitaría que el estado pueda reducir otros tipos de existencias a los gobiernos locales o que pueda cambiar la fórmula actual de dividir los ingresos provenientes del pago de licencias de vehículos entre los condados y ciudades.

47

**SISTEMAS DE JUBILACIÓN DE LOS LEGISLADORES Y JUECES.** Limita las pensiones de jubilación para aquellas personas que se afilien al Sistema de Jubilación de los Legislativos y Jueces después del 1 de enero de 1987. Impacto Fiscal: Algunos aumentos para el estado en años futuros si la tasa de inflación excede el aumento en los salarios que se pagan a los que actualmente ocupan cargos.

48
# Measures Submitted to Vote of Voters

## State Propositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Nonpartisan Offices. Prohibits a political party or party central committee from endorsing, supporting, or opposing a candidate for nonpartisan office. Fiscal Impact: No direct state or local government fiscal impact.</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Property Taxation. Disasters. Base-year value of property damaged or destroyed by disaster transferable to comparable replacement property in same county. Fiscal Impact: Local property tax revenues would decrease by an unknown amount. County assessor and tax collectors would have nonsignificant higher administrative costs. State would replace revenues lost by school and community college districts. State income tax revenues could increase due to lower property tax deductions on replacement properties. These state costs and revenues cannot be estimated.</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Multiple Defendants Tort Damage Liability. Plaintiff's non-economic damage recovery limited to defendant's liability based on defendant's percentage of fault. Fiscal Impact: Substantial savings to state and local governments. Savings could be several millions of dollars in a year, varying significantly from year to year.</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>County Correctional Facility Capital Expenditure Bond Act of 1986. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county correctional facilities and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of four hundred ninety-five million dollars ($495,000,000).</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## City & County Propositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgements against the City?</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Proposition C has been removed from the ballot by the Board of Supervisors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES**

**CARGOS NO PARTIDARIOS**
Prohibe a un partido político o a un comité central de un partido político patrocinador, poner o apoyarse en un candidato a un cargo no partidario. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo a los gobiernos estatal o locales.

**IMPUISOS A LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE DESATRES.** El valor en el año base de la propiedad inmueble afectada o destruida por un desastre puede ser transferible a propiedad inmueble de reemplazo comparable en el mismo condado. Impacto Fiscal: Los rendimientos provenientes de impuestos locales a la propiedad disminuirán en una cantidad desconocida. Las tasas y recadetes de impuestos del condado tendrán inscriptivos costos administrativos más altos. El estado reemplazará los rendimientos que los distintos escuelas y de colegios de educación superior dejaran de percibir. Los rendimientos del impuesto estatal a la renta podrán aumentar debido a menores deducciones en el impuesto a la propiedad en los propietarios de reemplazo. Estos costos y rendimientos estatales no quedarán ser calculados.

**RESPONSABILIDAD CIVIL DE MÚLTIPLES PARTES DEDICADAS EN JUEGOS DE AGRARIOS INDEMNIZABLES.** Limita la indemnización que puede recibir el damnificado por daños no económicos a la responsabilidad del damnificado basándose en el porcentaje de la culpabilidad del damnificado. Impacto Fiscal: Ahorro sustancial para los gobiernos estatal y locales. Los ahorros podrán ser algunos millones de dólares al año, que variarán significativamente en años de alimentos.

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA DESEMPOLLO DE CAPITAL PARA INSTALACIONES CORRECCIONALES DE CONDADOS DE 1985.** Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelación, y reemplazo de instalaciones correccionales de los condados y la ejecución del mantenimiento diario en las mismas en conformidad con una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos noventa y cinco millones de dólares ($495,000,000).

**PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONTADO**

**278 SI**
"¿Deberá la ciudad establecer una oficina de administración del riesgo y un despacho de investigación y administración de demandas, para estudiar y reestructurar el riesgo de plagas y enfermedades contra la ciudad?"

**279 NO**

**281 SI**
"¿Deberá autorizar el Comprador a firmar contratos por menos de $50,000 sin la aprobación del Jefe Administrativo y a permitir que sus agentes firmen contratos en su lugar?"

**282 NO**

**OFICIALMENTE ELiminada**

**A**

**B**

**C**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VOTER SELECTION CARD

**PRIMARY ELECTION**  
**JUNE 3, 1986**

**POLLS ARE OPEN**  
**FROM**  
**7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.**

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR CANDIDATE SELECTION

---

288 SI 贊成
289 NO 反对

289 SI 贊成

290 SI 贊成
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

D
Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?

YES 288
NO 289

E
Shall the City deny or revoke a liquor license issued by the Board of License Commissioners for a tavern at Ocean and Phelan Avenue?

YES 292

F
Shall the City prohibit compensation before any city commission, a contract, or for any candidate for municipal office?

G
Shall it be the policy of the people to establish a system of health and social services for the people of the City and County of San Francisco, which will be so organized and administered as to assure all residents of the City an equal opportunity to receive medical care, to ensure maximum health to the people of the City, and to provide a system of medical care that is economical for the City?

H
Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to establish a housing authority?

I
Shall it be the policy of the people to continue the construction of the Embarcadero Freeway?

J
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?

YES 310
NO 311

VOTER SELECTION CARD

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>County Central Committee*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>5.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td>6.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>7.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>8.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate</td>
<td>9.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td>10.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. Public Inst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to the sample ballot for the number of County Central Committee members to be elected. The number varies with each district.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT — An official list of candidates and propositions.

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

VOTE BY MAIL — See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

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

MEASURE — Another name for proposition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

COMPENSATED ADOCACY — Compensated means being paid for doing something; Advocacy means speaking or writing on behalf of someone else. Proposition F concerns the issue of compensated advocacy.

RISK MANAGEMENT — This field covers two areas: (1) deciding on when it is better to buy insurance and when it is better to be self insured or uninsured, then shopping for the insurance; (2) identifying hazardous conditions on one’s property and seeing that they are corrected so that liability and damage claims will be avoided. Proposition A concerns risk management.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

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

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

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

PROPOSITION A

Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgements against the City?

YES 278
NO 279

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Consultants hired by the Chief Administrative Officer are available to City departments that have questions about "risk management", such as how to keep damage claims to a minimum and how to find the best insurance rates. In some cases, the departments use these consultants. In other cases, the departments make their own decisions. When damage claims are filed, some are handled by the City Attorney's Office and some are handled by City departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would amend the City Charter to create an Office of Risk Management, under the Chief Administrative Officer. The office would set risk management guidelines for all City departments, boards and commissions. Proposition A would also establish a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration in the City Attorney's Office. The bureau would be responsible for investigating, evaluating and processing all damage claims made against the City, except those claims made against the Public Utilities Commission and the Police Department. The bureau would also have the power to investigate potential suits against the City and to make settlements within dollar limits to be set by ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer and a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want damage claims and risk management decisions to continue to be handled the way they are now.

Controller's Statement on "A"

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its potential future application and the exemption of certain employees from the civil service provisions of the Charter, costs may be affected in an amount presently indeterminate."

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On March 10 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted "No."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON A

Last fiscal year, over 6,400 claims and law suits were filed against the City, costing us more than $10 million in settlements. I believe that it is time to change the way we handle our claims, secure insurance, prevent risks and settle legitimate claims against the City.

Last summer, we appointed a task force of citizens, under San Francisco Bar President Jerry Falk, to make recommendations on how to streamline our procedures and save money at the same time. The present system is very slow, costly, and inefficient.

Currently, all claims are investigated by the department involved. The City Attorney cannot act on any claim until the department is ready. This results in delay and duplication of effort and increased costs. A centralized and accountable Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney would be more efficient, cost-effective, and professional. It would enable the City to settle many claims quickly, before litigation begins, saving the City the cost of defending itself in court and lowering the average cost of settling a case.

This can be accomplished without creating new jobs by simply moving into one office the city positions presently scattered throughout the government.

Vote "Yes" on A. Reduce the cost of City government.

Adoption of this measure would also formally establish responsibility for Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer, where it has been unofficially since 1978. With this strengthened authority, the Risk Management Office would be responsible for the gathering of claims data on a City-wide basis, the creation of incentives for both reducing the possibility for injuries and damage and the number of claims for each department, the coordination of insurance purchasing and specific suggestions to avoid and reduce risk.

This amendment is presented with the recommendation of the Mayor’s Task Force on Claims and Judgments, the Chief Administrative Officer, City Attorney, the President of the San Francisco Bar Association, and the President of the Lawyers’ Club of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Each year the City spends almost $10 million to settle damage claims. It is estimated that the overall costs to the City for all risk-related activities exceed $125 million a year. It is time for action to be taken to reduce these huge expenditures. This charter amendment is designed to do just that.

Claims Investigation and Adjustment

Right now, the City claims investigation process is decentralized and largely unorganized. Each department investigates its own claims. Investigators may or may not be specially trained for their duties. There is no uniformity of investigation procedure or claims reporting. In only a few departments do investigators contact injured parties within days of an accident in order to settle the claim quickly and economically.

This amendment will create a claims investigation and adjustment bureau in the Office of the City Attorney. Claims investigation and adjustment activities will be centralized, economized and made much more efficient. The new bureau will be able to respond immediately to accidents and claims, providing quick compensation to deserving persons while at the same time producing a prompt, professional investigation. This reform is greatly needed.

Risk Management

Presently, there is no overall plan for the management of the City’s risk exposure: insurance purchasing, avoidance of industrial accidents, gathering data on accident patterns, etc. Again, risk management as a function is fragmented among the various City departments. As a consequence, departments cannot develop the necessary expertise to manage themselves to reduce risk-related costs.

This measure will establish a risk manager under the Chief Administrative Officer. For the first time, overall City planning will be possible in order to control risk. Departments will be told what activities are producing injuries or damage and advised on corrective measures. Private industry has been utilizing risk managers of this type for years. It is time that the City did the same.

This amendment will reduce the cost of government and ensure a more efficient delivery of City services to all San Franciscans. We urge you to give it your unqualified support.

Board of Supervisors

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This charter amendment was proposed by a citizens' task force appointed by Mayor Feinstein. Its mission was to propose ways of reducing the number and financial costs of claims and lawsuits against the City.

The amendment has two principal features. The first is to centralize within the City Attorney's office the investigation of claims filed against city departments. This will allow for improved training and supervision of the investigators, who presently are scattered throughout city government. The result will be more efficient, cost-effective and professional investigation of claims. By improving the quality of claims investigation, the City can identify those claims which have merit and attempt to reach early — and less costly — settlements. Meritless claims will be denied with greater confidence that if suit is filed it can be defended successfully.

The second major feature of the amendment will establish a Risk Management office under the Chief Administrative Officer. Risk management is a concept widely used in private business. Risk managers are professionals skilled in reducing the overall cost of claims. The Risk Manager would be responsible for coordinating the City's insurance program, data collection, and correcting problems within the City which lead to claims. The Risk Manager would review those claims which have been filed against the City. Where it appears that an unsafe condition or practice has led to a claim, the Risk Manager would suggest to the affected department that corrective measures be taken. Reports to the Mayor and to the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors of the recommended corrections and the actions taken would ensure that the various departments will be responsive.

The City cannot eliminate claims and lawsuits against it. But it can limit its exposure by managing the claims process more effectively. This measure will reduce injuries and reduce claims, and that is good for everyone.

Jerome B. Falk, Jr.
Chair, Mayor's Task Force on Claims and Judgments
Against the City

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, May 31, 1986

12 Noon State Senate, Assembly, Congress and State Propositions
1:00 Proposition A—Risk Management & Claims
1:15 Proposition B—Purchaser & Contracts
1:30 Proposition D—Civil Service
2:15 Proposition E—Balboa Reservoir
2:30 Proposition F—Compensated Advocacy
3:00 Proposition G—Apartheid
3:20 Proposition H—AIDS
3:30 Propositions I, J—Embarcadero Freeway
3:50 Statewide Candidates

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

Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchaser must get the approval of the Chief Administrative Officer before signing certain contracts for more than $15,000. Only the voters may change that dollar limit. The Purchaser must personally sign every contract that comes through his office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would raise the limit on contracts requiring the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval to $50,000. It would also allow the Board of Supervisors to change that limit by ordinance. Proposition B would also permit the Purchaser to name certain people in his office to sign contracts on his behalf.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval only on contracts for more than $50,000. You also want the Purchaser to be able to name certain people in his office to be able to sign contracts on his behalf.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to require the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval on contracts for more than $15,000. You also want him to sign all contracts himself.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 3 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON B!
- The City’s Charter requires that a permanent, non-elected City official, the Chief Administrative Officer, review all purchases and contracts above $15,000. Of course, CAO approval of major contracts is very important. But, due to inflation, the number of contracts that have to go to the CAO for approval is always increasing. Today there are too many documents requiring CAO approval. This slows down the purchasing process, occupies staff time—and ultimately costs the City money. Proposition B will raise the CAO approval level to $50,000, and help the City to improve the efficiency of its purchasing operations.
- The City’s budget includes more than $250 million for purchases on tens of thousands of contracts. At the current $15,000 review limit, the CAO must approve thousands of documents every year—a costly, time-consuming process. In the long run the City loses money because of the inordinate length of time required to complete all the paperwork.
- An adjustment must be made to remove the smaller contracts from this cumbersome process. Review and approval of contracts under $50,000 should be under the responsibility of the City Purchaser, a highly trained and experienced professional, who reports directly to the CAO. By changing the present $15,000 to $50,000, it will be possible for the CAO to give each document that comes to him the attention it requires. And, by placing its orders and paying its bills faster, both the City and businesses will benefit—especially small business and those owned by minorities and women.
- Proposition B will allow future adjustments to the limit to be made by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility will ensure the City’s ability to adjust to inflation and changes in the market.
- This amendment comes to you with the recommendation of auditors, controllers, bankers, and others who exercise top fiduciary responsibility within their own organizations.

VOTE YES ON B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will make essential changes to update the purchasing and payment procedures under the Chief Administrative Officer. These measures are necessary and desirable because they will save the City money by significantly increasing our management efficiency.

Right now, the City loses because it takes too long for contracts to be reviewed and payments okayed, which means that early payment incentives go unutilized. The CAO has to approve every contract greater than $15,000—and with City purchases last year over $250 million, the paperwork logjam is vast and overwhelming.

An increase in the review limit from $15,000 to $50,000 will make an adequate adjustment for inflation—$50,000 now is only about $15,000 in 1967 dollars. Proposition B will also enable the City Purchaser, who reports to the CAO, to maximize potential savings through early payments by designating appropriate personnel to approve contracts up to $50,000. These “Good Business” amendments are consistent with private sector practices and should be incorporated by the CAO in the City’s best interests.

Finally, Proposition B will give the City the ability to respond quickly to changes in the market place by allowing changes in the CAO review limit by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility is necessary to ensure that in the future we will not lose money because of institutional rigidity. Control is maintained with the necessity of Board action and Mayoral approval to adjust the review limit, and this same feature will allow for change when desired.

Vote yes on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
Civil Service

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?

YES 288 ➞
NO 289 ➞

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the civil service system of the City of San Francisco. The structure of the civil service system and certain rules governing its operation are written into the Charter and can only be changed by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would make major changes. A Department of Personnel Administration would run the Civil Service system and would be able to change rules with Commission approval. Major features of Proposition D are described below. The complete charter amendment is printed in this voters' handbook.

Department of Personnel Administration

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Certain civil service rules governing the general operation of the system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs, are written into the Charter and carried out by the Civil Service Commission. Only the voters can change these rules.

THE PROPOSAL: A department of Personnel Administration would be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. A Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor would run the Department. Certain rules governing examination, selection and appointment would be taken out of the Charter. The Personnel Director would be able to change these rules with the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

Civil Service Commission

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the general operation of the civil service system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs. The Commission also hears and decides appeals on civil service matters.

THE PROPOSAL: The Civil Service Commission would no longer be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. The Commission could investigate the operation of the system, approve rule changes proposed by the Personnel Director, and hear and decide appeals only on claims of job discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest.

Employee Relations

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors appoints an Employee Relations Director to negotiate contracts with City employees; the Board approves all contracts.

THE PROPOSAL: The Mayor or his or her agent would negotiate with City employees; the Board of Supervisors would still approve all contracts.

What your vote means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing civil service system.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE
Controller's Statement on "D"

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not directly affect the cost of government, as it removes many civil service policy setting functions from the Charter and an independent Civil Service Commission and transfers responsibility for personnel matters, including labor negotiations, to the Mayor.

"As a product of its inherent flexibility and possible future application, costs could be affected or savings realized in amounts presently indeterminate but probably substantial."

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. Consistent with the City’s and County’s affirmative action goals, no applicant or employee shall be selected, appointed, reduced in rank, removed or in any way favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, union activities, political affiliation or sexual orientation.

(b) The purpose of the civil service system is to obtain for the city and county the best qualified persons to fill city and county positions in a timely and economical manner, using professional, fair and equitable personnel selection and personnel management practices with consideration of the following merit principles:

1. Recruiting, selecting and advancing employees on the basis of their ability, knowledge, skills and performance relative to the work to be performed.

2. Establishing equitable and adequate compensation, as provided elsewhere in this charter.

3. Training employees, as needed, to promote productivity and high quality performance and to facilitate career development.

4. Retaining employees during good service and separating employees for good cause.

5. Assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration, with proper regard for their privacy and constitutional rights; and assuring equal employment opportunity, based on the person’s ability to do the job.

6. Assuring that employees are protected against termination for non-political purposes and are prohibited from using their official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the outcome of an election or a nomination for office.

(c) This charter does not limit the power of departments, agencies, or other subdivisions of the city and county in their exercise of management prerogatives including but not limited to:

1. Directing employees in the performance of their duties;

2. Hiring, promoting, transferring and assigning employees from those qualified;

3. Classifying positions in accordance with Section 3.663 (k);

4. Disciplining employees;

5. Laying off employees because of lack of work, lack of funds or other reasonable cause; and

6. Determining the mission of its departments and divisions, and its budget, organization, the number of its employees, and the numbers, types, classifications and grades of positions or employees assigned to an organization unit, work project, shift or tour of duty, and the methods and technology of performing its work.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. No person shall in any way be favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, age, religion, national origin or other non-merit factors.

(b) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in subsection (a) or any other provisions of this charter, it shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, consistent with a policy of acquiring qualified personnel for the service of the city and county, to encourage the hiring of blind persons. It shall further be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that no otherwise qualified blind person shall be discriminated against in employment, re-examination, classification, appointment, re-appointment, waiver of eligibility for appointment or re-appointment, promotion or demonstration in any class, subclass or position in the civil service unless the sight is indispensable for the performance of the duties and responsibilities of the class, subclass or position. It shall be the duty of the commission to classify, and from time to time it may reclassify, places of employment in the civil service the duties of which may be efficiently performed by qualified blind persons and to conduct appropriate examinations which will fairly test the capacity of blind persons as well as sighted persons to perform such duties.

2.203 -2 Employee Relations: Director

With the provisions of Section 3.510 of this charter, the employee relations director shall be appointed by the board of supervisors and shall hold office at the pleasure of the board.

3.102 Employee Relations

It shall be the duty of the mayor to meet and confer with employee representatives on behalf of the city and county and all its constituent boards, commissions, departments and agencies as required by applicable law. These duties may be performed by a designee of the mayor who shall serve at the pleasure of the mayor. Nothing herein shall limit the mayor from contracting for the performance of these duties.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the mayor shall submit all memoranda of understanding or ordinances to be enacted pursuant to Article VIII of this charter herein to the Board of Supervisors for its approval or rejection.

3.660 Commission: Composition; Meetings

There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county shall have the general powers and duties set forth in Section 3.661.

The civil service commission shall consist of five members appointed by the mayor. The commission is to be in office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and this charter, section as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment, shall expire on June 30, 1981, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following.

The respective terms of the commissioners who shall hold office on the effective date of this section as amended shall expire at twelve o’clock noon on said date. Therefore, the mayor shall appoint the initial commissioner to serve until the next regular election and the terms of the other commissioners shall be staggered.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Vote YES and join 34,000 San Franciscans who signed petitions to get this crucial reform on the ballot. "D" clears the way to modernize Civil Service so that it is fair and efficient. The present system is a 50-year conglomeration of rules that tie the City's hands—

—A protest by one applicant can hold up hiring for an entire job classification for months—even years.

—Often tests cannot be given frequently enough to maintain current tests of qualified employees. This leads to delays and temporary appointments that make hiring top candidates all but impossible.

—Appointments to jobs are restricted to the top three names on a list even though more than three people have the same score!

—Many provisions are out of date. Some deal with hiring during the Korean War. Others limit our ability to carry out affirmative action.

"D" would remove archaic rules from the Charter so they could be changed as the times require—subject to meet and confer and public hearings. Job tests could be expedited; hiring and promotions speeded up; opportunities opened to women and minorities.

Specifically, Proposition D:
1) Creates a Department of Personnel Administration at no additional cost. Like other U.S. cities, day-to-day administration would be the responsibility of a director, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Supervisors.

2) Makes the Civil Service Commission the oversight body to set policy and hear appeals. Rulings would have to be within 60 days, eliminating endless delays.

3) Moves the office of labor relations from the Supervisors to the Mayor, who must make the tough-minded decisions to balance the budget. Never again could the Board give labor $27 million for "comparable worth."

This reform is the product of years of work with SPUR, League of Women Voters, Chamber of Commerce. Members of the Board of Supervisors could have put the reform on the ballot last year but bowed to some labor leaders, and 34,000 San Franciscans had to do the job for them.

Proposition D will enable City government to work better for you. Vote YES.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON 'D'

Proposition D is a complex proposition with a simple goal: remove the archaic restrictions on the hiring, promotion, or firing of city employees and bring San Francisco's personnel system into the modern age.

Archaic is the only way to describe a system that keeps equally qualified people from competing for a job, and that takes months—sometimes years—to fill vacancies.

For example, if 50 people score equally high on a competitive examination, shouldn't they all have a chance for any job for which they are eligible? Not under the current system, which requires complicated tie-breaking rules not at all related to a person's qualifications or abilities.

Or what about being able to hire the best person available for a given job? Currently, eligibility lists are frozen for two years and every person on each list, including the lowest-scoring, must be offered a job before the highest-scoring person on a more recent list. Private businesses couldn't function saddled with such absurdities.

Proposition D cuts through the red tape. It creates a modern personnel department, with a director responsible for carrying out rules to ensure fairness and efficiency. Accountable to the Mayor, the director would be selected from a list provided by the Civil Service Commission, and subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.

The Civil Service Commission remains an independent body, with the right to approve new personnel rules and hold hearings on abuses. Also under 'D', negotiations with employee unions would be under the Mayor, subject to approval by the Supervisors, providing checks and balances in balancing our budget.

With greater accountability and continued checks and balances, Proposition D will open the way to more efficient government in our City.

Bill Maher, Supervisor
Louise Renne, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON 'D'

Proposition D is a necessary reform to the City's Civil System. As the City's Chief Administrative Officer for almost ten years, I have found that quality employee hiring is difficult and the process causes long delays.

The current system is:
- inflexible. The City cannot hire and promote the most qualified persons.
- inefficiently administered by a commission. Other large

(continued)
Civil Service

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

It’s 1986 and we’re still trying to manage City business as if it were 1932. As heads of City departments, charged with the daily responsibility of putting out fires, fighting crime, maintaining hospitals, parks, libraries and providing other essential services, we know from bitter experience about shortcomings of the existing Civil Service System.

Enacted with the City Charter in 1932, the system is foundering in red tape. Outdated rules are the subject of endless challenges. Tests are put off; vacancies go unfilled; promotions delayed; any appeal, however groundless, stops the process in its tracks.

Proposition D would take old procedures out of the Charter so they could be changed in an orderly process by the Civil Service Commission, which also would hear appeals.

Day-to-day administration of the tests—the content, scoring, all the myriad details of managing a complex system, would be put into a modern, highly professional personnel office. Tests would be speeded up. Hiring would keep pace with need. Promotions would be on the basis of competence. High performance would be the standard. Discipline could be imposed with working rights fully protected, and women and minorities would be assured equal opportunity.

Proposition D will help improve management and the quality of City services. Vote Yes on D.

Frank Jordan, Chief of Police
Emmet Condon, Fire Chief
Don Birrer, Director, Public Works
Mary Burns, General Manager, Recreation & Park
John Frantz, City Librarian
Eugene Garland, Director, Port
Marvin Gettlinger, Purchaser
Wilbur Hamilton, Executive Director, Redevelopment Agency
Clare Isaacs, Director, Arts Commission
Ray King, Director, Parking Authority
Dean Macris, Director, City Planning
Grant McKinnon, Director, Human Rights Commission
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, PUC
Joyce Ream, Director, Aging
Ed Sarsfield, General Manager, Social Services
Thelma Shelley, Managing Director, War Memorial
Moiru So, Executive Director, Community Development
Louis Turpen, Director of Airport
Dr. David Verdegue, Director, Health Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The hiring practices outlined in San Francisco City Charter have been virtually unchanged since 1931, a severe handicap in running a modern city. Proposition D is designed to streamline the charter and ensure that the rights of present city employees and candidates for city jobs are protected, while improving the hiring process itself. The initiative also builds management accountability in the city system.

Proposition D Is More Fair, More Efficient, More Economical

The day-to-day personnel functions, including hiring, will be consolidated under a Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. Decisions of the Director of Personnel on examination content and administration are final, unless a decision is stayed during the appeal process by a unanimous vote of the Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D will make it easier to modernize the many archaic Civil Service rules and procedures now included in the Charter, while maintaining a strong and independent Civil Service Commission to safeguard the merit system and protect the rights of city employees. Many detailed rules will come out of the Charter and will become personnel regulations. These regulations can then be modernized, but only through a process which includes public hearings and meet and confer sessions with the union involved. In addition, the Civil Service Commission must approve any changes or new regulations governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfer, resignation and terminations.

Proposition D Will Improve Performance And Public Confidence

The openness and fairness of the proposition will benefit everyone. Well-qualified job candidates will have a better chance of being hired, and well-qualified job holders will have a better chance of being promoted. This means generally better job performance in all departments, resulting in higher employee morale and more public confidence in city government.

Submitted by
Louis Hop Lee, President
Civil Service Commission
Lee Munson, Member Civil Service Commission and Treasurer, San Franciscans for Fair and Efficient Government
Civil Service

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Cities can survive only with strong management. The greatest budgetary restraint must be exercised to assure that full value is received for each tax dollar spent.

With firm limits on what it can spend and faced with a possible loss of Federal funds next year, the City must be managed with the greatest possible efficiency.

Essential to greater efficiency is the need for Civil Service reform. As members of City Commissions, we constantly confront the torturous delays and confused rules that gridlock the present system. The present system simply can’t respond to the City’s personnel needs.

Qualified applicants become frustrated and seek employment elsewhere. Promotions are blocked. Morale suffers. Temporaries fill in; overtime mounts. The ability to plan is crippled; management is weakened.

Proposition D would put the system on a business-like basis. A personnel department would handle day-to-day administration. The Civil Service Commission would be the watchdog to assure the integrity of the merit system.

This streamlined system would replace what is now inflexible and cumbersome. Testing could be accelerated; hiring made more efficient and promotions made on time. The result would be greater efficiency and elimination of costly waste.

Vote Yes on D.

Jerry E. Berg, President, Board of Permit Appeals
Henry Berman, President, Fire Commission
Mo Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
John Bloom, Health Commission
Hector Chinchilla, Rent Board
Rev. Harry Chuck, Housing Authority
Dr. Arthur Coleman, President, Port Commission
Owen Davis, Police Commission
J. Edward Fleishel, Airports Commission
H. Welton Flynn, President, Public Utilities Commission
James Fisler, Health Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation & Park Commission
James Fussell, President, Housing Authority
Anne Halsted, Port Commission
Tommy Harris, Recreation & Park Commission
Tom Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Walter Jebe, Public Library Commission
Jeffrey Lee, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Phillip Lee, President, Health Commission
Bruce W. Lillienthal, Small Business Advisory Commission
Jacqueline Nemerovski, President, Arts Commission
Tony Rosenblatt, President, Planning Commission
Dr. David Sanchez, President, Police Commission
Juan San Jule, Housing Authority
John Patrick Short, President, Parking Authority
Marjorie G. Steen, President, Public Library Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D contains civil service reform measures urged by the League of Women Voters since 1969.

Proposition D will:

— Modernize the City’s outdated personnel system by creating a Director of Personnel, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors.

— Preserve the principles of merit through policies set by the Civil Service Commission.

— Create a more responsive Civil Service system at no additional cost to the taxpayer.

EFFICIENCY AND FLEXIBILITY

Proposition D transfers authority for day-to-day management of the City’s personnel system from the Civil Service Commission to the Director of Personnel. This will:

— Prevent hiring delays.

— Ensure only the most qualified individuals are hired and promoted.

— Provide City managers with more administrative flexibility.

FAIRNESS FOR EMPLOYEES

Proposition D will:

— Safeguard the rights of City workers.

— Protect gains made in hiring women and minorities.

— Retain the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit appeals board.

— Retain the ability of the City’s unions to negotiate working conditions.

— Create a system that can respond quickly and fairly to the needs of City workers.

Proposition D will bring the Civil Service system into the 20th century by making the Mayor accountable for the management of a system employing more than 25,000 people. Hiring by merit is still guaranteed by the Charter. Please join us in voting for this Reform!

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
Esther Marks, Past President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote Yes on Proposition D the Civil Service Modernization Initiative.

Prevent abuse of a system that was intended to serve the public and protect against favoritism. Prevent situations like this: an employee failed to report to work for a week without explanation; he was telephoned, notified by certified mail and a message left under his door; he was terminated 13 days later; he did not appeal the termination and the civil service commission up-
held the termination. Two months later, the employee petitioned the commission for reinstatement. The employee got his job back, not because the process of termination was wrong but because the commission had a long standing objection to using "absent without leave" as a reason for firing.

The quality of public services is dependent upon the effectiveness of the staff who deliver them. The primary role of the civil service commission should be to facilitate recruitment and retention of the best available personnel. It must protect against favoritism and must assure that everyone has an equal and fair chance at employment.

The present system does not do that. We feel this initiative will make the system work better, for the managers, for the employees and for the public.

Vote "YES" on Proposition D.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco government is huge, with a budget of more than $1 billion per year and 25,000 employees. It is expected to solve serious problems. This requires that the City have the ability to hire and promote talented people to do the job.

The present civil service system is so tied up in red tape that jobs remain vacant for six months to a year, and all too often someone who is not capable of doing a good job is hired. Your tax dollars are being wasted, and you are not receiving the quality of services you need and deserve.

Proposition D will modernize San Francisco's civil service system. It separates the personnel department from the Civil Service Commission, and puts the department under the Mayor where it belongs. The Mayor is responsible for balancing the budget and delivering city services as efficiently as possible. She cannot do this unless she can find capable people to do the job. That is the task of the personnel department in any organization.

Proposition D will also insure that the independent Civil Service Commission has sufficient authority to require the personnel system to be fair in its treatment of City employees. The Commission will be able to issue subpoenas and require testimony of witnesses on investigations it conducts. Should it find that discrimination has occurred, it can issue orders that must be obeyed.

Most major American cities, and virtually all cities and counties in California, have the kind of civil service system that will be established by Proposition D. San Francisco's present system is still mired in the past. It hobbles the ability of the City to deliver services and spend your tax dollars as efficiently as possible.

SPUR has not placed a statement in the Voter's Handbook for any other issue over the past 15 years. We feel that Proposition D is so vital for San Francisco's future that we are making this appeal for your support.

Vote "YES" on Proposition D.

SPUR—The San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Reform Initiative, will give San Francisco citizens the HIGH PERFORMANCE GOVERNMENT necessary to meet the many challenges of the future. Proposition D corrects the outdated and inflexible requirements originally written in San Francisco's City Charter in 1931. It will eliminate the problems which prevent San Francisco's personnel system from operating with efficiency the City's voters and taxpayers deserve:

Proposition D insures City jobs will be filled from current lists of the most qualified employees.

Proposition D prevents ungrounded appeals from delaying for years the appointment or promotion of qualified employees.

Proposition D eliminates the repetitive tasks currently monopolizing the Civil Service Commission meetings and directs the Commission to serve as an appellate body to protect the City's good employees.

Proposition D centralizes the day-to-day operation of the civil service system and makes the Director of Personnel responsible to the Mayor.

Proposition D simplifies the budgetary process by making the Mayor the City's chief labor negotiator, responsible for setting working conditions within the City's financial capacity.

Proposition D is the result of years of painstaking review by the most experienced, able and respected management experts in San Francisco. It is a plan intended to move City government out of the 1930s and equip San Francisco to enter the twenty-first century without being burdened by the red tape of the past.

After ten years of commitment to improving our City, the Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee is convinced adoption of Proposition D is one of the most important issues facing the voters. CHANGE IS LONG OVERDUE. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by,
The Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee

David Anachter
Jerome Anderson
Richard Blum
Charles Chapman
Arthur Cooke, Jr.
Benton Dirl
James Edgar
Ruben Garcia

Robert Hayden
Walter Houdeley
John Jacobs
Michael McGill
Ellen Newman
Roy Nordman
Frank Tatsum
Civil Service

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PERSONNEL MANAGERS SAY YES ON PROPOSITION D

As the personnel managers for City Departments, we are charged with the responsibility of managing the City's personnel system. The activities include examinations, hiring, training, discipline, union-management relations, affirmative action and compensation. No one knows better than we the frustrations experienced in attempting to monitor an unbelievable sequence of overlapping bureaucratic activities in attempting to get the job done.

Proposition D will bring our personnel system into line with most other public personnel systems. The improved system will create the potential for being more responsive to the needs of operating departments. It will improve labor relations by transferring this function to the executive branch of government where it belongs.

Proposition D will streamline certain routine procedures resulting in a reduction of cost and time. Under the current system delays are experienced due to lengthy appeals during which time the departments' objectives are delayed.

Proposition D will create an atmosphere of increased accountability for department managers in the areas of affirmative action, discipline and job performance.

Proposition D has been endorsed by the San Francisco Council of Human Resource Managers, the association of over one hundred personnel managers in City government.

Proposition D strengthens merit system principles. Civil Service commissioners will have more time to enforce and protect these principles rather than being bogged down in the day-to-day activities of administration.

Proposition D will help bring about improved methods and practices in personnel administration and should result in a more competent and effective workforce which the citizens of San Francisco have a right to expect.

Alvin W. Schauf
Personnel Director
Recreation and Park Department

Marsha Ramirez
Personnel Officer
San Francisco Port

Edward M. Gazzano
Personnel Director
Department of Health

James Horan
Senior Personnel Officer
Department of Social Services

James Illicki
Personnel Director
Sun Francisco International Airport

Andrea R. Gourdine
Manager, Bureau of Personnel & Training
Public Utilities Commission

Mori Neguchi
Senior Department Personnel Officer

Mary Smith
Senior Personnel Officer
Laguna Honda Hospital

Thelma Piotet
Senior Personnel Officer
San Francisco General Hospital

John Burke
Personnel Director
Controller's Office

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will assist the Department of Public Works by streamlining the Civil Service process.

- Under the current system, the duration of eligible lists from 2 to 4 years hampers the Department from hiring graduates of colleges and universities on an annual basis. Consequently, many excellent candidates are not entered into the Civil Service System. Passage of the proposition will improve the quality of the pool of applicants and thereby the quality of public service given by the Department.

- The establishment of a Personnel Director to administer the day-to-day tasks of the system will speed up the decision making process to the advantage of employees and management alike.

- The proposition still calls for checks and balances in that the Commission will continue to hear appeals on discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest. The Commission will act as a watchdog while leaving the general administration to the Personnel Director.

The initiative will make for an improved system for employees, management and the citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Donald Birrer
Director of Public Works

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Passage of this amendment will update our civil service system. These changes will make it comparable to other merit system agencies. Some of these changes are

(A) removal of administrative details from the charter which inhibit timely and effective personnel actions.

The following subjects will be placed in personnel regulations:

- Examinations for employees on military leave
- Certification of eligibles — Rule of three
- Duration of employment lists
- Temporary employee appointments
- (B) allows continuous up-dating of employment lists.
- (C) allows equitable treatment of job candidates with same test score.
- (D) realigns responsibilities: the Civil Service Commission dealing primarily with compliance and adjudication activities

(continued)
Civil Service

while the Personnel Department administers the day-to-day operation of the merit system.

Equally important the amendment retains important merit system provisions dealing with:
- Employee salary setting procedures
- Positions subject to merit system examinations
- Public hearing and meet and confer requirements
- Penalties for examination fraud
- Seniority, meritorious service and applicable educational credits for promotional examinations in the Police/Fire De-

partments
- Termination of unsatisfactory employees
- Disciplinary suspensions
- Conflict of interest
- Creation of positions

Proposition "D" merits a 'YES' vote.

John J. Walsh
General Manager Personnel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Initiative, is a long-overdue reform to streamline antiquated hiring practices in San Francisco's fifty-year-old charter. Proposition D will ensure that the best and brightest job candidates are chosen to serve our city, thus promoting excellence in job performance and helping to eliminate incompetence. This initiative builds management accountability in the city system, while giving the Civil Service Commission the independence to protect the rights of women and minorities.

A Better, More Efficient System at Less Cost

Proposition D consolidates personnel functions, including hiring, under a new Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. The Director has final authority over content of examinations given city job applicants, so more flexibility is possible in finding truly qualified candidates.

Provision D redefines the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit system appeals board and policy-setting body. The merit principles are spelled out in the Proposition. This allows the Commission to protect the rights of women and minorities at no cost to the public.

More Fair to Everyone

Proposition D greatly improves the city charter. Well-qualified job candidates have a better chance to be hired and well-qualified job holders have a better chance to be promoted. The public is rewarded with the better job performance, efficiency and friendliness one expects from good government employees. All of these improvements are at no additional cost to the taxpayer.

Submitted by
James W. Haas

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service System, as presently constituted, (vintage 1932!), is uncivil, and there is nothing "systematic" about it! It's pure, unadulterated municipal lunacy and chaos! Remarkably, BOTH Management and Labor despise it. It certainly is NOT producing the best qualified persons to fill City jobs!

Let's follow Mayor Feinstein's recommendations. If this operation doesn't dramatically improve, there are always FUTURE ELECTIONS where additional, more Draconian changes can be considered by the voters.

As matters now stand, it is far better to light a candle than just sit and curse the darkness! Any changes will be an improvement! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

For more than a half-century, San Francisco Mayors have abided by the employee examination, hiring and promotion policies administered by a strong and independent Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D is a deceptive and dangerous scheme that would give future Mayors and top-level bureaucrats the power to ignore competence and reward political loyalty.

Proposition D would take key Civil Service employment rules out of the City Charter and make them subject to wheeling and dealing by City Hall politicians.

There's an old saying — "if it ain't broke, don't fix it." Civil Service has worked well for more than 50 years. Proposition D is unnecessary, ineffective and even counter-productive. It's not just deceptive, it's dangerous.

Joseph L. Alioto
Former Mayor of San Francisco

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

Time and time again, different groups have put various propositions on the ballot to weaken our Civil Service System and reintroduce political patronage into City employment practices.

And every time the voters have wisely rejected these schemes, no matter how cleverly they have been disguised.

Proposition D is just another power grab by bureaucrats at the top in City Hall.

We've said NO! loud and clear in the past. Let's say NO one more time.

Submitted by:

TAXPAYERS FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT

Thomas Scanlon
City Treasurer, Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “D”!!!!

During the eight years while a member of the Board of Supervisors, I fought hard to reform the Civil Service Commission and to bring working conditions and city workers’ pay equitable to both workers and taxpayers. I fought to insure an independent Civil Service Commission that would remain just that— independent and free from political influence and political patronage of particularly the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

I am truly saddened by the Mayor’s insistence in bringing this disastrous Proposition “D” before the voters. Some of the Supervisors rejected this misguided measure for what it is; an unwise consolidation of authority to hire, fire and promote city workers by the Mayor and newly created personnel officer.

My efforts to bring pay equity to both taxpayers and city workers were continually squashed by then Supervisor Feinstein and Supervisor Molinari. Finally, in 1975, shortly after a disastrous city strike, I was able to place on the ballot, for voter approval, a measure that almost eliminates the power of the Mayor and Supervisors to manipulate the pay of city workers. This measure was overwhelmingly passed by the voters that year and we have not had any labor unrest since that date.

Vote No on “D”!

“D” stands for disaster. It will undo many of these reforms. Also, right now, the City is almost broke, thanks to the manipulation of Mayor Feinstein and her chief ally Supervisor Molinari.

If “D” passes the cost of operating our city government will increase in the next 24 months by not less than $60,000,000.

Contrary to the provisions of Proposition 13, property taxes would be increased, thus forcing up rents.

Vote No on “D”.

Don’t weaken our Civil Service Commission, whereby least deserving city employees could be promoted because of connection or clout.

Vote No on “D”.

We now almost have more problems than we can handle. We don’t want our city turned into another Chicago, where for nearly half a century a corrupt political system flourished under Mayor Richard Daley.

John Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We join San Franciscans for Fair Employment in opposing the Civil Service Initiative, Proposition D.

This measure will severely hamper the well-being of the San Francisco Fire and Police Departments. These departments are two of the finest in the Country and have consistently protected life and property in a professional manner. They must continue that tradition with a civil service system based on MERIT and not political patronage.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Andrew C. Casper
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Keith P. Colden
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

William F. Murray
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Thomas J. Cahill
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired

Donald M. Scott
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Our present Civil Service system was designed to keep corruption out of government. It has generally served that purpose well. This proposition would dismantle that system and in my opinion open the doors to nepotism, favoritism, patronage and corruption. Better a city government that is bureaucratic than one that is corrupt. Vote NO on D.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

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

 Proposition D is an attack on the merit system and an attempt to return patronage to the Mayor's office by eliminating the authority of the Civil Service Commission and its built in checks and balances.

 The present Civil Service system is not perfect, but corrections can be made within the Charter without destroying a system that has worked for over 50 years and has been free from fraud and corruption.

 This proposition will do nothing to improve the caliber of police performance and could have the opposite effect.

 I urge you to vote NO on PROPOSITION D.

 Submitted by
 The San Francisco Police Supervisors and Investigators Association

 Don Goad, Captain SFPD
 President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

 Proposition D could be a dangerous first step toward weakening the independent, impartial administration of our City government.

 Proposition D would transfer power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor. The Director's decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline and certification would be final. The Commission would have no right to hear examinations or disciplinary appeals.

 With the transfer of duties and responsibilities from the Commission to the Mayor's appointed Personnel Director, the Mayor would have control over personnel functions. Currently, commissioners have independent status and can be dismissed for cause. The Personnel Director could be dismissed at will.

 The Merit System could be replaced by a patronage system. Proposition D could open the door to rules permitting the Personnel Director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his or her position on the list.

 Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

 Proposition D is NOT a reform package. The checks and balances for efficient City government would be lopsided, with too much power in the hands of unknown future Mayors.

 We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

 Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
 John L. Molinari, President
 Harry G. Britt
 Richard Hongisto
 Willie B. Kennedy
 Wendy Nelder
 Nancy Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

 Beware of PROPOSITION D!

 Powerful special interest groups are attempting to remove key City employees from the independent and impartial Civil Service system in the name of "reform".

 They want instead to make these employees answerable directly to future Mayors and politically-appointed Personnel Directors and department heads.

 PROPOSITION D got on the ballot because the Chamber of Commerce and such companies as Pacific Bell and PG&E paid a professional southern California campaign firm, $70,000 to collect signatures.

 They're trying to destroy the merit system and replace it with an old-fashioned patronage system.

 Department heads will be able to ignore examination scores and reward loyalty rather than competence in promotions and hiring.

 Don't let the Chamber of Commerce, big business and their allies in the City bureaucracy dictate who's hired, fired and promoted among public employees.

 PROPOSITION D is not just deceptive, it's dangerous!
 Vote NO on PROPOSITION D!

 Libby Dennebein
 Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
 Dr. Tim Wolfred
 Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
 Ron Huberman
 Vice-Chairman, Democratic Central Committee
 Jim Wicob
 Democratic Central Committee
 Roberto Esteves
 President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
 Rick Picar
 President, Harvey Milk Lesbian Gay Democratic Club
 Walter L. Johnson
 Exec. Secty., S. F. Labor Council
 Michael Bensnick
 Linda Post
 Sal Roselli
 Deborah Stein
 John Mehling
 Pat Norman
 Nancy Walker
 Gwen Craig
 Harry Britt
 Louise Minnick
 Carole Migden
 Agar Jaicks
 Jack Morrison
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D places too much power in the hands of ONE. Proposition D will provide for personnel director to be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. The Mayor now appoints five members of the Civil Service Commission who also serve at her pleasure.

You work for years to climb the civil service ladder and then somebody comes along with an idea to cut you off at the pockets.

Proposition D will lock in all the employees employed in the Mayor’s office and will control the appointments of any new staff by the next Mayor elect in 1987 and years thereafter.

Like controlling your estate from the grave.

Vote NO on D.

Marguerite Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service Merit System has served our City well, giving San Franciscans an equal opportunity. It has helped us obtain employment and earn promotions based on objective examinations.

The Civil Service Merit system replaced the old patronage system that rewarded political loyalty more than competence.

Now the supporters of PROPOSITION D want to create a new Personnel Director, accountable only to the Mayor, and give department heads the absolute power to decide who works for the City and who gets promoted.

If PROPOSITION D passes, equal opportunity would give way to opportunity based on membership in the bureaucratic “establishment”.

Keep our Civil Service Merit System strong and free from the political abuses of the past.

Vote NO on D!

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly
Ben Whit
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
JoAnne Miller
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
A. Richard Cerbulator
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Sedonia Wilson
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, President
S. F. Community College Governing Board
Julie Tang
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Alan W. Wang
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Henry Der
Albert Chang
Rudy Meraz
Robert “Bob” Morales
Yori Wada

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Can you imagine studying for a civil service examination, being rated at the top of the eligible list and never receiving the promotion? That’s exactly what Proposition “D” will do should the electorate adopt this amendment.

The civil service merit system has defects, but to totally eliminate the system and replace it with a patronage system where promotions are based on who you know, rather than what you know is scandalous.

Civil service was put into place to prevent scandal and the “favor seeking” individual from getting a paid position because he/she happened to support the right elected official.

Proposition “D” will allow one person, chosen by the Mayor, to decide who will be promoted, hired and fired. This is awesome power for one single individual to have at any level of government.

Our current Mayor may choose a fair person for this position, but will future Mayors be as careful? As each new Mayor assumes office, the civil service system will again change. The potential to favor one individual or group over others is great.

Proposition “D” has a great potential to diminish the quality of services we now provide to our citizens, as the future of how people are hired and promoted in the San Francisco Police Department is completely unknown.

It’s true our promotional system is fraught with delays and delays frustrate us all, but Proposition “D” is not the answer. Proposition “D” will only add to our existing problems. Several years ago, our citizens elected a Charter Commission to streamline city government and make civil service work more efficiently. The voters eventually rejected those proposals. The checks and balances that make our government stable were no longer present. It simply went too far.

Proposition “D” goes even further. It brings about a system of patronage and should be defeated lest we want to engage in “free-wheeling and dealing” of civil service jobs and promotions.

We urge a strong No vote against Proposition “D”!

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS’ ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry, President
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The purpose of the Civil Service Commission is to ensure that the merit system would be the only criteria in any examination process.

If Proposition D passes, all authority concerning examinations would be taken from the Civil Service Commission and given to a Personnel Director, who is appointed by the Mayor. This Personnel Director would have the authority to hire and fire at his discretion, with no appeal available. This proposition is contrary to everything the Fire Department and all City employees have strived for over the years.

The Civil Service Commission in its present form was instituted to prevent any possibility of a patronage system, where one person has complete control.

This proposition would do nothing to improve your Fire Department. If you are satisfied with the work and make up of the San Francisco Fire Department in its present form, "Vote No On Proposition D". You will be doing a service for the San Francisco Fire Department, and the people of San Francisco.

Submitted by the San Francisco Fire Chiefs’ Association
John Flaherty, Battalion Chief SFFD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is bad government and bad politics, changing our independent civil service system into a system dominated by the Mayor:

. By shortening the six year terms of Civil Service Commission to conform to the Mayor’s four year term of office.

. By transferring most of the Commission’s powers to a Personnel Director who serves solely at the Mayor’s pleasure.

Keep politics out of employment services. Vote NO on Proposition D!

Alice B. Toklas, Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Roberto Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D fails to offer enough new and improved procedures to cure the current defects in the civil service system. Charter sections and civil service rules are repealed without specific known replacements.

Proposition D transfers power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created personnel director appointed by, and to serve at the pleasure of, the Mayor. The director’s decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline, and certification would be final. The commission would have no right to hear examination or disciplinary appeals.

There are hidden costs with Proposition D because the new Personnel Administration Department will employ a personnel director, and other employees “as may be necessary to carry out (its) functions and duties.”

The Merit System could be replaced by an old style Patronage System. Proposition D could open the door to rules which permit the personnel director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his/her position on the civil service testing list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Police and Fire Commissions would lose functions as a result of the personnel director’s new power. The director’s unlawful employment discrimination policy would be binding upon department administrators. The director’s procedure for employee dispute resolution must be used by all department heads and appointing officers.

Proposition D is not the answer. The checks and balances for efficient city government would be lopsided.

I urge a no vote on Proposition D.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, 17th Assembly District
Sala Burton
Congresswoman
Art Agnos
16th Assembly District
Milton Marks
State Senator

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Balboa Reservoir Development Ban

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission declared Balboa Reservoir South (located across Phelan Avenue from San Francisco City College) surplus in 1984 and made the site available for low, moderate and market rate housing. In July 1985, a City-community advisory committee chose a developer to build 203 single-family homes on the 13 acre site. Construction has not yet begun.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would prohibit granting new building permits and would revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site (Assessor’s Block 3180, Lot 1) between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit granting any new building permits and you want to revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to allow building permits to be granted for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “E” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for a three-year ban on development of the Balboa Reservoir site had qualified for the June ballot.

Sidney Kass and Jesse David Wall, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 12,430 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 10,012 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF proposition E BEGINS ON PAGE 77
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Having been responsible for providing leadership at City College from 1947 to 1977, we cannot stand by and see this site converted to housing. We must speak out. Such a move would preclude forever the logical and much needed campus expansion to what was once our West Campus. We left that site reluctantly to make way for water storage. If it is no longer required for that purpose, let us return it to City College.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 'E'

We question:
1. Why no EIR was required when the proposed development could have a substantial impact.
2. Whether the future needs of City College for classrooms, housing, and parking have been considered.
3. What the impact on taxpayers is with below market land sale and construction financing by bonds.

This moratorium will permit adequate study of these issues. Vote YES on Proposition ‘E’.

Bruce Bonacker, President
Board of Directors, Glen Park Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don’t let a developer make a mint on land across from the most overcrowded college in the Bay Area! Parking is already an impossibility for residents near City College... adding 200 homes to this land would make the situation much worse.

It’s simple: a college which can’t find room for more students at a time when more people are returning to education doesn’t serve the community.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

You’d probably be upset. We certainly are. Please help us protect our neighborhood. Please vote YES on proposition E.

Westwood Park Residents:
Edna Tooker
Minnie Dorwin
Eugene Eden
Donna Nicoletti
Robert Armstrong
Pauline Armstrong
Joel Martinez
Richard & Lisa Patterson
David Bean
H. Bozzone
William Burke
Richard Robel
Clyde Theriot
Danae Manus
Esma Manus

Sunnyside Residents:
Ellen Wall
Melissa Volvada
David Wall

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let the greedy developers take this potentially picturesque open space.
A yes vote means you want more time to consider its future use. All we ask is time to think and plan.

John Barbaragelata
Former member, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Suppose there was a publicly owned open space across the street from the main U.C. Berkeley Campus.
Can you imagine for one moment that it would be passed into private ownership?
Vote Yes on E for Equality and Excellence in Education

City College Students:
William Lew, Student
Tim McGuire, Student Council Member
Joseph Goldstein, Student Council Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

In 1952, the “Experts” said we needed reservoirs. They felt so strongly that they condemned the City College West Campus, destroyed the buildings, and constructed the reservoirs—all at taxpayer’s expense.
Now, in 1986 with more demand for water, the “Experts” say the reservoir is no longer needed. What is the concerned taxpayer to believe?
When in doubt, the city should hold on to the expensive things already paid for.

Stop the reservoir giveaway. Vote YES on E.

Taxpayers for Preserving the Reservoir,
Richard Paterson
Dorice Murphy
Lucille Carson
Daniel Gutierrez
Franz Wite
Bernhard Scholand
Ruth Hanson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This is a Planning issue
We have been accused of trying to stop housing for poor people. Not true. In the first place, the price levels are certainly middle income and above, but our main objection is that this badly done plan is damaging to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as to the over-crowded community college across the street.

WHAT WE WANT
Even our critics point out that we originally SUGGESTED housing for that site, but they don’t talk about what else we suggested. We want two levels of parking under a City College Li-

brary, Bookstore, and Auditorium, with housing on top. Furthermore, let the housing be TRULY affordable—for students and seniors. We are trying to stop the bureaucrats’ subsidized middle income housing project because it makes our dream impossible.
We ask for three years to give the neighborhood and the college a chance to produce a better plan.
SNaP (Sensible Neighborhood Planning Committee)

Helen Crizer, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council, representing 17 neighborhood associations in the area of the surplus reservoir property in question has voted to endorse the three-year stop of private construction on the old West Campus of City College. Dr. Louis Batmale, Chancellor of City College from 1970-1977, has persuaded us that City College needs the lands.

Juanita Raven, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Be a sport.
Give City College a vote of support.
City has 23,000 students and badly needs a library. The only place to put it is in the reservoir site. City College has walked closely with San Francisco for five decades. The reservoir site has always been understood to be reserved for City College.

Until now when someone wants it for housing. Housing is important, but it can be anywhere in town. But a City College library can only be located at the College.

Vote yes to support a book—and a reader.
Reading, studying, writing and research make up our town also.

It is hard to understand criticism of City for wanting to keep this area for a library. Sure, housing sites are at a premium—but even more so a library site for City which is one of the largest schools in the Nation.

Some people blast City for wanting a library because of the need for housing. Housing is needed. But some of those very same people want a big battleship stationed here that will bring in 15,000 new family members.
The Educational and cultural growth of San Francisco mandates living space for the City College library.

If this measure gets a no vote, it means there will be no site for a Library. This is the last chance. Vote YES to help out a book—and a reader.

State financing, when approved, will construct this building.

It is the top building priority at City College.

A YES vote here means there will be time to think about the use of the site. During that three year period, cooler heads may realize this is the only site for a Library. If the housing goes in there will be no library there.

Vote yes for a book, for a good school and a better City.

John Roridan, Board of Governors
San Francisco Community College District.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Sunnyside Neighborhood Association is not against housing, but we are trying to stop a hasty and short-sighted plan. We are asking for this moratorium to get time for a better plan that will answer a variety of needs and benefit the entire city as well as our community.

This is a planning issue.
The release of the reservoir property as surplus by the water department came as a surprise to our neighborhood. The June 1984 “Residence Element” of the city’s Master Plan did not even list the land as surplus. By 1985 major decisions were being made for use of the land without adequate neighborhood input.

There were some meetings attended by a few people carefully selected for their zealous pro-housing views or potential financial gain. The resulting plan has gone out of control. Now it benefits only the developer and the lucky few who will get houses on free land.

Proposition E is not an attack on housing.
Please help us save our neighborhood against poor planning by voting YES on Proposition E.

Joe Mahoney, President
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Miraloma Improvement Club urges a YES vote on Proposition E.

Frank Mastro, President
Arnell Rodrigues

Maggie Kroll
Dorothy Evers

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION E

All the talk in the world can’t change the fact that City College has fewer acres of land relative to its student population than any college in the Bay Area.

Enrollment at City College is INCREASING, as is the enrollment of the San Francisco public schools from which City College draws most of its students. It is obvious that City College needs and deserves the reservoir land. The three year moratorium will gave time to produce a better plan which will have in-

put by faculty, students and alumni who know the college’s needs and want to support it.

Sid Kass
Susie Langdon Kass
Phil Kass
City College Student
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The homeowners of Westwood Park, a neighborhood adjacent to the Balboa Reservoir, support the ballot initiative calling for a 3 year development moratorium. We believe that the City and City College should take additional time to determine their needs and how they might be met by using the Reservoir. In the event that City College does not need this property, we support its development as open space or as single family detached housing.

Westwood Park Association
Don C. Swander
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Let’s not aggregate the traffic problem around City College before we first develop solutions for the existing problems. A three-year moratorium only buys our neighborhood and elected officials time to find solutions; it doesn’t say no to housing. A YES vote is a vote for prudent development. A YES vote helps to preserve the family character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ken Hoegger
Realtor and community Activist

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As representatives of the students of City College, we understand first-hand, the intense need to reserve a site for future school expansion.

Preservation of the Balboa Reservoir, a site directly adjacent to the campus, is particularly crucial. The facilities that CCSF requires, such as a library and an auditorium, are essential to the main structure of the campus. Unlike classrooms, it would be unreasonable to build an auditorium or a library on an off-campus site, since these facilities are integral to the main function of the school.

In short, opposition to the moratorium based on the notion that alternate sites could be secured, is misleading. Once a site near the college is taken, any hope of expansion would be eliminated.

Associated Student Council of City College

Jack Lee, Vice President of Associated Counsel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Local 2121 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, representing City College faculty, urges a yes vote on Proposition E.

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

Yes on E for continued excellence in community college education.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is twice as crowded as any community college in northern California. It needs a much larger library, bookstore and auditorium, and more parking.

The college has always expected to use the empty SOUTH reservoir for educational needs. That land is finally surplus. Neither the college Governing Board nor the Chancellor attended the Mayor’s planning sessions for the property and the faculty was not informed. When the 12.3 acre site was offered to a developer for $36,900 for subsidized housing, the Chancellor said, “We are at a crossroad and the correct path is for the Board of Supervisors, with the Mayor’s support, to deed this surplus land to City College so that the college may continue to serve the city effectively for the next 50 years as it has for the past half century.” The Mayor refused. Now only Board member John Riordan supports the correct path.

The Water Department says it may need the NORTH reservoir now used for student parking. If that crisis occurs, the Chancellor says, “We'll deal with the situation then.” How, if the south reservoir is gone?

(continued)
When land is available other community colleges finance large projects through alliances with civic, athletic and cultural organizations, and through property sales. New methods for public funding are being developed. The faculty would like three years of careful study to unravel misunderstandings and poor management, and to find the best way to be a good neighbor.

Ken Crizer
Lene Johnson
Madeleine Mueller
Julia Scholand
Steering Committee,
City College Faculty for Responsible Development

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College needs land now for desperately needed facilities, one of which is a library. City College has an enrollment of 23,000 students but our library has seating for 450. There are other possible locations for new housing, but City College can't be moved. Give us an opportunity to plan a development for the community and the college.

Annie M. Young
City College Library Faculty and Staff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty and staff members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs. Vote YES on Proposition E

Virgil Appolin
Bill Carpenter

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs. Vote YES on Proposition E

Darlene Alioto
Mary Allen
Mary Amster
Tom Angeloff
Robert Balesstri
Don Baten
Diana Bernstein
Joe Berry
Anna Bratton
Thomas Brudel
James Bristol
Richard Broughel
Laurent Broussal
Philip Brown
Barbara Cabral
John Calien
John Caris
Frank Cerrato
Rosemary Clark
Perry Clouse
Hale Commons
George Crippen
Patricia Davis
Guy DePrimo
Edward Dierauf
Sharon Edwards
Larry Ernst
Mary Ervin
Kaye Fong
William Funke
Terry Greenfield
Robert Griffin
Michael Gubrite
Mary Hanna
YenKuang Ho
Peter Hoch
Ronald Hochsheider
Myraa Holden
Katherine Hordum
Michael Hubbert
Edward Hunt
Frank Ingersoll
Elaine Johnson
Wendy Kaufman
Jo Kennedy
Mercedes Kow
Rosalind Kwok
Don LaFerla
James Lujan
Steve Levinsen
Sue Light
Gary Ling
Amelia Lippit
Dave Lichhart
Leon Levy
Deanna Macaluso
Marion McManus
Patricia Madigan
Michael Maluchowski
Mary Marie
Maria Mariani
Sylvia Marshall
Valerie Meehan
Jose Mejia
Margi Michelmayr
Donna Mihl
Cindy Moody
Thomas Munro
David Myhre
Deborah Nagle
Glenn Nance
Herman Naylor
William Neff
Debra Piotrowski
Francine Poleski
Theresa Poydessus
Solomon Raju
Mary Rionion
Farrho, Shette
Marvin Schimmer
Fred Schneider
Earl Schrimer
Andy Seid
Ken Shen
Robert Struckman
McShuilum
Edward Taylor
Pierce Thiry
Barbara Thomas
Clare Thompson
Willa Thompson
Mary Tharler
Robert Trucano
James Traiter
Joanne Tumminia
George VonBroszy
Cherie Wessel
Austin White
Jean Wilson
Rosalie Wolf
Christina Yee

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Water Department has begun a resource study of water use, due for completion in two or three years. The study may well indicate that one or both reservoirs will be needed. The American Water Works Association states that reservoirs should be used in pairs. This is particularly important because it is the only reservoir at an elevation of 305 feet.

The Mayor twisted the arm of the Water Department to declare one of these reservoirs surplus before the water resource study is completed. Don’t let her get away with this kind of political manipulation.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Kurt Common
Ken Crizer
Ed Dierau
Herb Naylor
CCSF Engineering Professors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The South Balboa Basin has been unused since college leased buildings, including a large auditorium, were torn down on that site thirty years ago. We hope that three years of thorough planning would explore the possibility of returning a part of that property to the college for the development of a multi-purpose medium-sized auditorium which could be shared with community groups.

Joseph Alessi
Mary Argenti
Neyda Azavedo
John Bischoff

Robert Bossino
Mack Crooks
Bob Davis
Helen Diwolth
Franz Enciso
Richard Esterman
Richard Feiner
Lawrence Ferrara
Ted Fleming
Peggy Garman
William Grothkopf
David Hardiman

Judy Hubbell
Charles Hudspeth
Sieglinde Johann
Baruch Klein
John Koonstmark
Joshua Law
Steven Lopez
Jerry Mueller
Madeline Mueller
Marvin Bartak
Frank Townsell
City College Music Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition E. This moratorium is necessary because there are too many worthy uses for this land to make a hasty and potentially very costly decision. Only through careful planning can the limited land available for development be best used.

Jerome Hosken
Robert Kaiser
James Kerk
Dack Lee
Chelcie Liu
William Maynez
Annette Rapleyea
Oleg Reoott
David Well
City College Physics Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, as Physical Education Instructors, have always been committed to a diversified program for our students and community. The reservoir space is a natural land resource for a Multi Educational and Cultural Center.

Your YES vote on E will allow us the freedom to explore ways that this property could most constructively benefit all.

Nicolos Alexander
Paul Hewitt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, full-time faculty of the Computer and Information Science Department of City College, urge a YES vote to postpone the decision until additional planning and surveys can be conducted. The current proposal would negatively impact the College’s enrollment.

Gail Barton
Curtis Decker
Brad Duggan
Tanako Hagiwara
JoAnn Hahn
Daniel Hayes

Lenz Johnson
Grover Klemmer
Paula McCullum
Art Octavio
Louise Scourkes

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

William Beaver
Ronald Cerruti, Chairman
Kirk Gibson
Howard Grenger
Frank Holden
Michael Kelly

George Lanyi
Norman Ludkey
Charles Metzler
Charles Miller
Marilyn Schnake

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

A YES vote on Proposition E helps STOP a scheme to GIVE AWAY $12,300,000 worth of City land for $1,800,000 (or less) to a Redwood City real estate developer.

A YES vote will SAVE taxpayers $550,000 per year. The housing project will produce $240,000 in taxes, but supplying City services will cost $790,000 per year.

The Controller's cost estimate does NOT account for the $12,300,000 land value, since land sale below value is NOT technically a cost of government. The Controller also is NOT permitted to assume that the housing project will be constructed, since construction has NOT yet been ordered by the Board of Supervisors.

The plan does NOT restrict housing sales to moderate-income first-time buyers. The plan only restricts use of tax-subsidized funds. Any person favored by the developer or politicians can buy these dwellings and get the benefits of the public land giveaway.

The houses are made "affordable" by giving away the land far below market value, by City-backed low interest, and by cutting construction corners.

The real beneficiaries of the subsidized housing project are the financiers (NOT the project dwellers). Bondholders receive 9.6% average tax-free interest, which is equivalent to 24.6% taxable interest at 61% maximum tax. The developer and bond establishment receive $5,340,000; this is $26,300 (or 22.40%) for each $117,400 unit.

The City loses $51,700 worth of land GIVEN AWAY for each unit.

Vote YES on Proposition E for good fiscal management.

William Marquardt
Financial Analyst, SNaP
Helen Crizer, Treasurer, SNaP

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of College</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Campus (acres)</th>
<th>Area/1000 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City College of SF</td>
<td>22,624</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laney College, Oakland</td>
<td>9,805</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot College, Hayward</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa College</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of San Mateo</td>
<td>13,820</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>11.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Marin</td>
<td>6,663</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given these facts, why does the Governing Board not try to get the old West Campus back? Why don't they support this moratorium to delay the land grab?

The Governing Board is under political pressure from City Hall. They have been threatened with the loss of the north reservoir parking lot and funding for special projects. Forgive them.

Vote Yes on E.

Friends of City College
David Newton
Glen Simpson
Jack Baker
Thomas Velasquez
Tillie McCullough

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The student population at City College is increasing. This semester's enrollment is up 1,265 students over last semester.

The enrollment in the San Francisco public schools has been increasing by 1,218 per year for the last three years. City College draws most of its enrollment from public schools in San Francisco.

Obviously, City College will have a larger enrollment in the future years, and will be in desperate need of space if we do not give it back its old West Campus.

Please reserve this public land for the college.

Please vote YES on E.

Barbara Holman

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON E

In 1981, I launched a six-point program to expand San Francisco’s housing supply and the voters had approved a City policy to add 20,000 new housing units within five years. This Proposition would destroy a major portion of the effort to build affordable, single-family housing in our city.

The Balboa Reservoir Site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now a site for development of 203 new single-family homes, most with three bedrooms and two baths. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed as other homes built under the City’s program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom could not afford homeownership. It is believed that these new homes will sell rapidly.

The Balboa Reservoir site is one of the few sites large enough to accommodate a substantial number of new homes. Please do not let a few people stop a major opportunity for new housing. Vote no on Prop E.

Not only would Proposition E halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site, but the 9.8% fixed-rate, 30-year mortgage money set aside for the housing would also be lost.

Nothing constructive is accomplished by this measure—it does not provide additional land or facilities for City College. As a matter of fact, City College has neither plans nor money to use the property. Further, the Community College Board of Directors, the governing body for City College, has voted overwhelmingly to oppose the initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No on E.”

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the site of the unused Balboa Reservoir and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost.

These homes are desperately needed for San Franciscans who can’t afford to buy in the city where the average house is selling for over $160,000. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

The homes would be built on land that belongs to the City. Over two years ago, it was declared surplus and available for housing. It is not part of City College, and City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

We urge you to vote no on Proposition E if you want more affordable housing for San Franciscans.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

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

The 203 affordable owner occupied single family units slated for the southern portion of Balboa Reservoir are part of the 1988 total. Our progress in addressing the City’s housing shortage will be curtailed if this ill-advised initiative is approved. SUPPORT OWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Housing production is essential to check rising prices and to maintain our social, economic, and ethnic population diversity. AS A SAN FRANCISCO VOTER, YOU CAN BE PART OF OUR HOUSING PROGRESS BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

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

WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT THE CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY HOUSING BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

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

Doris M. Ward, Member
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

A critical issue facing San Francisco today is the lack of housing middle class San Franciscans can afford.

That is why I have joined these neighborhood associations to support the Balboa Reservoir neighborhood housing proposal. Those participating in the development of the proposal includes: O.M.I. Community Association, Dorado Terrace Association, Outer Mission-Ingleside Political Action Committee, Greater Ingelside Community, Mount Davidson Manor, Ocean Avenue Merchants Association, Ingleside Terrace Association, The San Francisco Open Space Committee, City College of San Francisco.

From early in 1985 I worked closely with these neighborhood groups in the discussions between city government and community leaders concerning the development plans for this desperately needed new housing at the unused Balboa reservoir site.

THES A REASONS YOU SHOULD VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

1. The neighborhood housing proposal that this initiative seeks to stop is the result of months of hard work by the largest coalition of neighborhood associations ever to join together to plan a housing development in San Francisco.

2. The housing at the Balboa Reservoir site was designed with the involvement of the coalition of neighborhood associations to enhance the surrounding community.

3. The governing Board of the Community College District has made clear that they have no plans for the site and no ownership rights to it. City College does not oppose the construction of this development and opposes this initiative.

4. Self-proclaimed “Friends” of City College want to stop the proposal in order to preserve the site for future faculty parking. A clique of City College staffers involved in a neighborhood association pose as community opposition to this development even though a representative from this organization, the Sunnyside Neighborhood Association, had helped plan and support the proposal.

5. By masquerading as concerned neighbors these self-appointed “friends” of City College hope to prevent the construction of 204 critically needed units of housing and pull off one of the biggest land grabs in San Francisco’s history.

DON'T BE FOOL ED. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Residence Element of the Comprehensive Plan of the City and County of San Francisco assesses the City’s housing needs and lays out specific steps to meet those needs. This document was adopted by the City Planning Commission in 1984 after extensive public review at neighborhood meetings and public hearings, and consideration of the detailed Environmental Impact Report.

The first objective of the Housing Element is “to provide new Housing for all income groups” in locations appropriate for residential development. To meet this goal, development of housing is to be aggressively pursued and encouraged on surplus, underused and vacant public land.

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

If you want more affordable housing in San Francisco vote no on Proposition E.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Susan J. Bierman, City Planning Commissioner

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

Vote NO on E. Proposition E deprives San Franciscans of one of their last real chances to become homeowners at an affordable price. At the South Balboa Reservoir we have City-owned land on which 203 units of three-bedroom, two-bath homes can be built at low prices which average San Franciscans can afford to pay. These homes need to be built now, not in three years. In three years the low interest rates on mortgages and the bond financing will be gone. Two hundred families will have lost the opportunity to become homeowners, and the City will have lost the opportunity to ease the tight market in rental housing.

Nor does this ill-conceived initiative help City College in any way. City College does not need this land. Speculation that the College may at some future date find a use for the land is not founded on fact. The College may never be able to build on the reservoir. Their enrollment has dropped by over 4000 students in the last few years.

This initiative is designed to confuse you. It will make our housing shortage worse for three long years. If you support affordable housing in our City, Vote NO on Proposition E.

Bill Maher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Balboa Reservoir site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now planned for development of 203 new single family homes. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed — other homes built under this program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom would not otherwise be able to afford home ownership.

San Francisco has the most expensive housing in the nation where last year the average home sold for over $160,000. Housing is difficult to produce because the obstacles are great — little land on which to build, high construction costs and uncertain interest rates.

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost. The initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional land or facilities for City College. The Community College Board, the governing body of City College, in fact recently voted to oppose this initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No” on Proposition E.

John L. Molinari

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

In 1980, the voters of the City and County of San Francisco approved a measure making it City policy to add 20,000 new units of housing within five years. In 1984 in an effort to satisfy this objective, the Board of Supervisors adopted a policy encouraging the expansion of the City's housing supply. Making surplus City-owned land, such as the site at Balboa Reservoir, available for affordable housing was an important part of that policy. A proposal to build 203 homes on the unused Balboa Reservoir site was advanced to help implement the pro-housing policy.

Approval of Proposition E would HALT construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.

The Balboa Reservoir homes would be built on land currently belonging to the City and County of San Francisco. The property IS NOT part of the City College, and City College has neither plans or money to buy the property and convert it for City College use.

The only debatable issue is the future of affordable housing on the Balboa Reservoir site.

As we are all aware, San Francisco has the most expensive homes in the United States. The average cost of a home is $152,000. Not many can afford such prices. However, the housing proposed for the Balboa Reservoir will give many more citizens the opportunity to become homeowners. The homes to be built will be sold to first-time buyers at prices ranging from $83,000 to $45,000.

Other homes built in San Francisco under the direction of similar affordable housing programs have been snapped up quickly by San Franciscans. Without the program, most would not have been able to purchase the home and become homeowners.

Again, if you desire to preserve the construction of more affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site, vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Willie B. Kennedy
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Additional single family housing is undeniably San Francisco's most acute social need. When some vacant surplus City land (12 acres) finally becomes available for 203 additional new private homes there will always be some selfish individuals who are in favor of new housing "just so long as it is not built across the street from me!" This unused, vacant City reservoir land hasn't generated a dime of taxes for over thirty years! Let's add 203 NEW home-owner taxpayers to the City's rolls as quickly as possible. Stop these self-serving no-growth obstructionists! Please vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Prop E would halt affordable housing construction at the Balboa Reservoir site. Many gay people need affordable housing, too, and we join with other community groups urging you to vote NO on Prop E.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Robert Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E, if approved, would block the construction of 203 badly needed single-family homes on the south portion of the Balboa Reservoir in San Francisco. Sixty percent of these homes would be available for purchase by moderate and middle income families at purchase prices between $80,000 and $120,000. They would be constructed on surplus public land and financed by the sale of mortgage revenue bonds to enable the developer to sell the homes at below market prices.

A neighborhood group headed by two city college faculty members is responsible for placing Proposition E on the ballot. The group contends that the land which is intended to be used for the project should be made available instead to City College for the construction of new teaching facilities even though enrollment at City College is declining and the City College Board has voted 6 to 1 to oppose the initiative.

Like many other areas of the country, San Francisco suffers from a shortage of housing. Purchase prices here are among the highest in the nation. The use of surplus public lands and revenue bond financing provide a means for making single family homes available to a broad spectrum of families at affordable prices.

The Balboa Reservoir project is supported by the leaders of 8 neighborhood groups in the area surrounding the location of the proposed project and by a majority of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, as well as by Mayor Dianne Feinstein. We urge you to encourage the construction of this type of housing in San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition E.

San Francisco Board of Realtors
William L. Jansen, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

SAVE OUR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS!
BERNAL HEIGHTS SAYS, "VOTE NO ON PROP E!"

We are residents of Bernal Heights in San Francisco. We've worked hard to build affordable family and senior citizen homes in our neighborhood.

We need more affordable housing in our City to survive. The real issue in Prop E is affordable family housing — a "yes" vote prevents the construction of 203 family homes. That's crazy! Join us in preserving what's best in our City. Vote "no" on Prop E!

Sylvia M. Yee, Bernal Heights Community Foundation Board of Directors***
Frank Hutchins, BHCF Board*
Mary Lou Berlotti, BHCF Board*
Leila Havener, BHCF Board*
Elizabeth Egger, BHCF Board*
Sister Janet Simons, BHCF Board*
Stephen Antonaras, BHCF Board*
Lorenzo R. Dill, BHCF Board*
Barbara Bagot, BHCF Board*
Margaret C. Randolph, Northwest Bernal Block Club*
Maureen Land, NWBBC*
Tim Molinar, BHCF Planning & Dev't Committee*
Buck Bugot, BHCF F & D Committee*
***Organization for identification purposes only.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco Needs Affordable Housing—Vote No on Proposition E

Everyone agrees that San Francisco needs affordable housing. The questions are how and where that affordable housing can be built.

The Balboa Reservoir housing development, to be built on the site of a reservoir built thirty years ago and unused since that time, answers those important questions for more than 200 San Francisco first-time homebuying families by providing:

—203 new affordable three-bedroom, single family homes
—9.8% fixed-rate financing
—A mix of 30% low-income, 30% moderate-income and 40% market-rate first time buyers
—A convenient site that has been declared “surplus” by the City and “available for development of affordable housing”

The Balboa Reservoir housing development is a small but significant step in the effort to generate affordable housing in our City.

Thousands of San Franciscans from every community, neighborhood group and viewpoint agree that the Balboa Reservoir development is good for San Francisco. Virtually every elected official, including the Governing Board of City College also agree.

All these San Franciscans ask you to say “yes” to affordable housing and “NO” to Proposition E.

San Francisco Coalition for Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar, Executive Director

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The viable plan for affordable single family housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site is being threatened by Proposition E. If Proposition E passes, 203 single family homes will be lost to the citizenry of San Francisco at a time when they are greatly needed.

The facts about the proposed housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site argue strongly against Proposition E. All 203 homes will be for first time home buyers. One-third of the homes will be available to households earning $27,000. Another third of the homes will be available to households earning $36,000. Adequate parking will be provided within the development itself, thus answering any concerns that traffic in the area will be congested.

City College has no need or plan to use South Balboa Reser-
voir for its facilities. City College’s priority is to develop its existing campus. South Balboa Reservoir should therefore be used for one of the City’s greatest needs: increased and affordable housing which is available to lower and middle income families.

As homeowners who live in the vicinity of South Balboa Reservoir, we welcome its planned use for single family housing and feel it will become an integral and contributing part of the community. We therefore urge you to vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Submitted by:
Stephen Graham, Chairman of the Housing Sub-committee of the Citizen’s Committee for Community Development
Roderick A. McLeod, Vice-Chairman of the Citizen’s Committee on Community Development

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing is a group of neighbors which consists of many of the renters of Westwood Park and Sunnyside neighborhoods as well as owners and renters of Ingleside which are the closest neighbors to the Balboa Reservoir along with some of the students and teachers of City College.

We strongly support the Balboa Reservoir for housing. We believe that the Balboa Reservoir is an ideal spot for housing.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

As Merchants as well as residents of Ocean Avenue, Greater Ingleside and San Francisco, we support the Development of the Balboa Reservoir as housing.

A Traffic Survey has stated that there will be minimal impact on the existing patterns of traffic by this development.

Additional City College Parking is being considered on another location off I-280 to keep the college congestion away from the neighborhood's streets.

City College has 44 more acres in which to expand and existing buildings at City College have viable means to expand.

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

Proposition E would stop construction on much-needed affordable, single-family housing at the long vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. This proposition would also block a major housing development that would bring jobs into an area of the city that has little industry or private business.

Sale prices for these units are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the San Francisco housing market, where the average home is selling for $160,000. Construction of these homes will help all young, first-time home buyers and will require only 5% down, instead of the 20% down payment on houses bought with conventional home mortgages.

This plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by nine nearby neighborhood organizations. If Proposition E is approved and this project is blocked, more young adults will purchase their first home in Vallejo or some other outlying area, further draining San Francisco of the young families that every growing community needs.

San Francisco residents will gain apprenticeships, jobs, contracts and subcontracts from this development.

This plan calls for 2 and 3 bedroom, family-sized houses, with space for another bedroom which can be finished when needed.

Each house will have 2½ parking spaces in front and would not cause parking problems in the area. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

City College of San Francisco has no plans to buy the property, has no money for institutional expansion, nor any mention of this land in any master plan. Some supporters of this proposition are motivated by racist notions and have said they fear that this development will become another "Geneva Towers." This type of thinking is similar to support for apartheid practiced in South Africa and must be defeated by progressive San Francisco voters. Property values will increase, instead of a decrease as a result of this project.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition E.

Larry Ukali Johnson-Ried — President, O.M.I. Pilgrim Community Center Inc. 
Maria Campbell-Casey — Program Director, Bay Area Engineering Societies Committee for Manpower Training, Inc. 
Clara Mills-Brady — Program Director, O.M.I. Senior Center 
John C. Jackson 
Linda Rose-Gipson 
Jon Still — Secretary, Young Adult Committee 
Kenneth Butler

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote "No" on Proposition E.

Affordable Housing Alliance — Mitchell Omerberg, Director 
Bay Area Urban League — Gregory Best, Field Representative 
Bernal Heights Community Foundation — Andre Lennell Daye 
Community Educational Services — Dorothy Chen, Executive Director 
Japanese Community Youth Council St. Francis Square Apartments, Inc. — Sandra Mayor-Jenkins, Secretary 
Minority Contractors Association of Northern California — James Haugabook, Secretary, Board of Directors 
National Community Congress — Dr. Eddie C. Welban 
Parkmerced Residents Organization, Inc. — Ricardo A. Callejo, Esq. 
Poteet Hill Neighborhood House — Enola Maxwell 
San Francisco Building Trades Council — Stan Smith 
San Francisco Housing & Tenants Council — Joseph Lacey 
San Francisco Tenants Union — Jim Rye 
Rev. Amos C. Brown — Local Pastor & Community Servant 
Greg Day — Chairman, Citizens Committee on Community Development 
Polly Y. Marshall — Commissioner, San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board 
Regina A. Sneed 
Jim Wiadock — San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee 
Michael E. Willis, AIA — Fleming Corporation
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Greater Ingleside Political Club—Frank Noto, Treasurer
Housing Conservation and Development Corporation—Louie Lawson,
Board of Directors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Bayview Baptist Minister Fellowship—Rev. N. B. Mills, President
Bread of Life Missionary Baptist Church—Rev. S. A. Bailey
Cosmopolitan Baptist Church—Rev. A. Ray Gentle
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Raymond M. Howard Sr.
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Carole Nelson
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Cornelius P. O'Reilly
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Paul G. Theiss
Old St. Mary's Housing Committee—Charles Gale, Chairman
St. Peters Housing Committee—Tessa Rowerol

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!
You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: With certain exceptions, City officers, including elected officials and commission members, may represent clients before City boards and commissions other than their own, and be paid for their services. State legislators may represent clients before City boards and commissions, and be paid for their services. Any person may contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would prohibit City officers from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay. This proposition would prohibit State legislators from appearing before City boards, commissions and departments on behalf of clients for pay. City officers would be prohibited from discussing with these officers and legislators matters that the City is deciding. Proposition F would also prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit City officers and State legislators from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to allow City officers and State legislators to represent clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to allow any person to contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

Controller's Statement on "F"

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

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

How "F" Got on Ballot

On February 26 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for limitations on compensated advocacy and campaign contributions had qualified for the June ballot.

Quentin Kopp, Marth Gillham and Cheryl Arenson, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 9,400 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,986 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.
Compensated Advocacy
& Campaign Limits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The purpose of Proposition F is to cut campaign contributions by large contributors (and thus reduce campaign spending) and eliminate undue influence by officeholders retained as paid lobbyists for projects requiring City approval.

Let's take a minute to analyze the untrue arguments against Proposition F.

• The opponents claim that Proposition F will force half the City's Commissioners to resign. In fact, Proposition F does not force any Commissioners to resign. It simply says they can't be a paid lobbyist and a City Commissioner at the same time. Does a commissioner value making money by lobbying more than public service?

• Some have also alleged that Proposition F will prevent duly-elected union leaders from serving as City Commissioners. No it won't. Proposition F prohibits "compensated advocacy"—that means lobbyists hired by an organization, not members of the organization itself. Proposition F does not apply to salaried employees of labor unions, corporations, or non-profit agencies. Moreover, Section 8.105 of the Charter precludes it specifically from applying to any member serving as a representative of any profession, trade, business, union or association on any board or commission which requires membership of representatives of specific professions, trades, businesses, unions or associations.

• Another untrue argument against Proposition F is that it prohibits City officials only from discussing pending issues with other City officers or State Legislators who are also acting as paid lobbyists in a matter and doesn't stop those officeholding lobbyists from writing City officials about their clients' objectives. That's not so. Proposition F applies to all such lobbying, written or oral. (The dictionary defines "discuss" as "to examine by means of speech or writing.")

End government decision-making by "insiders" and reduce the influence of money on local campaigns.

VOTE YES ON F.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
San Franciscans for Good Government

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

In all our years of observing San Francisco City government, we have found one maxim to be true time after time: a good idea gets copied, especially among politicians.

For no sooner did Quentin Kopp promise to bring Proposition F to the voters than did Mayor Feinstein come up with an informal, administrative version of her own. Fine, you say (and the Mayor says), then why vote Yes on Proposition F?

(1) The Mayor's remedy of asking City Commissioners who also act as lobbyists before City agencies to resign is nothing more than a hand slap, and is good only as long as she is mayor. It's not binding on future mayors and could be changed without any vote of the Board of Supervisors, let alone the people of San Francisco. Proposition F prohibits this kind of conflict-of-interest, and it will be the law, no matter who is mayor.

(2) The Mayor's action did nothing to state legislators who can also act as lobbyists before City Boards and Commissions,

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The worst and most persistent problem in American politics is that politicians and political races can be "bought". Reducing the size of campaign contributions will be a step forward in reducing the role of money in elections. Vote yes for more honest government.

John J. Barbogalata
Harry Alego
June Cahn
Dorothy Partridge

Robert Aresman
Rudolph Lehnis
Janet Wentworth

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

RESTORE to the people their rightful and equal power as individual voters by reducing the monetary clout and influence of private interests who make the laws and the policies as City officials and Commissioners or State legislators.

TELL the special interests that their money and influence can no longer interfere with representative government.

TELL the special interests that the voters will no longer tolerate the influence-buying which comes with large campaign contributions.

TELL the special interests that this measure will encourage highly talented citizens to serve San Francisco honestly and responsibly.

VOTE YES ON F.

Cheryl Arenson
Anne Renfrew
David Pacheco

Tom Hayes
Dorothy Vukovich

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

"Government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

These noble words from Abraham Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address, cast in bronze at the entrance to City Hall, seem to have escaped the attention of some City officials who pass by them every day. For in San Francisco City government, Lincoln’s simple formula for representative government would read quite differently: “Government of the powerful, by the lobbyists, and for the wealthy.”

Government of, by, and for the privileged few is bad government. Government of, by, and for all the people is good government. It’s as simple as that—as simple as Lincoln first put it.

Proposition F, the Good Government Initiative, will help San Franciscans maintain control of their government and will prevent undue influence by City officeholders.

To reduce undue influence, Proposition F outlaws the practice of City Commissioners and State Legislators representing special interests for pay before City Commissions and Boards. City Commissions should render their decisions deliberately and impartially, not be swayed by the political clout of the lobbyists appearing before them, or by any political favors those lobbyist/politicians might promise. “I’ll scratch your back if you scratch my back” bargains do not belong in government. And until such backroom bargains are made illegal, City government will not belong to the rest of us either.

Proposition F also reduces the maximum amount that anyone can give to a local candidate from $1,000 to $500. If large contributors and other special interests can’t give as much money, they can’t buy as much influence with elected officials. And the lower the contribution limit, the less campaign spending and the more City government will be responsive to all San Franciscans.

You can “buy back” City government from the privileged and powerful with the most precious of all political commodities: your vote.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Mary Lohneis
Peter Fatouh
Judith Thorson

Babette Drefke
Daniel Jordan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F, an initiative of the people, is needed to protect the voters and the integrity of the legislative process from being corrupted by the power of money and influence. It prevents City officials and State Legislators from lobbying the City on behalf of high-powered special interests. It also lowers the campaign contribution limit from $1,000 to $500, thus reducing the influence of those same special interests over our elections and elected officials.

The bogus argument that the Mayor won’t be able to find qualified people to serve on City commissions if Proposition F is adopted ignores the plain fact that there are 700,000 people in San Francisco, a pool of civic-minded citizens more than large enough to accommodate the 250 commission appointments available in our City government. For example, there are plenty of architects to fill the one architectural appointment on the Art Commission, just as there are plenty of non-lobbyist business people and lawyers available to serve on other commissions.

Thousands of San Franciscans, not just the “insiders”, are ready, willing, and able to serve the public.

Proposition F deserves your vote. Restore integrity to City government. Restore the confidence of the citizens of San Francisco in that government. Let’s have no more Wilkes Bashford situations.

VOTE YES ON F.

Oscar Sutro
Martha Gillham
Marguerite Warren

Leonel Monterey
Tony Kilroy
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE “NO” ON F

This proposition disguises itself as “good government” but, in reality, would drive good people out of government. It is so cruelly drawn—so sweeping in its implications—that it would bar from government almost anyone with even a remote business or community tie to government.

It would purge from City commissions anyone who “directly or indirectly” receives compensation from any “interests” with an issue before any City agency. Effectively, this could discriminate against employees from community and neighborhood groups, civil rights organizations, non-profit corporations, labor unions, merchant and business groups, as well as architects, lawyers and other professionals.

Actually, there currently are no commissioners who represent any clients before any City agency. All who are appointed in my administration sign a statement saying they will not advocate for any paying client before any official body of the City while they are commissioners. This proposition simply is not necessary.

Proposition F also would lower the limit for any individual campaign contribution from $1000 to $500. Although this sounds good, it would permit a wealthy person with various businesses and numerous family members to contribute many thousands of dollars through different sources. This would encourage “hidden” contributions. We must strive for disclosure of contributions, not a system which drives contributions underground. Candidates must be able to raise funds enough to put their message before the voters. Reducing the contribution limit can be a tactic to discourage persons from challenging incumbents.

Vote no on Proposition F.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition F purports to achieve a noble objective: The removal of “influence peddling” from City Hall. In fact, Proposition F is so poorly-crafted, it may have exactly the opposite effect on City government. It is not a “good government” initiative. It is bad legislation.

Proposition F provides no definitions and no standards for the public to judge whether City officials comply with its restrictions. Its uncertainties will be chaotic and lead to endless, needless lawsuits.

A measure similar to Proposition F was rejected by the Board of Supervisors because no public hearings were ever held on the legislation. If the public had had a chance to comment on this initiative, it might not have the critical shortcomings, deficiencies and uncertainties that now warrant its rejection by responsible San Franciscans.

In the coming months, the Board will review good government measures that are comprehensible, effective and, most important, certain. Proposition F is a misguided disaster.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

This should properly have been titled the “SINK WILLIE BROWN ORDINANCE”! The “meat of the cocoanut” is in Section 4.

Supervisor Kopp’s intentions are good, however this sloppily drafted and incomprehensible measure succeeds in “burning down the barn” to eliminate a couple of rats!

Under this proposal, to avoid any potential INDIRECT conflict of interest, (which is undefined!), one would have to be a destitute, unemployed welfare recipient to qualify for service on any City Board or Commission! The Mayor has already solved this “hired advocacy” problem with the “conflict of interest” affidavits she demands IN ADVANCE from any prospective appointee.

Quentin’s proposed $500.00 campaign contribution limit is an “inside joke” and he, of all people, knows it! It merely obliges a heavy contributor to have his wife, children, business associates, or friends send in SEPARATE $500.00 checks if he wants to contribute more than $500.00 to a politician’s campaign.

These proposals require additional City employees for enforcement and wind up doing far more harm than good. Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O’Keefe, Sr., President
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Union members and labor officials have legitimate reasons for meeting with City officers. It is unfair and wrong to lump them in the same category as special interest lobbyists, yet that's exactly what Proposition F does. Working people deserve representation on City boards and commissions. VOTE NO!

Walter Johnson
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council
LaRay King
James Elliot
Keith Eckman
Reena Olson

Jeff Greendorfer
Stan Smith
Larry Griffin
Steve Rubbida
Terrence Ryan
Jack Beggs
Tony Marovich

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

If you want to ban business owners and executives from serving on City boards and commissions, then vote for Proposition F.

If you think board members of non-profit corporations and employees of community agencies have nothing to contribute to City government, then vote for Proposition F.

If you believe union members and labor officials should not have a voice at City Hall, then vote for Proposition F.

But if you share our belief that these individuals have legitimate concerns and expertise that is valuable in running major City departments, then join us in voting NO on Proposition F.

Proposition F is a simplistic, sloppily-drafted, meat axe approach to a problem already resolved by Mayor Feinstein's ban on commissioners lobbying on behalf of private clients.

Proposition F is not good government and it is not reform. Proposition F is bad legislation. VOTE NO.

Hon. Douglas Engmann
Hon. Charlotte Berk

Hon. Eugene Friend
Hon. Phyllis Lyon

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

We're sympathetic to the need for political reform. But it's a complicated problem, and Proposition F just isn't the way to go.

Frankly, we can't tell who is and isn't affected by this measure. While a handful of people sometimes might abuse their positions, that's no reason to question the integrity of so many solid citizens who give tirelessly to public service. Proposition F is simply the wrong approach. Please join us in voting NO.

Hon. Amy Meyer
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Walter Jebe
Hon. Bruce Lilienthal
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Jean Kortum
Hon. Thomas Horn
Hon. Henry Berman
Hon. Robert McCarthy
Hon. Richard Guuggenheim
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Hon. Patrick McGrew
Hon. Kirk Miller
Hon. Melvin Lee
Hon. Jerry Berg
Hon. Bonnie Gibson
Hon. Mary Noel Pepsy
Hon. Mark Bueli
Hon. Tim Carreiro
Hon. Jo Hanson
Hon. Kevin Malone
John Sanger
Tom Moore

Donald Disher
Jim Wucheb
Anne Daley
Linda Post
Lyenne Williams
Todd Dickinson
Peter Hanson
Herbert Kurlan
William Scooritz
Van Hart
Iris Fluellen
Noum Rand
John Schmidt
James Mock
Thomas Karwoki
Wendy Goldberg
Joseph Schwartz
Belle Lazarus
Antonio Barrios
Bruce Barrett
Charles Howell
Walter McGaire
Sharon Davall
Joyce Mauriello

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Concerned about elected officials spending $400,000 to run for supervisor and $1 million on a mayor's race? Then vote NO on Proposition F.

That's right. NO.

Proposition F isn't going to do anything about campaign spending. Prop F simply limits the size of contributions, reducing the current limit from $1,000 to $500. Supervisors can and will continue spending outrageous sums on their re-election campaigns. With Proposition F they'll just spend twice as much time raising money from twice as many sources, and that makes

William E. McDonnell
Frances May McAteer
N. A. Sapunar
Caroline and Michael Figoni

Martin D. Murphy
Eugene C. Payne III
Suzanne B. McCarthy

special interests even more powerful. They can always find ways around campaign limits.

We need campaign spending reform, but Proposition F doesn't provide it. Please join us in voting NO on F.

District 8 Democratic Club
Stephen L. Tobler
Ruth Gnanats
Alan Raznick
Miriam Blaustein

Linda Chapman
Dale Carlson
James Firth
Debra Barnes
Leni Serbin
Debra Stein

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

When campaign contributions are limited, political freedom suffers. Your right to free speech includes not only your right to express your views, but also your right to support as much as you want, any candidate who speaks for you.

Minority viewpoints depend heavily on the contribution of a few dedicated supporters to get your message out. To limit your financial support of your beliefs is to silence your political voice.

Only incumbents, who have many opportunities for free media exposure benefit from this assault on free speech. The dangers of a campaign contribution limit far outweigh any possible benefit from this proposition. Defeat Proposition F!

San Francisco Libertarian Party
Michael R. Fowler, Secretary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

You may think Prop F only applies to big-time lawyers and a few legislators who represent developers. Think again!

Prop F would prohibit many community leaders from public service. If it passes, board members and employees of community and charitable organizations could be banned from serving on City boards and commissions.

We appreciate the public need for a government free of “influencing peddling.” But restrictions on “compensated advocacy” ought to be clearly and carefully crafted to protect the voices of community leaders who argue on behalf of the public interest, not private special interests.

Vote No.

Hon. Juanita Del Carlo
Mission Hiring Hall

Bob Ross
Publisher, Bay Area Reporter

Hon. Jeffrey Ken Mori
Japanese Community Youth Council, Inc.

Bill O'Callahan
American Red Cross

Hon. George Sancin
Horrizons Unlimited

Hon. Jean Rita Alvar
Mission Education Project

Hon. Greg Day
Pall Street Town Hall

Hon. Naomi Gray
Hon. James Foster
Carol Wong
Marlena Marseille
Lee Woods
Jo Daly
Dennis Collins
Hon. H. Welton Flynn

(Organizations listed only for purposes of identification.)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will have no effect on developers' lawyers. None.

It won't make any difference to state legislators either.

Don't kid yourself. This is not “reform” and it isn't “good government.” Proposition F will allow the special interests and influence peddlers to continue exercising influence over our elected officials. It has so many loopholes, lobbying will actively continue, untouched, in the back rooms of City Hall.

And developers will always find ways around campaign contribution limits. As Common Cause has noted, Prop F simply makes tracing their dollars more difficult for the public.

Real reform would directly attack the source of huge contributions—the developers and other special interests that employ the lobbyists to peddle their influence.

VOTE NO.

Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
David Looman
Michael Mason

Rich Walker
Susan Klugerman
Rene Cazuenave
Margie O'Driscoll

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION G
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has adopted an ordinance prohibiting the City, with certain exceptions, from purchasing goods or services from companies doing business with South Africa. The Board of Supervisors to identify the companies which have the greatest ties to Apartheid so that the public can also boycott those companies.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a declaration of policy that says the City must try to avoid doing business with companies that significantly profit from or help maintain the Apartheid system in South Africa. It calls on other public bodies and private groups to adopt similar policies. It directs

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to avoid doing business with companies that help maintain Apartheid, and you want a public boycott of those companies.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

“The proposed Declaration of Policy be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.

How “G” Got on Ballot

On November 6, 1985 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for the City to boycott businesses with significant ties to South Africa had qualified for the June ballot.

Arlo Hale Smith, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,546 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on October 11.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,941 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:
It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
South Africa Boycott

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This measure calls for a public boycott of companies that aid apartheid.

Any claim of "conflict" between Proposition G and existing anti-apartheid legislation is imaginary: It is the legislative intent of supporters of this measure that it can be construed as a directive for making existing law tougher.

Personal attacks have no legitimate place in a ballot measure campaign. As proponent of this measure, I repudiate all such tactics.

Vote NO on apartheid. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Arlo Hale Smith

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Boycotts are grassroots politics. They've helped the farmworkers, they've helped win integration, and they can help end the legal racism called "Apartheid".

A Gallup poll found 77% of South Africa's black majority favoring international economic boycotts to force the Apartheid regime to accept reform peacefully.

After the Boycott Initiative made the ballot, the San Francisco Supervisors unanimously passed a similar city purchasing policy. The issue that remains is whether to call on the general public to join in, boycotting companies identified by the Supervisors as the worst offenders in each industry.

The companies that would be targeted consider profits to be the "bottom line". Economic pressure is all they understand.

The AFL-CIO, NAACP, and NOW have called a boycott of Shell Oil because of its profiteering from South Africa's oppressive economic conditions. Proposition G supports that and would put the same pressure on other industries as well.

This proposition is supported by the elected county central committee of the Democratic Party, the Peace-and-Freedom Party and the Humanist Party, and by leading attorneys, such as Terry Francois, Terence Hallinan, Tony Serra, Lewis Hope Lee, Marc Van Der Hout, Abby Ginsberg and Terence Redmond.

If South Africa were a democracy, its majority would long ago have voted to end Apartheid. We need to vote Yes — because they can't.

Atty. Arlo Hale Smith, Democratic Party County Central Committee
Paul Kangas, Peace and Freedom Party
Lois Salisbury, Public Advocates
Dr. Kevin Donaher, Food First
Jesse James, Mission Rebels
Terry Collins, Community Activist
Stony Gebert, Election Action
Robert McCall, Hotel & Restaurant Employees
Executive Board Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Attorneys speak out against Apartheid:

South African police can arrest anyone without charge. They can hold you incommunicado — no contacts with family, lawyers or press.

They regularly censor news, books, music. They have banned Christmas caroling, funerals and other peaceful gatherings. Groups which criticize the government are forbidden to hold meetings.

Blacks are subject to legal segregation; their property and employment rights are greatly restricted; often, they are simply murdered.

As attorneys, we help people who have legal rights that are being violated. But what can we do for those who have no legal rights?

Boycotts and other economic sanctions are the only way to make the Apartheid government accept reform peacefully.

In the Court of World Public Opinion, Apartheid has been convicted of crimes against humanity. By imposing a sentence of economic isolation, we can end Apartheid.

Vote Yes — take a stand for justice.

Terence Hallinan
Arlo Hale Smith
Terry Francois
Karen Anderson Ryer
Robert R. Bryan
Ann Menasche
Rachel Ginsburg
Leo Poli
Gabriel Gesmer
On Prouchovnick
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is a moderate, responsible but effective proposal to bring economic pressure on the South African government to establish constitutional rights for all of its citizens.

Vote Yes.

Terence Faulkner, Republican
Mike Garza, Republican

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

All decent Americans abhor apartheid. However, boycotting U.S. investment in South Africa is counterproductive; it only penalizes the actual victims of apartheid.

U.S. international firms have acted as progressive agents for change through the Sullivan principles. Their investments have improved the social and economic condition of the labor force.

It is improper to penalize their positive contributions.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

We are individuals and organizations working actively to end the racist system of apartheid in South Africa. And we are voting NO on Proposition G.

Why?

(1) Because Proposition G will weaken San Francisco's present divestment law. This law requires companies doing business with the city to sign affidavits that they will make no new contracts with South Africa.

Proposition G has no such provision.

(2) Proposition G provides no mechanism or funding to carry out its declared purpose of "boycotting" South Africa.

Proposition G will not stop South African products from entering the Port of San Francisco.

Vote against this useless, confusing, and deceptive initiative.

Preserve the stronger divestment law San Francisco already has.

Vote NO on Proposition G!

Yvonne Golden
Geraldine Johnson
Dr. Julienne Malveaux
AFT 2121 Anti-Apartheid Committee
Artists Against Apartheid
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Coalition of Conscience
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club Executive Committee
ILWU 10 and SEIU 250 Southern Africa Liberation Support Committees
National Conference of Black Lawyers
San Francisco Anti-Apartheid Committee
Southern Africa Freedom Committee/All Peoples Congress

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1983 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against on a single measure!

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

PROPOSITION H

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?

Yes 303

No 304

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Several city and private agencies conduct various programs related to AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a declaration of policy that says San Francisco should support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council, consisting of a Committee on Education and a Fund-Raising Committee. The Research Committee would make recommendations on the most useful AIDS research projects and try to prevent duplication of efforts. The Education Committee would inform the public about the latest research and about ways to prevent AIDS. The Fund-Raising Committee would seek donations and grants for AIDS research and education projects.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

“The proposed Declaration of Policy for an AIDS research and education council and the formation of advisory committees of civic leaders would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, additional expenditure of public funds for AIDS research may result, the amount of which cannot be determined.”

How “H” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for AIDS research had qualified for the June ballot.

Stony Gebert, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 10,540 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on December 6, 1985.

A check of each signature on the petition showed that 7,564 of the signatures were valid. This is more than 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We need a council to expose and address major AIDS issues without the impasse of present medical/political bias.

As taxpayers, we are subsidizing a treadmill of continual AIDS casualties. There are major oversights where AIDS is concerned. Only recently was it learned that CDC statistics suggest 79% of early AIDS cases appear drug-related. We hear AIDS is 100% fatal. Perhaps that is because death may also be drug-related in the way of immuno-suppressive antibiotic and radiation overloads to already compromised immunity systems. Prevailing medicine is both tunnel-visioned and high-profit motivated. Also well-funded. This solution may be part of the problem. Some physicians are beginning to feel where AIDS is concerned many current practices are ethically, medically bankrupt.

Remissions occur. Largely through immunity-enhancing, holistic medicine. Significantly, only 1% of AIDS cases occur among people at risk in the Asian community. Perhaps this is due to less drug abuse or use of an unfunded, ignored resource: herbology as part of diet. More options: homeopathy, acupuncture, etc.

If, as anticipated, upwards of 40% of those testing positive come down with AIDS, we may become overburdened. To ignore all of the above becomes part of the problem. Vote Yes on Proposition H.

Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Rich McKirkeby, Former Orderly,
   Marketing Associate, Pacific Bell
Joseph P. Clady, AIDS Hospice, Shanti Counselor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There is great need for research and education about AIDS and related conditions.

We need to attack the disease, not its victims.
Knowledge is the only vaccine available today.
Vote Yes.

John Lorenzini, President,
People With AIDS Alliance
Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Jan Beck, Steven Russell, Eugene Ewins, ARC/AIDS Vigil

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There are many possible treatments for AIDS and related conditions which are not being examined by the federal government, especially therapies based on natural substances and processes.

Vote Yes for an AIDS Research Council open to all viewpoints.

Scott Gregory, M.D.
Paul Kangas

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

A tape recording (Talking Book) of the San Francisco Voter Information pamphlet is available from the San Francisco Public Library’s branch for the blind. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

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

Name__________________________________________________________

Address______________________________________ Apt. #_______

Telephone No. (required)________________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any)___________________________________

Signature_______________________________________________________
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

PROPOSITION I

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway? YES 307 NO 308

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the Freeway with a surface roadway.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City’s policy to remain as it is, and you want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to change the City’s policy, and you do not want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a policy statement asking whether or not the Embarcadero Freeway should be torn down.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway demolished, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by at least $10.2 million in local funds. Potential private sector financing and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “I” Got on Ballot

On March 3 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy placing the question of demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway before the voters had qualified for the June ballot.

Richard Hongisto, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 11,119 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,720 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

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

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land now under the Broadway ramps is put back on the tax rolls, with low-rise buildings limited by restrictive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when united with Proposition J, recognizes these facts:

1) The Embarcadero Freeway is what is left of a never-completed elevated freeway that would have ringed the City through North Beach and Marina neighborhoods to the Golden Gate Bridge.

2) Today this massive freeway, which separates us from our waterfront, would never be built.

3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.

4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman’s Wharf will be preserved.

5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked for this new system.

6) Only that portion of the Embarcadero Freeway east and north of the Main and Beale Street ramps—basically the portion directly on the waterfront—will be removed to make way for the new system. The removal cost, approximately $10 million to be paid for with privately-generated new revenues, is a relatively small part of the overall new system.

As for Proposition I, vote "YES, let’s tear down the Embarcadero Freeway." Then turn to Proposition J and support the plan for a beautiful waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Removing the Embarcadero Freeway will allow San Francisco to:

- Create a six-lane, tree-lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero.
- Build on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway.
- Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula.
- Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero.
- Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.
- Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won't benefit San Francisco. Don't let outsiders determine our future. Vote YES on I.

Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Jack Wholey
Roger Boyer
A. Lee Knight
Robert Bradford
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Donald A. Crosby, AIA
Ray Y. Okamoto
Robert Meyers
Ralph Hurtado
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Douglas G. Wright
Anita Sanchez
Chuck Forester
Fritz Arko
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones
Randall Rossi
Karl Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Brunkena
Jon Twichell
Jane Winslow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON I

This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY—VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds—without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city’s fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.

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

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT—VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let spe-

HON. DORIS W. KAHN
MONICA H. HALLORAN
LISA KLAIMONT
JEFFREY HELLER
NANCY KATZ
ROBERT KATZ
BOB ISAACSON
JOHN BEHANNA
CITY LIGHTS BOOKS, INC.
KENNETH R. LERCH

ALAN LABLINER
NORMAN ROLFE
JERRY HURTADO
GREGORY E. JONES
MARC KASKY
JAMES W. HAAS
RICHARD REINHARDT
MRS. BLOND PLATT
DONALD BLACK
DAVID M. HARTLEY

MAIL COMPLETED FORM TO:
Registrar of Voters
Room 155 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

PREPARED FOR

MAILER \\

Election Date June 3, 1986

PLEASE PRINT REGISTERED NAME:

FIRST NAME MIDDLE NAME LAST NAME

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

NUMBER AND STREET DESIGNATE N, S, E, W CITY ZIP

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT DO NOT PRINT DATE (AREA CODE) DAYTIME TELEPHONE

I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.

(AREA CODE) RESIDENCE TELEPHONE

THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT PROPER SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE

STREET OR BOX

CITY STATE ZIP

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE.

waterfront freeway! Where will they all go?

Aside from the outrageous demolition costs involved, (some engineers estimate $40,000,000 of taxpayer money!), eyeball ob-

O N T R E K R E E F E , Sr., President

San Francisco Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled.

Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO

current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, clos-

ing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Pru-

dence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its

unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should

stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our

local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I
In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should also replace the waterfront, which spells out the construction, would never be built.

1) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.

2) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south.

FROM:

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?
¿FIRMÓ SU APLICACIÓN?

Place Postage Here
14¢ Coloque la estampilla aqui

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

Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Donald A. Crosby, AIA
Ray Y. Okamoto
Robert Meyers
Ralph Hurwad
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Douglas G. Wright
Anita Sanchez

H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones
Randall Rossi
Karl Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
Jon Twitchell
Jane Winslow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON I
This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY—VOTE YES ON I
Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds—without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city's fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities. **DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT — VOTE YES ON I**

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honor. Doris W. Kahn</th>
<th>Alan Lubliner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monica H. Halloran</td>
<td>Norman Rolfe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Klarmon</td>
<td>Jerry Hurado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Heller</td>
<td>Gregory E. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Katz</td>
<td>Marc Kasky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Katz</td>
<td>James W. Haas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Isaacson</td>
<td>Richard Reinhart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Behanna</td>
<td>Mrs. Bland Platt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Lights Books, Inc.</td>
<td>Donald Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth R. Lerch</td>
<td>David M. Hartley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to 157 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown, Fisherman’s Wharf and the financial district would be reduced.

Travel within the city would be slowed down at all hours. Vote no to the destruction of the freeway.

*Supervisor Richard Hongisto*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
- Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
- Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
- If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that—By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
- Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
- MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
- Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

*Judith Torneese*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Tear it down? The concept is preposterous! There are 70,000 cars a day whizzing by on this high speed downtown elevated waterfront freeway! Where will they all go?

Aside from the outrageous demolition costs involved, (some engineers estimate $40,000,000 of taxpayer money!), eyeball observation, logic, and just plain "common sense" dictates that ground level "total gridlock" will result if this expensive freeway is now destroyed.

Nostalgic individuals must realize that the times have changed! We can't bring the Bay back up to Montgomery Street! On behalf of San Francisco's overburdened taxpayers, we urge a NO vote!

*SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled.
Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

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

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a policy statement that says that the City would replace the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt a policy statement which says that the Embarcadero Freeway would be torn down if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt a policy statement to replace the Embarcadero Freeway under these conditions.

Controller's Statement on "J"

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

"The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway replaced with a tree-lined six lane boulevard and other traffic and transit improvements, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by approximately $27.5 million. This includes a one-time freeway demolition cost of $10.2 million plus $17.3 million required to match potential federally-funded transit improvements. Potential financing by the State and private sector and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost."

How "J" Got on Ballot

On March 5 a declaration of policy regarding the future of the Embarcadero Freeway was delivered to the Registrar from the Mayor and several supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows the Mayor or four or more supervisors to submit a declaration of policy to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

In addition to Mayor-Felstein, the March 5 document was signed by Supervisors Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker, Molinari, Kennedy and Nelder.

POLLS ARE OPEN
FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans now have a chance to remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with an at-grade, six-lane parkway, which will open our waterfront and restore views blocked for years by this large freeway.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for traffic and transit improvements:

• New, shorter freeway ramps connecting directly with The Embarcadero;
• A tree-lined, at-grade, 6-lane Embarcadero Boulevard, with a new waterfront Muni line, a jogging and bicycle path from Fisherman’s Wharf to Mission Bay;
• Extension of Muni Metro south to the Caltrain station at 4th and Townsend;
• New ramps connecting I-280 with The Embarcadero;
• Changes in traffic flow and improvements to existing freeway ramps.

Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman’s Wharf will be preserved and enhanced.

The Board of Supervisors has specified that the Embarcadero Freeway will be torn down only if preliminary engineering during the next two years confirms—as traffic and environmental studies already have—that removal of the freeway will not result in more problems than it solves.

San Francisco became eligible for $88 million in federal highway funds for this new system when the Supervisors approved the plan in 1980. The $10.2 million cost of freeway demolition itself can be paid from revenues from low-rise development of the parcels now under the Broadway ramps and the increased values of nearby properties. Strict waterfront zoning limits the size of any development.

Traffic and environmental studies by the California Department of Transportation since 1980 clearly indicate that the new waterfront transportation system will be vastly superior to the existing situation, and that traffic congestion levels will not be notably different with the elevated structure removed.

Vote Yes on J and let’s remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with a parkway and transit system—once again let us see our waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J gives the voters a chance to be heard on an important and timely issue. This issue is the replacement of a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway as one element of a comprehensive package of transportation improvements in the Waterfront area.

Last fall, the Board of Supervisors adopted for further study a set of traffic and transit improvements for the Waterfront. These improvements include:

• a new landscaped surface-level boulevard
• replacement of the Clay/Washington and Broadway on and off ramps with new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom
• removal of the unused stub of I-280 and construction of new ramps connecting the new waterfront boulevard to Route I-280
• a new light rail transit line linking Fort Mason with the Caltrain Depot
• extension of the Muni Metro to the train depot, improving the Peninsula Commute Service

A YES vote on Proposition J does not allocate funds for these projects. It does allow for further design and engineering studies, including cost analysis, assessment of impacts on traffic, and other matters. The studies will then be presented to the Supervisors so that they can make an informed decision on the plan. If the studies prove positive, San Francisco will be able to transform its Waterfront for the benefit of all.

Proposition J will insure that the City will not proceed with the removal of any of the Freeway until all the studies are completed and all potential consequences are assessed. This is the responsible approach. Vote YES on J.

SPUR
League of Women Voters
Embarcadero Citizens Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SAN FRANCISCO’S NEIGHBORHOODS ASK YOU TO VOTE YES ON J.

REDUCE TRAFFIC CONGESTION—YES ON J!

Traffic backed up by the Embarcadero Roadway slows travel and creates congestion in North Beach and other nearby neighborhoods. J will speed traffic flow.

IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION—YES ON J!

Proposition J will provide regular streetcar service along the Embarcadero and extend Muni Metro service to the south, ultimately extending to Bayview-Hunters Point.

PROMOTE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY—YES ON J!

If Proposition J does not pass, San Francisco could lose $88 million in federal funds for traffic improvements.

(continued)
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RESTORE THE WATERFRONT—YES ON J!
San Francisco’s waterfront could become a focal point for the city, graced by a grand promenade, instead of the dismal, deteriorating eyesore it is now.
San Francisco’s neighborhoods join together to ask your support for an improved Embarcadero. We guarantee the freeway will not be removed unless it is replaced by facilities that will assure a smoother, more efficient traffic flow. YES ON J!
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Robert Bradford
Ruth Gravant
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Anita Sanchez
Nancy Katz
Robert Katz
Beverly Mills
North Beach Neighbors
John Behanna
Herbert D. Kozovitz
Jerry Hurado
Gregory E. Jones
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors
Dale A. Carlsten
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Ralph Hurado
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Chuck Forester
David M. Hartley
Donald P. Black
Mrs. Bland Platt
Richard Reinhardt
James W. Haas
James Ream
Jill M. Jones
Peter J. Locke
Marjorie G. Sern
John B. Lowry
Lawrence Ferlinghetti
Nancy Peters
Steven Tiber

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J
SUPPORT PUBLIC TRANSIT—VOTE YES ON J.
SAVE SAN FRANCISCO FROM GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON J.
The revitalization of the Northeastern Waterfront...as included in San Francisco’s Master Plan and transit plans, as overwhelmingly approved by the Board of Supervisors and as urged by Mayor Feinstein...will allow almost $90 million in unused federal highway funds to be used for vital downtown and waterfront transit and street improvements which will be a key to reducing needless auto congestion in San Francisco.
PROPOSITION J SUPPORTS IMPORTANT TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS TO THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT. It will:
—extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific/Cal’Train depot
—create a new rail line (possibly using historic streetcars) to connect the entire waterfront from Mission Bay to the Ferry Building to Fishermen’s Wharf and Fort Mason
—set the stage for a possible streetcar line along Third Street
Since the city of San Francisco adopted the Transit First policy in the early 1970’s, transit investments in the Muni Metro, in new electric trolley an articulated bus service, and in BART and Golden Gate Transit, have saved downtown San Francisco from gridlock!
IF you are concerned about the future of transit in San Francisco, IF you are concerned about reducing needless auto congestion, THEN we urge you to join Mayor Feinstein and the majority of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in voting Yes on Proposition J.
Norman Rohe
San Francisco Muni Coalition
California Transit League
Jack Whaley
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Regina Sneed
Tony Kilroy
Hon. Jack Morrison
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Bay Area Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Hon. Amy Meyer, Recreation and Park Commissioner
Alan Lubliner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J
A SOUND BUSINESS PROPOSITION—YES ON J!
Common sense and good business demand we make the most of our resources. San Francisco’s waterfront is an economic and civic asset unrivaled anywhere—yet much of it is cut off by an ugly, noisy, elevated roadway. The traffic improvements called for by Proposition J will benefit workers, tourists, property owners, neighborhoods...and business.
—Traffic flow and transit will move quickly on a realigned, reorganized Embarcadero Roadway, allowing easier, more pleasant access to waterfront businesses.
—An improved and beautified Embarcadero will create new commercial opportunities and increase the value of existing property and businesses.
—New jobs and an expanded tax base will generate increased revenue for the city as several lots now covered by freeway ramps return to productive private ownership. Though limited to low rise development (40 to 65 feet), tax revenues from development will more than make up the city’s share of the project.
Robert Meyers
Dennis J. Potts
Kenneth R. Letch
M. Arthur Gensler, Jr., FAIA
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Dehert, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones
Randall Rossi
Karl A. Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
Jon Twichell
Pritz Arko
Michael J. O’Shea

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J OFFERS RESIDENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO A ONCE IN A LIFETIME OPPORTUNITY TO RECAPTURE THEIR WATERFRONT.

Converting the Embarcadero into a tree-lined boulevard and building a new streetcar line will make the waterfront more pedestrian and transit oriented, that is, more people oriented.

A freeway structure that is a source of objectionable noise and casts a pall over a large part of the waterfront will be removed. The waterfront will be opened up to sunlight and fresh air and made more inviting and cheerful to those who wish to walk on one of the world’s outstanding waterfronts. Air pollution that is now retained by the existing elevated structure will be dissipated.

The transit orientation of the new waterfront will encourage energy conservation. Proposition J will:

- Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero
- Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway
- Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula

- Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero
- Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line
- Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won’t benefit San Francisco. Don’t let outsiders determine our future.

VOTE YES ON J FOR A BETTER SAN FRANCISCO.

Sierra Club
Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage
Willinda McCrea*
Bob Crane*
Rebecca Evans*
Richard Livingston*
Marilyn Clements*
Jennie Lew*
Jeffrey Henne*
Jane Winslow*
Roger Boyer

A. Lee Knight
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Patrick S. Habin
Monica Halloran
 Walter K. Morris
Lisa Klarinent
Jeffrey Heller
Bob Isaccson
George T. Rockrise, FAIA
Jon Twicke
Marc Kasy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J GIVES US A CHANCE TO CORRECT A COLOSSAL MISTAKE!

The Embarcadero Freeway should never have been built. The original plan was to build a freeway from bridge to bridge, destroying the Northern Waterfront, Fisherman’s Wharf, Fort Mason, and Marina Green in the process. When the people of San Francisco saw what was happening, they stopped it in mid-air—literally.

Walk under it. Hear the noise. Feel the gloom. See how it cuts out light.

It’s time to remove this mistake.

The new waterfront plan will give us a tree-lined boulevard, a new streetcar line, and a Muni Metro extension to the Southern Pacific/Caltrain depot. It will give us a transit and pedestrian oriented waterfront that will give us pride and pleasure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J!

San Francisco Tomorrow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, with a membership of 1700 working architects in San Francisco, urges a “YES” vote on Proposition J. In 1968 the citizens of San Francisco stopped highway planners from ringing our waterfront with freeways. Today voters have another opportunity to return the waterfront to our citizens. Removal of the Embarcadero Freeway is one part of a carefully researched transit plan for San Francisco. This proposition supplies an unique opportunity to carry out a broad range of transportation improvements that will have many positive effects on the City of San Francisco.

Removal of the freeway will:

1. Return the waterfront to the people by removing this barrier to access and view.
2. Facilitate needed MUNI improvements.
3. Encourage development of the Embarcadero as a grand civic boulevard unifying the City of San Francisco.

The members of the American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition I and “YES” on Proposition J.

Donald Kennedy, FAIA
President
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans love their city, the ambiance, the Bay, waterfront, the views, the healthy neighborhoods.
Freeway builders did their damnedest to destroy the city and divide our neighborhoods.
Now we can remove that damned spot, the concrete dinosaur, the hideous barrier that destroys our scenic views, the fence that keeps us from the Bay, the concealer of the Ferry Building. Correct a mistake.

VOTE YES ON J.

Miriam Blaustein
Charlene Clark
Marie Cleasby
Zach Cowan
Dick Grosboll
Rick Hauptman

Tony Kilroy
Jean Karim
Ira Karlander
Jack Morrison
Andy Nash
Norman Rolfe

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

NO ON PROPOSITION J.
"J" is for JOKE—a cruel joke on us. What will J really do? Add traffic to every street east of Gough. Delay the construction of waterfront streetcar service. Cost millions in local dollars needed to improve MUNI. Create a ground-level freeway on the waterfront as big as Van Ness, with more cars.
I'm a private citizen who's concerned about traffic and what it's doing to our City. If you are too, vote NO on Proposition J.

Steve Colman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
• Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
• Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
• If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
—By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
—Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
—MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
—Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Blair C. Pascoe

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

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:
1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION A

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by boldface type.

3.203 Office of Risk Management
There is established under the chief administrative officer an office of risk management which shall review, analyze and report to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the finance committee of the board of supervisors the practices of the several departments, boards and commissions of the city and county regarding loss prevention and risk management, including the insurance requirements of the city and county. The office shall also establish and assist in the implementation of planning and operational guidelines regarding risk management and loss prevention for each department, board or commission. The chief administrative officer may appoint, at his or her pleasure, or contract with, a qualified individual or organization for the operation of the office. The qualifications of the individual or organization operating the office shall include relevant education, training and experience in insurance and risk management.

4.201 City Attorney
(a) The city attorney shall be an elective officer. He shall furnish an official bond in the sum of ten thousand dollars ($10,000). He shall appoint, and at his pleasure may remove, all assistants and employees of his office. He shall devote his entire time and attention to the duties of his office. He must, at the time of his election, be an elector of the city and county, qualified to practice in all the courts of the state, and he must have been so qualified for at least 10 years next preceding his election.

The city attorney must represent the city and county in all actions and proceedings in which it may be legally interested, or, for or against the city and county, or any officer of the city and county in any action or proceeding, when directed so to do by the supervisors, except where a cause of action exists in favor of the city and county against said officer. Whenever any cause of action exists in favor of the city and county, the city attorney shall commence the same when within his knowledge or when directed so to do by the supervisors. He shall give his advice or opinion in writing to any officer, board or commission of the city and county when requested. Except as otherwise provided in this charter, he shall not settle or dismiss any litigation for or against the city and county, unless, upon his written recommendation, he is ordered so to do by ordinance.

The city attorney shall prepare, or approve as to form, all ordinances before they are enacted by the supervisors. He shall approve, by endorsement in writing, the form of all official or other bonds required by this charter or by ordinance before the same are submitted to the proper commission, board or office for final approval, and no such bond shall be finally approved without such approval as to form by the city attorney. Except as otherwise in this charter provided, he shall prepare in writing the draft or form of all contracts before the same are executed on behalf of the city and county. He shall examine and approve the title of all real property to be acquired by the city and county.

He shall keep on file in his office copies of all written communications and opinions, also all papers, briefs and transcripts used in matters wherein he appears; and books of record and registers of all actions or proceedings in his charge in which the city and county or any officer or board thereof, is a party or is interested.

(b) The duties of the city attorney in connection with the bureau of delinquent revenue collections shall be transferred to and performed by the attorney for said bureau who shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

(c) There is established in the office of the city attorney a bureau of claims investigation and administration which shall have the responsibility of investigating, evaluating and processing for the several boards, commissions and departments all claims for money or damages made upon the city and county pursuant to section 7.703 of this charter or the general law of the State of California. Claims investigation functions of the police department in existence on June 4, 1986, shall continue as an adjunct to the bureau established under this section. Claims functions of the public utilities commission shall remain under that commission unless transferred to the bureau of claims investigation and administration by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the bureau shall also have the power to investigate events and occurrences giving rise to potential civil liability against the city and county and adjust and settle demands, within dollar limits to be established by ordinance, prior to their presentment as claims. There shall be established by ordinance a revolving fund to satisfy such claims adjusted prior to their presentment as claims. The bureau shall be responsible for the investigation of all claims and the analysis of city policies and practices upon which the bureau shall report and advise the several departments.

The city attorney shall appoint a chief of the bureau who shall serve at his or her pleasure. The chief of the bureau may appoint, subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors, investigators who shall serve at the pleasure of the chief; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of civil claims investigator or any equivalent classification on the date of approval of this amendment by the electorate shall continue to have civil service status in said position under the civil service provisions of this charter.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by boldface type; deletions are indicated by horizontal strikethrough.

7.100 Materials, Supplies and Equipment
The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreements for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies

shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract. All purchases in excess of one thousand dollars ($1,000) shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases and a permanent record of all such quotations shall be kept. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000); fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) for materials, supplies, and equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifteen-thousand-dollars ($15,000); fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of materials, supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two or more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned and may advertise for
bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting the manufacturer of delivery in other articles made and sold for the same purpose to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall direct the rejection of all articles which may be below standards, specifications or samples furnished. He shall not approve any bill voucher for articles not in conformity with specifications, or which are at variance with any contract.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall also have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment purchased and in use in all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the mayor and the controller. He shall not approve any bill voucher for articles not in conformity with specifications, or which are at variance with any contract. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.

7.103 Requisition, Contract and Payment

All purchase orders and contracts shall be based on written requisitions, or, for materials, or supplies in common use in the various departments, on the purchase orders or contracts in use by all departments. Purchase orders and contracts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000); fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) must be approved by the chief administrative officer. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall approve all bids and vouchers for materials, supplies, equipment, and contractual services before the controller shall draw and approve warrants therefor. All contracts for the purchase of materials, supplies and equipment shall be made after investigation by the chief administrative officer and shall be kept on file. When an award of contract is made, notice that the same has been made shall be given by one publication, and any interested person may examine the bids and records at the purchaser's office.

The controller of purchases shall by rules and regulations prescribed by the chief administrative officer and the controller, designate and authorize appropriate personnel within the purchasing department to exercise the purchaser's signature powers for purchase orders and contracts approved as provided in this charter.

7.200 Public Works and Purchasing Contracts

The construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements, and the purchasing of supplies, materials and equipment, when the expenditure involved in each case shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000); fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), shall be done by contract, except as otherwise provided by this charter. It shall constitute official misconduct to split or divide any public work or improvement or purchase into two or more units for the purpose of evading the contract provisions of this section. In an emergency, provided an actual emergency be declared by the board of supervisors to exist, and where authorized by resolution of said board, and public or private speci-fic work or improvement may be executed in the most expeditious manner. Notwithstanding any other provision in this section or this charter contained, upon the approval of the chief administrative officer declaring the work to be emergency in character, there may be expended by the department of public works the sum not to exceed five hundred dollars ($500) for new construction of any type in or upon unimproved or unoccupied streets.

Any public work or improvement estimated to cost less than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000); fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) may be performed under contract or written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials of city and county. Any public work or improvement executed by the city, other than routine repair work, shall be authorized and executed by the chief administrative officer, or by the heads of departments not under the chief administrative officer, only after approval by the board of supervisors. The approval shall be given by all parties concerned.

There shall be separate accounting for each work or improvement so executed, which accounting shall include all direct, indirect and supervisory elements of cost chargeable to such work or improvement, and each cost accounting shall be reported to the chief administrative officer, or to the mayor when such work shall have been performed by departments not under the chief administrative officer. All such accounts shall be reported to the controller. Any public work or improvement costing less than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000); fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) and not performed by the city and county labor, materials, and supplies shall, if not performed under contract, be covered by written order or agreement which shall be based on not less than three bids, notice of which shall be given by three days' posting. Records of such bids shall be kept by the department.

When the expenditure for any public work or improvement shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000); fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), the same shall be advertised as otherwise provided in this charter. The head of the department in charge of or responsible for the work for which a contract is to be let, or the purchaser of supplies in the case of purchases of materials, supplies and equipment, shall let such contract to the lowest reliable and responsible bidder not less than ten days after advertising by one publication for sealed proposals for the work, improvements or purchase contemplated. Each such advertisement shall contain the reservation of the right to reject any and all bids. The officer responsible for the awarding of any such contract shall require from all bidders information con- cerning their experience and financial qualifications, as provided by general law relative to such investigations authorized by department of public works.

The purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer for bids in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000); fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or the department head concerned, with the approval of the board or commission to which he is responsible, may reject any and all bids and readvertise for bids.

The department head or the purchaser of supplies, as the case may be, shall have power to sign such contract for the estimated expenditures thereunder not in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000); fifty thousand dollars ($50,000). Any contract involving the expenditure of more than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000); fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), relative to departments under his jurisdiction, or the signature of the department head and the approval by resolution of the board or commission concerned for departments not under the chief administrative officer.

The board of supervisors, by ordinance, shall establish procedure whereby appropriate city and county departments may file sealed bids for the execution of any work to be performed under contract. If such bid is the lowest, the contract shall be awarded to the department. Accurate units costs shall be kept of all direct and indirect charges incurred by the department under any such contract, which unit costs shall be reported to and audited by the controller monthly and on the completion of the work.

In any case where the lowest gross price or unit cost bid is not accepted, and a contract is entered into with another bidder, written report shall be made to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the controller by the officer authorized to execute the contract, with the reasons for failure to accept such lowest bid.

If any provision of this section is in conflict with any provision of section 7.100 of the charter, the provision contained in section 7.100 shall govern and control.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.

7.201 Public Works Contract Procedure by Ordinance

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter and, in particular, the provisions of section 7.200, the board of supervisors shall by ordinance determine the monetary limits not to exceed fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000); fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), within which the construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements may be done by contract or by written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county, consistent, save as to monetary limits, with the manner provided for in section 7.200 and section 7.201.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D, Continued from page 25

point two commissioners to terms of one year each, one commissioner to a term of two years, one commissioner to a term of three years and one commissioner to a term of four years. Thereafter, the terms of the commissioners shall be for four years from the commencement thereof. Not less than one-fourth of said commission shall be from the city, and one member shall have prior experience representing public utility interests, and one member shall have prior experience representing management.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of one hundred dollars ($100).

Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of considering and adopting examination questions shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission. The meetings shall be held between the hours of 3 p.m. and 5 p.m. Such person or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

In accordance with section 3.500, the commission shall have the power and it shall be its duty to appoint an executive assistant to be the administrative head of the affairs under its control who shall serve at its pleasure; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of assistant secretary to the civil service commission on the effective date of this section as amended shall continue to have civil service status in the position of assistant secretary under the civil service provisions of this charter.

3.661 General Powers and Duties

(a) The civil service commission shall be the employment and personnel department of the city and county and shall determine appointments on the basis of merit and fitness, as shown by appropriate tests.

The commission shall classify, and from time to time may reclassify, in accordance with duties and responsibilities of the employment and training experience required, all places of employment in the departments and offices of the city and county not specifically exempted from this charter from the civil service provisions thereof, or which may be created hereafter by general laws and not specifically exempted from the civil service provisions of this charter, but which, by the provisions of section 8.401 thereof, are made subject to classification for salary standardization purposes on the duties and responsibilities of the employment and training experience required. The civil service commission shall be the judge of such classification.

The commission shall also, in accordance with duties and responsibilities, allocate, and from time to time may re-allocate, the positions in the various classes of the classification. The allocation or re-allocated positions shall not adversely affect the civil service employees regularly holding such positions. Not person shall hold a position outside of the classification to which he has been appointed, provided that every employee of any department or office shall discharge any of the duties pertaining to such department or office to which his chief may temporarily assign him.

(b) The commission shall adopt rules and regulations for the conduct of examinations; and the rules shall govern applications; examinations; eligibility; duration of eligibles; certification of eligibles; appointments; promotions; transfers; resignations; lay-off or reduction-in-force, both permanent and temporary, due to lack of work or funds, reorganization, or completion of work; the filling of positions, temporary and permanent; classification; approval of payroll; and such other matters as are not in conflict with this charter. The commission may, upon one week's notice, make changes in the rules, which change shall thereupon be printed, and be in force; provided that no such change in rules shall affect a case pending before the commission. The commission secretary or his duly authorized assistant shall certify eligibles and promulgate and conduct examinations under the rules of the commission.

(c) The commission shall have power to institute and prosecute legal proceedings for violations of any of the civil service provisions of this charter.

(d) The civil service commission shall establish an inspection service for the purpose of investigating the conduct of and action of appointees in all positions and services and for the promotion and other purposes. All departments shall cooperate with the commission in making its investigations and any person hindering the commission or its agents shall be subject to suspension.

(e) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the civil service commission shall by rule establish procedures for the investigation of allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. The determination reached under civil service commission procedures shall be final and shall be enforced by every employee and officer.

3.661 General Powers and Duties

(a) The civil service commission shall have the power to inquire into the operation of the personnel system of the city and county to ensure compliance with the principles set forth in section 8.310. After such inquiry, the commission may recommend to the personnel director, as established pursuant to section 3.663, the mayor or to any other officer of the city and county such action as the commission believes necessary to carry out the civil service provisions of this charter. In any hearing conducted by the civil service commission or by any hearing officer it appoints, the commission may require the attendance and examination of any persons having knowledge of the facts, to hear and examine the evidence and require the attendance of witnesses and the production of records as provided in section 3.701.

(b) The civil service commission may require periodic reports from the personnel director in a manner and form which it shall prescribe.

(c) The civil service commission may hear appeals from an action of the personnel director with respect to any provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the civil service commission regarding allegations of discrimination shall forthwith be enforced by every officer and employee;

(d) No action by the personnel director which is the subject of any appeal shall be stayed during the appeal process except by the unanimous vote of the civil service commission.

(e) The commission shall be notified of the production, adoption, amendment or repeal of personnel regulations and may comment on such proposals. The adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing civil service employees shall be subject to ratification by the commission. In addition, the adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing merit system principles on classification, examination, examinations, promotions, transfers, resignations and terminations shall be subject to ratification by the commission. The commission shall ratify or reject any such regulation within 60 days of receipt. The commission's failure to act shall be deemed approval.

3.662 Department of Personnel Administration

There is hereby established a department of personnel administration which shall consist of a personnel director and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the civil service commission and whose job function is under the department of personnel administration shall be assigned to a position in the personnel department.

The department of personnel administration shall perform the personnel department for the city and county and shall provide a means to recruit, select, certify, appoint, train, evaluate, promote career development, classify positions, administer salaries, administer employee discipline, discharge and other personnel functions in order to maintain an effective and responsive work force.

3.663 Personnel Director

(a) A personnel director shall be appointed and serve at the pleasure of the mayor, provided, however, that the personnel director shall be selected from candidates nominated by any civil service commission and confirmed by vote of the board of supervisors. The nominee of the mayor may be appointed acting personnel director pending confirmation. The person so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of personnel director in the spirit of this declaration."

(b) The personnel director shall maintain appropriate examinations for employment, establish eligible lists based on the results and provide for certification of eligibles. The action of the personnel director on examination matters including,
but not limited to, announcements, minimum qualifications, classes of applicants, components, construction, weighting, content, type, list length, duration and certification shall be final.

c) The personnel director shall adopt personnel regulations which, except as otherwise provided in this charter, shall govern both the administrative matters within the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration and the exercise of the authority granted in this section, including, but not limited to, the following applications: examinations; qualifications; duration of eligible lists; certification of eligibles; permanent, temporary and provisional appointments; regular performance evaluations; promotions; transfers; resignations; layoffs or reduction in force due to lack of work or lack of funds, reorganization, retraining or completion of work; and classification. No personnel regulations shall be adopted, amended or repealed without a prior public hearing upon at least two weeks notice by the personnel director. After the meeting and conference sessions with recognized employee organizations as required by state law, all civil service commission rules relevant to the foregoing as well as the provisions of former sections 3832, 3833, 3836, 3838, 3839, 3840, 3841, 3842, 3843, 3844, 3845, 3846, 3847 and 3848 of this charter shall become personnel regulations on the effective date of this charter amendment.

(d) The personnel director shall conduct the salary surveys for the civil service commission as set forth elsewhere in this charter.

e) The personnel director by personnel regulations shall establish procedures to review and reconcile allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the personnel director shall forthwith be enforceable by every employee and officer, unless the decision is appealed to the civil service commission in accordance with personnel regulations.

(f) The personnel director shall investigate all employee complaints concerning job related conduct of City and County employees and shall promptly report to the source of the complaint.

(g) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall promote effective and efficient management through personnel programs that encourage high productivity and exemplary performance.

(h) The personnel director shall also be reviewed and approved by the Commission. Failure of the Commission to act within thirty days of submission of the contract by the personnel director shall be expedited so that final adoption of the eligible list is not delayed beyond sixty (60) days after the date of posting. Eligibles who, as a result of their ranking, would receive a notice of appointment regardless of the outcome of the process may be offered employment from the list pending the resolution of any protest(s) and amendment to the adopted eligible list.

8.326 Promotions in General

- Except as specifically provided for in section 8.327, the Civil Service Commission shall provide for examinations on an entrance, promotional or combination entrance and promotional basis. Consideration shall be given to permanent employees in separate promotional examinations and in promotional examinations which are combined with entrance examinations for city and county employees when the passing mark has been attained and may include evaluation of work performance and other criteria. When an examination announcement is issued for a class on both a promotional-and-entrance basis, there shall be one resulting list of eligibles which shall include all successful candidates both promotional and entrance in order of relative performance.

- Nothing notwithstanding to the contrary in this or any other provision of the charter, an employee who has been certified from a regular or adopted eligible list to a non-promotional position in a civil service classification shall be permitted to participate in promotional examinations on the same terms and conditions as a person holding a permanent appointment to a position in that same classification, subject to a demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period of one year, as may be provided by the charter commission.

- The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to promotional examinations announced after its effective date.

8.328 Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave

- Employees on permanent civil service position who, because of absence on duly authorized military leave after June 27, 1950, did not participate in a promotional examination held after June 27, 1950, and during time of war as defined in section 8.324 of this charter, and in which examination the employee would have been otherwise eligible to compete, had the war not intervened, and which examination is herein referred to as the original promotional examination, shall, after abridgment of military leave, have the right to have their examines transferred to a similar promotional examination.

- Provided, that persons and employees who were on entrance or promotional eligible lists, shall, for the purpose of this amendment, be deemed to be appointed in their classifications from the time their names were reached for permanent certification while in the military service.

- In order to qualify for participation in a similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section, such employee shall have participated in the original examination, the passing of which examination is herein referred to as the original examination, or the employee shall have qualified for and participated in a similar examination subsequent to the entry of his military leave, or within thirty days after the effective date of this amendment. Failure to file such written request to participate in a similar promotional examination as herein provided shall be deemed a waiver of all rights of the employee to participate in such similar promotional examination.

- The civil service commission shall arrange to hold such similar promotional examination within a reasonable time after employee eligible to request participation in such examination under the provisions of this section have indicated their desire to so participate, or have waived their right to participate, as herein provided.

- The civil service commissioner shall be the sole judge of the adequacy of such similar promotional examination. If the employee obtains in the similar promotional examination a score rating equal to or
more than the minimum passing mark established by the civil service commission for inclusion on the list of eligibles resulting from the original promotional examination, his name shall thereafter be entered on the eligible list. No person shall be entitled to the benefits of a promotional examination in accordance with the relative excellence obtained by all the qualified participants in the original and similar promotional examinations. Such employees shall be eligible for appointment from such list of eligibles in accordance with civil service rules to any vacancy thereafter occurring, and subject to satisfactory completion of a probationary period as provided in section 8.340 of this charter for a period of four years after the date on which their name is entered on the eligible list and being eligible to permanent employment as it may deem just to candidates.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this or any other provision of this charter, an employee who has been certified from a regularly-adopted eligible list to a non-permanent position in a civil service classification shall be entitled to appointment to a permanent position within that same classification before the commission certifies to the appointing officer the names and addresses of persons standing highest on the current eligible list in the opinion of the employees, subject to a demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the commission.

The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to requisitions for permanent positions filled from and after January 1, 1980.

8.330 Duration of Lists of Eligibles

The civil-service commission may remove all names from the list of eligibles after they have remained thereon for more than two years and all names thereon shall be removed at the expiration of five years. The commission may also provide in the examination announcement that the list of eligibles secured thereby shall automatically expire at a date not less than two or more than four years after the adoption of such list.

8.331 Limited-Tenure Appointments

When in time of war declared by the Congress of the United States eligibles are not available for appointment from registers established through the regular-examination procedure as provided under Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof, the civil service commission may certify eligibles for wartime appointments to positions through informal and non-competitive tests. Such tests and appointees resulting therefrom shall be governed solely by the provisions of this section and by rule of the civil service commission adopted pursuant thereto and the tests shall be adequate in the judgment of the civil service commission to determine the capacity of applicants to perform the duties of the positions to be filled pending creation of lists of eligibles through the regular-examination procedure as provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof. Appointments made under the provisions of this section shall be designated "limited tenure appointments" and may continue only until regular lists of eligibles are established through the regular-examination procedure provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof but in no event to exceed six months beyond the cessation of hostilities. Limited tenure appointments may be terminated by the appointing officer at any time for lack of work or funds. Limited tenure appointments may be terminated by the appointing officer for good cause at any time with the approval of the civil service commission with reference to the procedures governing removals set forth in Section 8.342 hereof. Persons serving under limited tenure appointments as in this section provided shall be subject to discipline in the same manner as other employees in the civil service commission. No person shall be compensated under any non-civil service or emergency appointment or appointment as authorized under the provisions of the foregoing paragraphs of this section for a period exceeding one hundred and thirty working days.

8.332 Temporary and Emergency Appointments

When no list of eligibles exists or no eligible is available on an existing list for a position in the class, the appointing officer may make a non-civil service or emergency appointment for a period not exceeding one hundred and thirty working days. No person shall be compensated under any non-civil service or emergency appointment or appointment as authorized under the provisions of this section. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of thirty working days after the time such civil service eligible reports for duty are provided in accordance with section 8.329 of this charter.

If a list of eligibles exists for the position required, but immediate service is deemed necessary by the appointing officer pending the time an eligible from such list is certified and reported for duty as provided in section 8.329 of this charter, the commission may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment for a period not exceeding one hundred and thirty working days. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of thirty working days at the time of the appointment.

8.332A Certification of Eligibles: Rule of-Three

When a position controlled by the civil service commission is to be filled, the appointing officer shall make a requisition to the civil service commission for a person to fill it. Thereupon, the commission shall certify to the appointing officer the names and addresses of the persons standing highest on the list of eligibles for such position. In case the position is temporary, the commission shall certify the names and addresses of the three persons standing highest on such list. If there are fewer than three names on the list from which certification is to be made, there shall be certified the number thereon.

The appointing officer shall fill the position by the appointment of one of the persons certified. The provisions of this section as herein amended at the election of November 5, 1976, shall be applicable only to lists of eligibles finally adopted by the civil service commission pursuant to the provisions of section 8.323 of this charter or on or after the effective date of this amendment. In the event of such certification, sex shall be disregarded except when a statute or rule of the commission so requires.
mayor shall request and the supervisors shall make supplemental appropriation therefore in the manner provided herein for supplemental appropriations.

3.840 Dismissal During Probation Period

Any person appointed to a permanent position shall serve a probationary period. The civil service commission personnel director shall by rule establish a procedure that is more than six months in duration and up to a maximum of twelve months’ service for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed ranks of the police department, fire department, sheriff’s department and San Francisco International Airport police force shall be for twelve months except that in the case of the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve months’ service from the day following completion of the prescribed department field training officer program, but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment; provided further that probationary members of the uniformed ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in section 3.843 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four months may be established for executive and management classifications. At any time during the probationary period the appointing officer may terminate the appointment upon giving written notice of such termination to the employee, and to the civil service commission specifying the reasons for such termination. Except in the case of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments the civil service commission shall review the termination. The civil service commission shall by rule establish the procedures for such review. If the appointment resulted from an entrance examination the commission may declare such person dismissed by order that the employee be paid salary from time of the termination of the appointment; or (c) order the return of such person to a position in the classification from which that person was promoted and may recalculate the employee’s eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same promotional classification under such conditions as the commission may deem just.

The commission shall render a decision within thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person dismissed; or (b) order such person reinstated to the position without prejudice to seniority, salary or vacation pay which may have accrued at time of termination the appointment or order that the employee be paid salary from time of the termination of the appointment; or (c) order the return of such person to a position in the classification from which that person was promoted and may recalculate the employee’s eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same promotional classification under such conditions as the commission may deem just.

The decision of the commission shall be final; immediately prior to the expiration of the probationary period the appointing officer shall report to the civil service commission as to the competence of the probationer for the position; and if competent, shall recommend permanent appointment. The commission shall conclude the civil service commission from reviewing terminations for the purpose of future employability including terminations in the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments.

8.407 Definition of Generally Prevailing Rates of Wages

Notwithstanding any provision of section 8.401 or any provision of any other section of this charter to the contrary, generally prevailing rates of salaries and wages for those employees covered by section 8.401 of the charter shall be determined by the civil service commission as set forth below.

The civil service commission personnel director shall conduct a comprehensive investigation and survey of basic pay rates and wages and salaries in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment for like work and like service, based upon job classifications as provided in section 3.663 of this charter and shall make its findings, based on facts and data collected, as to what are the generally prevailing basic pay rates for each benchmark class of employment solely in the manner hereinafter provided. A benchmark class is defined as a "key class" within an occupational grouping selected as the class for which a representative sample of data will be collected.

Basic pay rate data for public and private employment shall be collected solely from the Bay Area counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, San Francisco and Santa Clara; provided, however, that for any benchmark class of employment for which the civil service commission personnel director determines there is insufficient data from Bay Area public jurisdictions the commission personnel director shall survey major public agencies in the state employing such class, major public agencies to be defined as those employing more than 3,000 persons.

The commission personnel director shall collect basic pay rate data for like work and like service from Bay Area public jurisdictions as follows:

(a) The ten most populous cities in the six Bay Area counties, namely the civil service commission personnel director.
(b) The ten most populous cities in these five Bay Area counties based on the latest federal decennial census.
(c) Agencies of the state and federal governments and from school districts and other special districts in the six Bay Area counties, identified by the civil service commission personnel director.

The commission personnel director shall collect private basic pay data from recognized governmental Bay Area salary and wage surveys of private employers in the city and county of San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. The data collected shall be limited to basic rates of pay and salaries actually being paid by public and private employers for like work and like service.

The term "prevailing rates of wages" for employers governed by charter section 8.401 and this section shall be defined as the rates of pay that are within the weighted average of the midpoint of the basic pay rates, excluding fringe benefits, for surveyed public and private employers and the median of the pay rates for private employers to be determined as follows:

(1) multiply the medians from the private and the midpoints from public employment data base by the number of employees in the given classification from each data base;
(2) add the products of (1);
(3) divide the sum in (2) by the total number of employees surveyed for that classification; and
(4) extend this figure by 10 percent to establish the maximum of the range and reduce this figure by 10 percent to determine the minimum.

When fixing rates of compensation the board of supervisors shall fix basic pay rates as close as reasonably possible to prevailing rates, provided, however, that the board of supervisors shall not set the maximum rate of pay for any class in excess of the maximum prevailing rate for that class; provided further, however, that no employee shall have his basic pay rate reduced to conform to prevailing rates except as provided for in section 8.406. For those classifications of employment in which the practice is customary, the schedules of compensation shall provide for minimum, not less than three intermediate, and maximum salary steps and for a method of advancing the salaries of employees from minimum to intermediate to maximum with due regard for seniority of service.

The term "basic pay rate" as used in this section is hereby defined as applying only to the basic rate of wages, with included range scales, and does not include any other benefits of employment or working condition benefits.

It is the declared intent of the qualified electors of the city and county that the elected supervisors or the mayor have any hostile power to provide any benefits of employment except those enumerated already provided for in this charter, and any addition, deletion or modification of benefits of employment enumerated in the charter shall be submitted, as a charter amendment, to the qualified electors of the city and county. The qualified electors expressly state that they understand that benefits of employment are sometimes referred to as "fringe benefits" of employment and the qualified electors expressly reserve the right to either grant or deny such benefits except those conditions of employment commonly referred to as "working conditions". Any reference to "fringe working conditions" shall mean those compensations which must necessarily be provided in order for the employee to perform his job description duties efficiently and safely, and shall include but not be limited to such working conditions and benefits as are typically included in the administrative provisions of the salary standardization ordinance and the salary survey.

The board of supervisors may, in his or her discretion, provide working condition benefit for the employees covered under this section and section 8.407 of this charter only in accordance with the following provisions:

(a) the civil service commission personnel director shall by rule establish, certify and recommend to the board of supervisors the terms and conditions on which all employees are provided for in the working condition benefits.
(b) The working condition benefit, as recommended by the civil service commission personnel director, is substantially comparable for like work and like service to that provided for the job classification and is provided to not less than 50 percent of the employees of the class in the jurisdiction covered by the salary survey.

9.108 Initiative, Referendum, and Recall

(a) The registered voters shall have power to propose by petition, and to adopt or to reject at the polls, any ordinance, act or other measure which is within the power conferred upon the board of supervisors to enact, or any legislative act which is within the power conferred upon any other board, commission or officer to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinance, act, charter amendment or other measure may be so proposed by filing with the registrar a petition signed by a number of registered voters of the city and county as many in number as the percentages hereinafter required of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor cast at the last preceding regular municipal election.

Any declaration of policy may be submitted to the electors in the manner provided for the submission of a petition, and when approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting on said declaration, it shall thereafter be the duty of the board of supervisors to enact an ordinance or ordinances to carry such policies or principles into effect, subject to the referendum provisions of this charter.

Any ordinance which the supervisors are empowered to pass may be defeated by a two-thirds vote of the board of supervisors, or by the mayor, and when so proposed shall be submitted to the voters at the next succeeding general election. No ordinance passed by the supervisors granting any public utility franchise
or privilege, shall go into effect until the expiration of sixty days from the date it becomes final. At the end of such sixty days such ordinance shall be in force and effect, unless within such period there shall be filed with the registrar a petition signed by registered voters equal in number to five percent of the entire vote cast for mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election, requesting that such ordinance be submitted to the voters. In case such petition is filed, such ordinance shall not go into effect until approved by a majority of the voters voting thereon at a general or special election.

If, before the time any other ordinance involving legislative matters becomes effective, there shall be filed with the board of supervisors a petition signed by qualified electors of the city and county equal in number to at least ten per centum of the entire vote cast for all candidates for mayor at the last preceding general municipal election at which a mayor was elected, protesting against the passage of such ordinance, the same shall be suspended from going into operation, and it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to reconsider such ordinance, and if the same be not entirely repealed, said board shall submit the ordinance to the vote of said electors either at the next general municipal election or at a special election to be called for that purpose, and such ordinance shall not go into effect or become operative unless and until a majority of the qualified electors voting therein shall vote in favor thereof. The provisions of section 9.109 and 9.110 of the charter shall apply to and govern the verification and certification of such petition.

Annual budget and appropriation ordinances, supplemental appropriation ordinances, the annual salary ordinance, or ordinances amending the same, the ordinances levying taxes, any ordinance appropriating money from the emergency reserve fund, ordinances authorizing the city attorney to compromise litigation, and ordinances necessary to enable the mayor to carry out any of the powers vested in him in the case of public emergency as defined in section 3.100 of the charter, ordinances enacted pursuant to section 8.410 of the charter, as well as ordinances relative to purely public matters, shall not be subject to referendum.

Any elective official, the chief administrative officer, the controller or any member of the board of education or public utilities commission may be recalled by the electors. The procedure to effect such recall shall be as follows: a petition demanding the recall from office of the person sought to be recalled shall be filed with the registrar. Said petition shall contain a statement of the grounds on which the recall is sought. Any insufficiency of form or substance in such statement shall in no way affect the validity of the election and proceedings held thereunder. No recall petition shall be filed against any officer until he has held his office for at least six months.

(b) In the event the representative of the board of supervisors, the mayor and the representatives of recognized employee organizations do not reach an agreement through the meet-and-confer process on matters contained in the annual salary standardization ordinance by March 15 of any year, the mayor shall recommend and the board shall adopt, approve or reject a schedule of compensation which reflects current prevailing rates for the classifications covered by Section 8.410 of this Charter the last good faith offer presented by the mayor or his representative.

In any year when an agreement on matters contained in the salary standardization ordinance has not been achieved, the civil service commission personnel director, upon receipt of a written demand from a recognized employee organization made upon the mayor and the personnel director shall prepare, prior to April 1, a schedule of compensation and administrative provisions which reflect additional rates that would be payable, and working conditions, based upon the last demands made by the recognized employee organization(s) which participated in the meet-and-confer process.

Said schedule shall be transmitted to the registrar of voters for submission to the electors of the city and county at a general election or a special election called for the purpose, and said special election shall be held no less than sixty (60) days from the date of the call. No such schedule shall be withdrawn after it has been received by the registrar of voters. At said election, the ballot shall contain the following two alternatives:

(1) Approval of the schedule of compensation based upon employee organizations last demands.
(2) Disapproval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

If a majority of the valid votes cast in the election favor paying the additional rates set forth in the schedule of compensation based upon the last demands of the recognized employee organizations which engaged in the meet-and-confer process, it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to amend the salary standardization ordinance to reflect said increased compensation.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION E

NOTE: All sections are new.

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

Section 1. This ordinance may be called the "City College Public Lands Preservation Ordinance.

Section 2. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall disapprove or deny, WITH NO EXEMPTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS, any building permit application for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, located across Phelan Avenue from the presently occupied campus of City College and consisting of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

Section 4. The term "building permit" includes building permits, site permits and any other permits for the performance of construction work.

Section 5. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of the ordinance shall not be affected thereby. It shall be in full force and effect. No provision of this ordinance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent implementation of the policy stated above.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION F

NOTE: All sections are new.

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

Section 1. The People of the City and County of San Francisco desire and are entitled to a local government whose officers do not engage in, assist or promote compensated advocacy on behalf of private interests before City and County commissions and boards while also serving as City and County officers.

Section 2. No officer of the City and County may, during the term of office, engage in compensated advocacy before any City and County board or commission, or any member of the board or commission or its staff, in order to represent any private interest, for which representation the officer receives, directly or indirectly, any compensation, reward or gift.

Section 3. Officers of the City and County shall not discuss matters pending before their commission or department with other City and County officers or state legislators when those other officers or state legislators are acting as compensated advocates for a private interest.

Section 4. No member of the California State Legislature shall appear before any City and County board, department or commission as a compensated advocate representing a private interest.

Section 5. In the financing of city and county campaigns: (a) No person other than a candidate shall solicit or accept, any contribution which will cause the total amount contributed by such person with respect to a single election in support of or opposition to such candidate, including contributions to political committees supporting or opposing such candidate, to exceed $500.00. (b) If any person is found guilty of violating the terms of this section, each campaign treasurer who received part or all of the contribution or contributions which constitute the violation shall pay promptly, from available campaign funds, if any, the amount received from such person in excess of the amount permitted by this section to the City and County Treasurer for deposit in the General Fund of the City and County. (c) This section shall not apply to any in-kind contribution of television or radio airtime to any candidate or committee granted to said candidate or committee pursuant to the "Fairness Doctrine" articulated in Cullman Broadcasting, 40 FCC 576 (1963).

Section 6. Any person violating the terms of this ordinance shall be subject to the penalties set forth in San Francisco Charter Section 8.185. Such penalties shall include, but not be limited to, removal from office.

Section 7. If any provision of this ordinance, or its application to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, it is the expressed intent of the people of the City and County of San Francisco that the remainder of the ordinance, or the application of such provision, or any other provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.
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rates and the same shall be in lieu of said annual compensation, and notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, said rates shall become effective and be payable as if adopted prior to April 1, of any year.

The provisions of sections 3.100 and 3.100-1, relating to the emergency powers of the mayor, shall not be applicable to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

11.165 Effective Date of Amendments
The effective date of the amendments, additions and deletions to the civil service provisions of the charter shall be ninety (90) days after the acceptance and filing thereof with the Secretary of State.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION G

We the people of San Francisco declare this to be our policy:

1) IT IS IMPROPER TO PROFIT FROM OR PROVIDE SUPPORT TO THE RACIST POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SYSTEM IN SOUTH AFRICA, KNOWN AS APARTHEID.

Therefore it is necessary to sever commercial ties to South Africa, until people of all races obtain equal rights in that country, including equal voting rights.

2) COMPANIES HAVING SUBSTANTIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH APARTHEID MUST BE CONSIDERED IRRESPONSIBLE.

(a) The Board of Supervisors must determine which companies doing or seeking business with the City have the greatest ties to Apartheid. Companies that have a significant involvement in profiting from or maintaining the Apartheid system, may, on that basis, be deemed "irresponsible bidders."

In purchasing goods and services and awarding other contracts, the city must give priority to avoiding such companies; the degree of the preference must be in proportion to the company's complicity with Apartheid, according to the following criteria:

— how much business the company does in or with South Africa;
— how much the company profits from that business;
— how much support the company provides the Apartheid government in taxes, loans, payments or other funding;
— the nature of the company's South Africa business;
— the degree of the company's cooperation with South African political censorship or secrecy agreements;
— the degree to which the company provides the South African government with the technology, materials and other means to maintain and enforce Apartheid.

(b) City funds must not be deposited or invested with any bank or other company which does business in or with, or makes loans to, South Africa.

(c) If any exception to the above policies is found to be necessary or appropriate, the responsible official must promptly and publicly report it to the Board of Supervisors, clearly describing the exception and the reasons for it.

(d) The term "city" includes all agencies, departments, officials, employees, units and subunits of the city and county of San Francisco, and all funds administered by or on behalf of the city or county.

(3) WE CALL ON ALL OTHER PUBLIC BODIES AND PRIVATE OR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS TO ADOPT SIMILAR POLICIES.

(4) WE CALL A GENERAL PUBLIC BOYCOTT, FOCUSING ON THOSE COMPANIES HAVING THE GREATEST TIES TO APARTHEID.

The Board of Supervisors must determine and announce which company or companies are the worst offenders within each major industry, so that the public can focus its boycott on those companies.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION H

SUMMARY: THIS INITIATIVE STATES THAT THE AIDS EPIDEMIC IS A MAJOR PUBLIC HEALTH PROBLEM OF CONCERN TO EVERYONE, REQUIRING INCREASED SUPPORT FOR RELATED MEDICAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION. IT CALLS FOR A COUNCIL FOR AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION OR SIMILAR UNITED EFFORT TO STOP AIDS.

The people of San Francisco hereby adopt the following policy:

The AIDS epidemic has rapidly become a major public health problem, costly both in human lives and in general community resources;

—the first steps in dealing with such a crisis are:
— the scientific research needed to discover and understand the nature, causes, co-factors, prevention, diagnosis and treatment of the disease, and
— the education of the public about the lessons of that research;

A proper program of research and education pays for itself in the long run;

Prompt action is urgent, because of the rapidly growing number of persons affected, increasing not only the suffering but also the difficulty of eradicating the disease;

The leadership and support of such an effort is everyone's responsibility;

While San Francisco's role in the overall effort against AIDS has been viewed as a positive example to other areas, the continued rapid increase in the spread of the disease means that we cannot afford to rest on our laurels or leave further responsibility to others.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:
We call on all appropriate government bodies as well as medical, professional, charitable and community organizations and concerned individuals to join together in an all-out effort to stop AIDS;

We call for support to an organized united effort along the lines of an AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION COUNCIL, including, in some form:
— A COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, to provide informed evaluations as to priorities among research projects and proposals, recommending those which are most cost-effective and most likely to produce early results useful in the prevention or treatment of the disease, to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts or neglect of promising approaches, and to provide the council with complete and up-to-date information regarding comparative results of experimental treatments, prevention programs and other existing research;
— A COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, to inform the public regarding prevention and other research findings, and to inform relevant government officials and the general public, concerning the factual basis for a re-ordering of current public funding priorities toward an increased war against disease, including research and education against AIDS and related conditions;
— A FUND-RAISING COMMITTEE, to solicit donations, lobby for grants, organize benefits and other fund-raising projects spreading the financial burden by appealing to many sources;

We ask the council and committees to be responsive and accessible to public input, to include representation of all interested groups, to consider all viewpoints, and to be capable of prompt action;

We ask appropriate city officials to determine whether a suitable form of such a council already exists; if it does, we wish the city to support it actively; if not, we wish the city to seek to encourage its formation by such means as may appear proper.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION I

SUMMARY: This initiative asks "Shall we tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?" The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated portion of Route 480 known as the Embarcadero Freeway. This initiative declaration of policy will give the voters the opportunity to establish the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco regarding the proposed teardown of the Embarcadero Freeway.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION J

Shall the City replace a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if such replacement would open up the Waterfront to its citizens, improve the tax base, and create a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic?
Candidates

FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER
JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: The Bill of Rights guarantees that every person accused of a crime shall have the effective assistance of counsel. Whether an individual is rich or poor, that person is entitled to a competent and dedicated attorney.

In San Francisco it is the duty of the Public Defender to uphold this sacred right. In every case, we provide the client with the best defense under the law.

In the last 7 years, my outstanding staff has done this work with the highest degree of professionalism. In the next 4 years, that same strong, professional, independent and ethical representation will continue.

Jeff Brown

FOR ASSESSOR
SAM DUCO

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I was elected your Assessor in 1978 and re-elected in 1982. My years in the Assessor’s Office were spent in a professional appraisal capacity personnel and administration. I have two university degrees, the coveted MAI designation, and am the recipient of a special Congressional Advisory Board award from the United States Congress. I have served in an advisory capacity, both nationally and internationally, in property tax administration and will continue to serve the taxpayers of the City and County of San Francisco in dealing with Article XIII A of the State Constitution. My community involvement includes participation in cultural, civic business organizations.

Sam Duca

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John D. Bardia, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Sala Burton, 1650 Shot Blvd., Representative In Congress, 5th District
Manuel Caballero, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
George Christopher, 170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Clerk
Linda T. Fries, 830 33rd Ave., Artist/Community Organizer
Brian Getz, 55 22nd Ave., Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson, Sheriff of San Francisco
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., International Vice President, ILGWU
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for Children & Youth
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3072 26th Ave., Executive Assistant to Sala Burton M.C.
Ephraim Margolin, 30 Seecin Way, Attorney
Carol Migdan, 56 28th St., Community Health Director
Linda Ann Post, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative
Jim Rivaldo, 430 Steiner St., Political Consultant
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Member, SF Community College District
Governing Board
Yori Wada, 565 44th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel W. Walker, 562 Campbell Ave., President — Local 250-A Transport Workers Union of America
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hillitias Ave., Minister
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor
C. R. Zanu, 1966 Pacific Ave., Auto Repair Proprietor

The sponsors for Sam Duco are:
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
Eugene L. Friend, 2910 Lake St., Investor
Nancy Pelosi, 40 Presidio Ter., Housewife and volunteer in politics
Walter H. Shorenstein, 740 El Camino del Mar., Chairman, Milton Meyer & Co.
Stanley Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Emma W. Louie, 1257 Jackson St., Housewife
Alfred S. Wisely, 2590 Jackson St., Chr. of Exec. Comm. of Diversified Holding Co.
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hinchley Walk, Physician
Gerson Bakar, 2310 Hyde St., Investor
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired
Joseph C. Orenco, Sr., 866 Faxon Ave., Publicity Dept. — S.F. Giants
James A. Scatena, 101 St. Elmo Way, Chairman of the Board, Scatena York Co.
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher
Frances May McAfee, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Recreation & Park Commissioner
Frederick F. Campagnoli, 2609 Larkin St., Attorney
Betty Brooks, 1738 26th St., Field Representative
Jess Turvel Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Businessman
Cyril I. Magnin, 994 California St., Merchant
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John H. Swanson, 145 Lake Merced Hill South, Bowling Alley Owner
Frances G. Goldman, 743 El Camino Del Mar, Child Guidance
Irma M. Bernardo, 2182 34th Ave., Housewife
Leo J. Murphy, 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Charles M. Cunningham, 475 Connecticut St., Self Employed
Lawrence V. Eppinette, 815 Fell St., Conf. Secretary
Mary M. O’Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Volunteer & Homemaker
Elizabeth R. Duca, 16 Wawona St., Homemaker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Application for Absentee Ballot
is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

Name ____________________________
Residence Address ____________________________
Mailing Address ____________________________
Signature ____________________________

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

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

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

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

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

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter en route to the polls have not been considered.
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YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 5, 1986.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
• are a U.S. Citizen,
• are at least 18 years of age on election day,
• are a resident of California, and
• are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, such as this one, you can only choose among the candidates of your party.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Senator, State Assembleymember, County Central Committee, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your polling place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 3, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in”. If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

Q—Can a worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
• Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
• mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see enclosed card).

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

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
• your home address,
• the address where you want the ballot mailed,
• then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail by absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 3, 1986.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS CONCERNING VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

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

STEP 1

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

D 第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.
Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabezuelas rojas.

D 第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.
Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perforé con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

D 第三步
請把帶針之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.
Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

D 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封內，票尾凸在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO ÚNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por un candidato de su selección, perfore la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta al nombre del candidato. Cuando hayan de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfore la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfore la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SÍ" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borraduras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

選民須知:

選出你的選擇的任何其他候選人；請在選票上標籤所指之候選人名打孔。如果有兩位或以上候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上標籤所指之所有候選人中，選出你要選的候選人打孔，但不要超過要選舉的候選人數目。

選出合格的非候選人的候選人，請在非候選選人選票背面所列的預定空位上寫下欲候選人所屬novation的職位和候選人的姓名。

選出任何候選人，請在選票上標籤所指之 "YES" 或 "NO" 字樣打孔。

選票上若有撕痕或黏貼物，選票作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔誤了，撕壞或損壞了，或撕破了、弄髒了非候選候選人的選票信封，應把該選票遞交給選舉區的監票員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

請在下頁開始投票

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
### GOBERNADOR 州長

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EILEEN ANDERSON</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singer and Dancer, Cantante y Bailarina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES “CHUCK” PINEDA, JR.</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Hearing Officer, Oficial de Audiencias Estatales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM BRADLEY</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor, City of Los Angeles, Alcalde, Ciudad de Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUGH G. BAGLEY</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman, Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK L. THOMAS</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*WRITE-IN* To vote for a candidate whose name does *not* appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### VICEGOBERNADOR 副州長

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEO T. McCARTHY</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor, Vicegobernador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*WRITE-IN* To vote for a candidate whose name does *not* appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### SECRETARIO DE ESTADO 州務卿

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARCH FONG EU</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State of California, Secretario de Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*WRITE-IN* To vote for a candidate whose name does *not* appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTROLLER</strong></td>
<td>GRAY DAVIS Member of the State Assembly</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN GARAMENDI State Senator, Businessman</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALISTER McALISTER Assemblyman</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TREASURER</strong></td>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH California State Treasurer</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATTORNEY GENERAL</strong></td>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP Attorney General</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEMOCRATIC PARTY

PRIMARIES JUNE 3, 1986

UNITED STATES SENATOR

CHARLES GREENE
ROBERT J. BANUELOS
JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT

ALAN CRANSTON

3/10/86

SENATOR DE ESTADOS UNIDOS

(SENADOR DE ESTADOS UNIDOS)

BRIAN LANTZ

UNITED STATES SENATOR

BERT DE LOTIO

137

135

133

State Board of Equalization

CONWAY H. COLLIS

Member, State Board of Equalization, Second District

Vote per One

Vote per One

162

150

148

146

144

142

137
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MICHAEL MOBERG</strong></td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Public Accountant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contador Público Certificado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SALA BURTON</strong></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress 5th District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diputada en el Congreso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANDREW KLEIN</strong></td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(WRITE-IN)* To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

164

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE SENATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>本區没有州參議員選舉。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MINDY D. &quot;MIKE&quot; NEVIN</strong></td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Inspector/Councilman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector de Policía/Concejal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JACKIE SPEIER</strong></td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, San Mateo County Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro, Junta de Supervisores del Condado de San Mateo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(WRITE-IN)* To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

182
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHIRLEY COHELAN BURTON</td>
<td>Photo-Journalist</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOAN M. TWOMEY</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAWN ATKINSON</td>
<td>State Central Committee</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB GEARY</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK J. EPPICH</td>
<td>Economist</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSAN KELLY KENNEDY</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARLO SMITH</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEXA SMITH</td>
<td>Corporation Legal Coordinator</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL FAZIO</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the printed instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>DANIEL NUSBAUM</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEANNE BAIRD</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>SAM DUCY</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $850,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans. YES 236 NO 237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 COMMUNITY PARKLANDS ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for acquiring, developing, improving, rehabilitating, or restoring urgently needed local and regional parks, beaches, recreational areas and facilities, and historical resources. YES 239 NO 240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 WATER CONSERVATION AND WATER QUALITY BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $150,000,000 to provide funds for water conservation, groundwater recharge and drainage water management, and clarifies language in the Clean Water Bond Law of 1984. YES 242 NO 243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 DEPOSIT OF PUBLIC MONEYS IN CREDIT UNIONS. Authorizes Legislature to provide for deposit of public moneys in any credit union. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect. Legislation already approved implementing measure could result in greater interest income to state and local governments. YES 246 NO 247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 PROPERTY TAXATION. Provides exception to property tax limit when acquisition or improvement of real property approved by two-thirds of voters. Fiscal Impact: By itself, measure has no fiscal effect. No increase can occur in local property tax rate unless bond issue is approved by two-thirds vote. State costs for tax relief programs could increase. State income tax revenues could decline as taxpayers deduct greater amounts for property tax payments. YES 249 NO 250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 ALLOCATION OF VEHICLE LICENSE FEE TAXES TO COUNTIES AND CITIES. Requires allocation of Vehicle License Fee taxes to local governments. Fiscal Impact: Measure would have no direct fiscal effect. Prevents Legislature from changing the law to take vehicle license fees away from counties and cities. Measure would not prevent state reducing other forms of aid to local governments or changing existing formula for dividing vehicle license fee revenues between counties and cities. YES 254 NO 255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 LEGISLATORS' AND JUDGES' RETIREMENT SYSTEMS. Limits retirement allowances for persons entering Legislators' and Judges' Retirement Systems after January 1, 1987. Fiscal Impact: Minor savings to state in future years if rate of inflation exceeds increase in salaries paid to current officeholders. YES 258 NO 259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

236 SI 贷成
237 NO 反对

ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1988. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $950,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en la compra de granjas y casas para los veteranos de California.

239 SI 贷成
240 NO 反对

ACTA DE TERRENOS DE PARQUES DE LA COMUNIDAD DE 1988. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición, desarrollo, mejoramiento, rehabilitación o restauración urgentemente necesitada por parques, playas, áreas o instalaciones de recreación, y los recursos hídricos locales y regionales.

242 SI 贷成
243 NO 反对


246 SI 贷成
247 NO 反对

DEPÓSITO DE FONDOS PÚBLICOS EN COOPERATIVAS DE CRÉDITO. Autoriza a la Legislatura para que disponga el depósito de fondos públicos en cualquier cooperativa de crédito. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. La legislación ya establecida que pone en efecto la medida podría resultar en mayor ingreso de intereses para los gobiernos locales y estatal.

249 SI 贷成
250 NO 反对

FISICIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD: Dispone exenciones a los bienes de impuestos a la propiedad en el caso de adquisición o mejoramiento de la propiedad inmueble al ser aprobado por dos terceras partes de los votantes. Impacto Fiscal: Por la existencia de una ley de impuesto a la propiedad, los ingresos de este impuesto son menores. La medida podría aumentar el gasto neto del estado.

254 SI 贷成
255 NO 反对

ASIGNACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS POR PAGOS DE LICENCIA DE VEHÍCULOS A LOS CONDADOLES Y CIUDADES. Requiere la asignación a los gobiernos locales de los impuestos recaudados en proporción a la cantidad de automóviles. Impacto Fiscal: La medida no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo, ya que la Legislatura puede combinar la ley para tomar los fondos provenientes de licencias de vehículos de las ciudades y condados. La medida no evitará que el estado pueda reducir otras formas de existencia a los gobiernos locales o que pueda cambiar la fórmula actual de dividir los rendimientos provenientes del pago por licencia de vehículos entre los condados y ciudades.

258 SI 贷成
259 NO 反对

SISTEMAS DE JUBILACIÓN DE LOS LEGISLATORES Y JUECES. Limita las pensiones de jubilación para aquellos personas que se afiliaron al Sistema de Jubilación de los Legisladores y Jueces después del 1° de enero de 1987. Impacto Fiscal: Ahorreros menores para el estado en el futuro si la tasa de inflación excede el aumento en los salarios que se paguen a los que actualmente ocupan cargos.
### Measures Submitted to Vote of Voters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fiscal Impact</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Nonpartisan Offices. Prohibits a political party or party central committee from endorsing, supporting, or opposing a candidate for nonpartisan office. Fiscal Impact: No direct state or local government fiscal impact.</td>
<td></td>
<td>262</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Property Taxation. Disasters. Base-year value of property damaged or destroyed by disaster transferable to comparable replacement property in same county. Fiscal Impact: Local property tax revenues would decrease by an unknown amount. County assessor and tax collectors would have nonsignificant higher administrative costs. State would replace revenues lost by school and community college districts. State income tax revenues could increase due to lower property tax deductions on replacement properties. These state costs and revenues cannot be estimated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>266</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Multiple Defendants Tort Damage Liability. Plaintiff’s non-economic damage recovery limited to defendant’s liability based on defendant’s percentage of fault. Fiscal Impact: Substantial savings to state and local governments. Savings could be several millions of dollars a year, varying significantly from year to year.</td>
<td></td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>County Correctional Facility Capital Expenditure Bond Act of 1986. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county correctional facilities and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of four hundred ninety-five million dollars ($495,000,000).</td>
<td></td>
<td>273</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### City & County Propositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgments against the City?</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Proposition C has been removed from the ballot by the Board of Supervisors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

262 SI
CARGOS NO PARTIDARIOS. Prohíbe a un partido político a un comité central de un partido político patrocinar, apoyar o designar a un candidato a un cargo no partidario. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo a los gobiernos estatal o locales.

263 NO

264 SI
IMPUTOS A LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE DESGUASTE. El valor en el año base de propiedad inmueble debería ser reducido por un desastre que pueda ser transitable a propiedad inmune de reemplazo comparable en el mismo condado. Impacto Fiscal: Los impuestos provenientes de impuestos locales a la propiedad disminuirían en una cantidad desconocida. Los taxadores y recesores de impuestos del condado tendrían insignificantes costos administrativos, pero el estado compensaría las reducciones de impuestos con una reducción en los impuestos legales de los condados de educación superior de fuentes del impuesto sobre ventas. Los desastres del impuesto estadual a la renta podrían aumentar debido a menores deducciones en la imposición de la propiedad, por estas razones, los costos sujetos a impuestos no pueden ser calculados.

265 NO

266 SI
RESPONSABILIDAD CIVIL DE MÚLTIPLES PARTES DEMANDADAS EN JUICIOS DE AGRARIOS INDEMNIZABLES. Limita la indemnización que puede recibir el demandado por daños no económicos a la responsabilidad del demandado basándose en el porcentaje de la responsabilidad del demandado. Impacto Fiscal: Algunos sustancias para las gobiernos estatal y locales. Los daños podrían ser algunos millones de dólares al año, que variarían significativamente de año en año.

267 NO

268 SI
ACTA DE BONOS PARA DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA INSTALACIONES CORRECCIONALES DE CONDADAS DE 1985. Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelación, y reformas de instalaciones correccionales de los condados y la ejecución del mantenimiento diario en las mismas en conformidad con una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos noventa y cinco millones de dólares ($450,000,000).

269 NO

PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONTO

270 SI
"¿Debe la Ciudad establecer una oficina de administración del riesgo y un despacho de investigación y administración de demandas, para estudiar y reducir el riesgo de plagas y sentencias contra la Ciudad?"

271 NO

272 SI

273 NO

274 SI

275 NO

276 SI
"¿Debe autorizar al Comprador a firmar contratos por menos de $30,000 sin la aprobación del Jefe Administrativo y a permitir que sus agentes firmen contratos en su lugar?"

277 NO

278 SI

279 NO

280 SI

281 NO

282 NO

OFFICIALMENTE ELIMINADA

正式撤消

市及郡提案

A

B

C
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?</td>
<td>YES 288</td>
<td>NO 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?</td>
<td>YES 292</td>
<td>NO 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?</td>
<td>YES 296</td>
<td>NO 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?</td>
<td>YES 300</td>
<td>NO 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?</td>
<td>YES 303</td>
<td>NO 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?</td>
<td>YES 307</td>
<td>NO 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?</td>
<td>YES 310</td>
<td>NO 311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
288 SI 贷成
289 NO 反对

VOTER SELECTION CARD

PRIMARY ELECTION
JUNE 3, 1986

POLL ARE OPEN
FROM
7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 236 237</td>
<td>A 278 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 239 240</td>
<td>B 281 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 242 243</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 246 247</td>
<td>D 288 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 249 250</td>
<td>E 292 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 254 255</td>
<td>F 296 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 258 259</td>
<td>G 300 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 262 263</td>
<td>H 303 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 266 267</td>
<td>I 307 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 270 271</td>
<td>J 310 311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE REVERSE SIDE
FOR CANDIDATE
SELECTION
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

D
Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter? YES 288 NO 289

E
Shall the City deny or revoke an educator at Ocean and Phelan Avenue? YES 288 NO 289

F
Shall the City prohibit compensation before any city commission, at the candidate for municipal office? YES 288 NO 289

G
Shall it be the policy of the people and private organizations to establish the greatest ties with South Africa? YES 288 NO 289

H
Shall it be the policy of the people and private organizations to establish the greatest ties with South Africa? YES 288 NO 289

I
Shall it be the policy of the people and private organizations to establish the greatest ties with South Africa? YES 288 NO 289

J
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic? YES 310 NO 311

VOTER SELECTION CARD
Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>County Central Committee*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate</td>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Public Inst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to your sample ballot for the number of County Central Committee members to be elected. The number varies with each district.

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR PROPOSITIONS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Núm.</th>
<th>Propuesta</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>288 SI</td>
<td>&quot;Deberá la Ciudad transformar la administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil a un departamento de administración de personal que tenga poder para cambiar las normas del servicio civil que el presente constan en la Carta Constitucional?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289 NO</td>
<td>&quot;Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el boicotear las empresas que tienen mayor vinculación con la segregación racial subyacente?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292 SI</td>
<td>&quot;Deberá la Ciudad negar o revocar cualquier permiso de construcción para edificar en la Represa Balboa en las Avenidas Ocean y Pollock en los próximos tres años?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293 NO</td>
<td>&quot;Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el una semana de la ciudad que negar a la ciudad que negociar con la segregación racial?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296 SI</td>
<td>&quot;Deberá prohibir la defensa remunerada efectuada por oficiales de la ciudad o legisladores estatales ante cualquier demanda de la ciudad, y limitar la cantidad con la que una persona pueda contribuir para un candidato a una oficina municipal en $500?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297 NO</td>
<td>&quot;Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco que expropiar las empresas que tienen mayor vinculación con la segregación racial?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 SI</td>
<td>&quot;Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el boicotear las empresas que tienen mayor vinculación con la segregación racial?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 NO</td>
<td>&quot;Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco al declarar que tienen mayor vinculación con la segregación racial?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303 SI</td>
<td>&quot;Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el boicotear las empresas que tienen mayor vinculación con la segregación racial?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304 NO</td>
<td>&quot;Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el boicotear las empresas que tienen mayor vinculación con la segregación racial?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307 SI</td>
<td>&quot;Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el boicotear las empresas que tienen mayor vinculación con la segregación racial?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308 NO</td>
<td>&quot;Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el boicotear las empresas que tienen mayor vinculación con la segregación racial?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310 SI</td>
<td>&quot;Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el boicotear las empresas que tienen mayor vinculación con la segregación racial?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311 NO</td>
<td>&quot;Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el boicotear las empresas que tienen mayor vinculación con la segregación racial?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT — An official list of candidates and propositions.

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

VOTE BY MAIL — See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

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

MEASURE — Another name for proposition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

COMPENSATED ADVOCACY — Compensated means being paid for doing something; Advocacy means speaking or writing on behalf of someone else. Proposition F concerns the issue of compensated advocacy.

RISK MANAGEMENT — This field covers two areas: (1) deciding on when it is better to buy insurance and when it is better to be self insured or uninsured, then shopping for the insurance; (2) identifying hazardous conditions on one's property and seeing that they are corrected so that liability and damage claims will be avoided. Proposition A concerns risk management.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

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

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

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

Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgments against the City? YES 278 | NO 279

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Consultants hired by the Chief Administrative Officer are available to City departments that have questions about "risk management," such as how to keep damage claims to a minimum and how to find the best insurance rates. In some cases, the departments use these consultants. In other cases, the departments make their own decisions. When damage claims are filed, some are handled by the City Attorney’s Office and some are handled by City departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would amend the City Charter to create an Office of Risk Management, under the Chief Administrative Officer. The office would set risk management guidelines for all City departments, boards and commissions. Proposition A would also establish a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration in the City Attorney’s Office. The bureau would be responsible for investigating, evaluating and processing all damage claims made against the City, except those claims made against the Public Utilities Commission and the Police Department. The bureau would also have the power to investigate potential suits against the City and to make settlements within dollar limits to be set by ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer and a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want damage claims and risk management decisions to continue to be handled the way they are now.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not affect the cost of government. However as a result of its potential future application and the exemption of certain employees from the civil service provisions of the Charter, costs may be affected in an amount presently indeterminate."

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 10 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted "No."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON A

Last fiscal year, over 6,400 claims and lawsuits were filed against the City, costing us more than $10 million in settlements. I believe that it is time to change the way we handle our claims, secure insurance, prevent risks, and settle legitimate claims against the City.

Last summer, we appointed a task force of citizens, under San Francisco Bar President Jerry Falk, to make recommendations on how to streamline our procedures and save money at the same time. The present system is very slow, costly, and inefficient.

Currently, all claims are investigated by the department involved. The City Attorney cannot act on any claim until the department is ready. This results in delay and duplication of effort and increased costs. A centralized and accountable Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney would be more efficient, cost-effective, and professional. It would enable the City to settle many claims quickly, before litigation is begun, saving the City the costs of defending itself in court and lowering the average cost of settling a case.

This can be accomplished without creating new jobs by simply moving into one office the city positions presently scattered throughout the government.

Vote "Yes" on A. Reduce the cost of City government.

Adoption of this measure would also formally establish responsibility for Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer, where it has been unofficially since 1978. With this strengthened authority, the Risk Management Office would be responsible for the gathering of claims data on a City-wide basis, the creation of incentives for both reducing the possibility for injuries and damage and the number of claims for each department, the coordination of insurance purchasing and specific suggestions to avoid and reduce risk.

This amendment is presented with the recommendation of the Mayor's Task Force on Claims and Judgments, the Chief Administrative Officer, City Attorney, the President of the San Francisco Bar Association, and the President of the Lawyers' Club of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Each year the City spends almost $10 million to settle damage claims. It is estimated that the overall costs to the City for all risk-related activities exceeds $125 million a year. It is time for action to be taken to reduce these huge expenditures. This charter amendment is designed to do just that.

Claims Investigation and Adjustment

Right now, the City claims investigation process is decentralized and largely unorganized. Each department investigates its own claims. Investigators may or may not be specially trained for their duties. There is no uniformity of investigation procedure or claims reporting. In only a few departments do investigators contact injured parties within days of an accident in order to settle the claim quickly and economically.

This amendment will create a claims investigation and adjustment bureau in the Office of the City Attorney. Claims investigation and adjustment activities will be centralized, economized, and made much more efficient. The new bureau will be able to respond immediately to accidents and claims, providing quick compensation to deserving persons while at the same time producing a prompt, professional investigation. This reform is greatly needed.

Risk Management

Presently, there is no overall plan for the management of the City's risk exposure: insurance purchasing, avoidance of industrial accidents, gathering data on accident patterns, etc. Again, risk management as a function is fragmented among the various City departments. As a consequence, departments cannot develop the necessary expertise to manage themselves to reduce risk-related costs.

This measure will establish a risk manager under the Chief Administrative Officer. For the first time, overall City planning will be possible in order to control risk. Departments will be told what activities are producing injuries or damage and advised on corrective measures. Private industry has been utilizing risk managers of this type for years. It is time that the City did the same.

This amendment will reduce the cost of government and ensure a more efficient delivery of City services to all San Franciscans. We urge you to give it your unqualified support.

Board of Supervisors

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
This charter amendment was proposed by a citizens’ task force appointed by Mayor Feinstein. Its mission was to propose ways of reducing the number and financial costs of claims and lawsuits against the City.

The amendment has two principal features. The first is to centralize within the City Attorney’s office the investigation of claims filed against city departments. This will allow for improved training and supervision of the investigators, who presently are scattered throughout city government. The result will be more efficient, cost-effective and professional investigation of claims. By improving the quality of claims investigation, the City can identify those claims which have merit and attempt to reach early—and less costly—settlements. Meritless claims will be denied with greater confidence that if suit is filed it can be defended successfully.

The second major feature of the amendment will establish a Risk Management office under the Chief Administrative Officer. Risk management is a concept widely used in private business. Risk managers are professionals skilled in reducing the overall cost of claims. The Risk Manager would be responsible for coordinating the City’s insurance program, data collection, and correcting problems within the City which lead to claims. The Risk Manager would review those claims which have been filed against the City. Where it appears that an unsafe condition or practice has led to a claim, the Risk Manager would suggest to the affected department that corrective measures be taken. Reports to the Mayor and to the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors of the recommended corrections and the actions taken would ensure that the various departments will be responsive.

The City cannot eliminate claims and lawsuits against it. But it can limit its exposure by managing the claims process more effectively. This measure will reduce injuries and reduce claims, and that is good for everyone.

Jerome B. Falk, Jr.
Chair, Mayor’s Task Force on Claims and Judgments
Against the City

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN
KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, May 31, 1986

12 Noon State Senate, Assembly, Congress and State Propositions
1:00 Proposition A—Risk Management & Claims
1:15 Proposition B—Purchaser & Contracts
1:30 Proposition D—Civil Service
2:15 Proposition E—Balboa Reservoir
2:30 Proposition F—Compensated Advocacy
3:00 Proposition G—Apartheid
3:20 Proposition H—AIDS
3:30 Propositions I, J—Embarcadero Freeway
3:50 Statewide Candidates

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

PROPOSITION B

Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?

YES 281

NO 282

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchaser must get the approval of the Chief Administrative Officer before signing certain contracts for more than $15,000. Only the voters may change that dollar limit. The Purchaser must personally sign every contract that comes through his office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would raise the limit on contracts requiring the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval to $50,000. It would also allow the Board of Supervisors to change that limit by ordinance. Proposition B would also permit the Purchaser to name certain people in his office to sign contracts on his behalf.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval only on contracts for more than $50,000. You also want the Purchaser to be able to name certain people in his office to be able to sign contracts on his behalf.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to require the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval on contracts for more than $15,000. You also want him to sign all contracts himself.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 3 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 71
Purchaser & Contracts

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON B!

The City's Charter requires that a permanent, non-elected City official, the Chief Administrative Officer, review all purchases and contracts above $15,000. Of course, CAO approval of major contracts is very important. But, due to inflation, the number of contracts that have to go to the CAO for approval is always increasing. Today there are too many documents requiring CAO approval. This slows down the purchasing process, occupies staff time—and ultimately costs the City money. Proposition B will raise the CAO approval level to $50,000, and help the City to improve the efficiency of its purchasing operations.

The City's budget includes more than $250 million for purchases on tens of thousands of contracts. At the current $15,000 review limit, the CAO must approve thousands of documents every year—a costly, time-consuming process. In the long run the City loses money because of the inordinate length of time required to complete all the paperwork.

An adjustment must be made to remove the smaller contracts from this cumbersome process. Review and approval of contracts under $50,000 should be under the responsibility of the City Purchaser, a highly trained and experienced professional, who reports directly to the CAO. By changing the present $15,000 to $50,000, it will be possible for the CAO to give each document that comes to him the attention it requires. And, by placing its orders and paying its bills faster, both the City and businesses will benefit—especially small business and those owned by minorities and women.

Proposition B will allow future adjustments to the limit to be made by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility will ensure the City's ability to adjust to inflation and changes in the market.

This amendment comes to you with the recommendation of auditors, controllers, bankers, and others who exercise top fiduciary responsibility within their own organizations.

VOTE YES ON B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will make essential changes to update the purchasing and payment procedures under the Chief Administrative Officer. These measures are necessary and desirable because they will save the City money by significantly increasing our management efficiency.

Right now, the City loses because it takes too long for contracts to be reviewed and payments okayed, which means that early payment incentives go unutilized. The CAO has to approve every contract greater than $15,000—and with City purchases last year over $250 million, the paperwork logjam is vast and overwhelming.

An increase in the review limit from $15,000 to $50,000 will make an adequate adjustment for inflation—$50,000 now is only about $15,000 in 1967 dollars. Proposition B will also enable the City Purchaser, who reports to the CAO, to maximize potential savings through early payments by designating appropriate personnel to approve contracts up to $50,000. These "Good Business" amendments are consistent with private sector practices and should be incorporated by the CAO in the City's best interests.

Finally, Proposition B will give the City the ability to respond quickly to changes in the market place by allowing changes in the CAO review limit by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility is necessary to ensure that in the future we will not lose money because of institutional rigidity. Control is maintained with the necessity of Board action and Mayoral approval to adjust the review limit, and this same feature will allow for change when desired.

Vote yes on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
Civil Service

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?

YES 288
NO 289

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the civil service system of the City of San Francisco. The structure of the civil service system and certain rules governing its operation are written into the Charter and can only be changed by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would make major changes. A Department of Personnel Administration would run the Civil Service system and would be able to change rules with Commission approval. Major features of Proposition D are described below. The complete charter amendment is printed in this voters’ handbook.

Department of Personnel Administration

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Certain civil service rules governing the general operation of the system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs, are written into the Charter and carried out by the Civil Service Commission. Only the voters can change these rules.

THE PROPOSAL: A department of Personnel Administration would be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. A Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor would run the Department. Certain rules governing examination, selection and appointment would be taken out of the Charter. The Personnel Director would be able to change these rules with the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

Civil Service Commission

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the general operation of the civil service system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs. The Commission also hears and decides appeals on civil service matters.

THE PROPOSAL: The Civil Service Commission would no longer be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. The Commission could investigate the operation of the system, approve rule changes proposed by the Personnel Director, and hear and decide appeals only on claims of job discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest.

Employee Relations

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors appoints an Employee Relations Director to negotiate contracts with City employees; the Board approves all contracts.

THE PROPOSAL: The Mayor or his or her agent would negotiate with City employees; the Board of Supervisors would still approve all contracts.

What your vote means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing civil service system.

CONTROLLER’S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE
Controller's Statement on "D"

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not directly affect the cost of government, as it removes many civil service policy setting functions from the Charter and an independent Civil Service Commission and transfers responsibility for personnel matters, including labor negotiations, to the Mayor.

"As a product of its inherent flexibility and possible future application, costs could be affected or savings realized in amounts presently indeterminate but probably substantial."

How "D" Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative Charter amendment rewriting the civil service provisions of the Charter had qualified for the June ballot.

Robert Bradford, Jonathan Bulkeley, Lee Munsen and Mary Hilton, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 36,049 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 25,027 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

POLLs CLOSE AT 8:00 p.m.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. Consistent with the City's and County's affirmative action goals, no applicant or employee shall be selected, appointed, reduced in rank, removed or in any way favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, union activities, political affiliation or sexual orientation.

(b) The purpose of the civil service system is to obtain for the city and county the best qualified persons to fill city and county positions in a timely and economical manner, using professional, fair and equitable personnel selection and personnel management practices with consideration of the following merit principles:

1. Establishing and advancing employees on the basis of their ability, knowledge, skills and performance relative to the work to be performed.

2. Establishing equitable and adequate compensation, as provided elsewhere in this charter.

3. Training employees, as needed, to promote productivity and high quality performance and to facilitate career development.

4. Retaining employees during good service and separating employees for good cause.

5. Assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration, with proper regard for their privacy and constitutional rights; and assuring equal employment opportunity, based on the person's ability to do the job.

6. Assuring that employees are protected against coercion for political purposes and are prohibited from using their official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the outcome of an election or a nomination for office.

(c) This charter does not limit the power of departments, agencies, or other subdivisions of the city and county in their exercise of management prerogatives including but not limited to:

1. Directing employees in the performance of their duties;

2. Hiring, promoting, transferring and assigning employees from those qualified;

3. Classifying positions in accordance with Section 3.633 (k);

4. Disciplining employees;

5. Laying off employees because of lack of work, lack of funds or other reasonable cause; and

6. Determining the mission of its departments and divisions, and its budget, organization, the number of its employees, and the numbers, types, classifications and grades of positions or employees assigned to an organization unit, work project, shift or tour of duty, and the methods and technology of performing its work.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. No person shall in any way be favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, age, religion, national origin or other non-merit factors.

(b) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in subsection (a) or any other provisions of the charter, it shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, consistent with a policy of acquiring qualified personnel for the service of the city and county, to encourage the hiring of blind persons. It shall further be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that no otherwise qualified blind person shall be discriminated against in employment, appointment, re-appointment, waiver of eligibility for appointment or re-appointment, promotion or demotion in any class, subclass or position in the civil service unless the eyesight is indispensable for the performance of the duties and responsibilities of the class, subclass or position. It shall be the duty of the commission to classify, and from time to time it may reclassify, places of employment in the civil service the duties of which may be efficiently performed by qualified blind persons and to conduct appropriate examinations which will fairly test the capacity of blind persons as well as sighted persons to perform such duties.

2.203-2 Employee Relations Director

(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3.510 of this charter, the employee relations director shall be appointed by the board of supervisors and shall hold office at the pleasure of said board.

3.102 Employee Relations

It shall be the duty of the mayor to meet and confer with employee representatives on behalf of the city and county and all its constituent boards, commissions, departments and agencies as required by applicable law. These duties may be performed by a designee of the mayor who shall serve at the pleasure of the mayor. Nothing herein shall limit the mayor from contracting for the performance of these duties.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the mayor shall submit all memoranda of understanding or ordinances to be enacted pursuant to Article VIII of this charter herein to the Board of Supervisors for its approval or rejection.

3.660 Commission; Composition; Meetings

There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county. The city and county shall have the general powers and duties set forth in section 3.661.

The civil service commission shall consist of five members appointed by the mayor. The commission members in office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and this charter section as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the term for which they were appointed, provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment, shall expire on June 30, 1981, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed. The respective terms of the commissioners shall hold office on the effective date of this section as amended shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date. Thereupon, the mayor shall ap
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON 'D'

Proposition D is a complex proposition with a simple goal: remove the archaic restrictions on the hiring, promotion, or firing of city employees and bring San Francisco's personnel system into the modern age.

Archaic is the only way to describe a system that keeps equally qualified people from competing for a job, and that takes months—sometimes years—to fill vacancies.

For example, if 50 people score equally high on a competitive examination, shouldn't they all have a chance for any job for which they are eligible? Not under the current system, which requires complicated tie-breaking rules not at all related to a person's qualifications or abilities.

Or what about being able to hire the best person available for a given job? Currently, eligibility lists are frozen for two years and every person on each list, including the lowest-scoring, must be offered a job before the highest-scoring person on a more recent list. Private businesses couldn't function saddled with such absurdities.

Proposition D cuts through the red tape. It creates a modern personnel department, with a director responsible for carrying out rules to ensure fairness and efficiency. Accountable to the Mayor, the director would be selected from a list provided by the Civil Service Commission, and subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.

The Civil Service Commission remains an independent body, with the right to approve new personnel rules and hold hearings on abuses. Also under 'D', negotiations with employee unions would be under the Mayor, subject to approval by the Supervisors, providing checks and balances in balancing our budget.

With greater accountability and continued checks and balances, Proposition D will open the way to more efficient government in our City.

Bill Maher, Supervisor
Louise Renne, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON 'D'

Proposition D is a necessary reform to the City's Civil System. As the City's Chief Administrative Officer for almost ten years, I have found that quality employee hiring is difficult and the process causes long delays.

The current system is:

• inflexible. The City cannot hire and promote the most qualified persons.
• inefficiently administered by a commission. Other large (continued)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

It’s 1986 and we’re still trying to manage City business as if it were 1932. As heads of City departments, charged with the daily responsibility of putting out fires, fighting crime, maintaining hospitals, parks, libraries and providing other essential services, we know from bitter experience about shortcomings of the existing Civil Service System. Enacted with the City Charter in 1932, the system is foundering in red tape. Outdated rules are the subject of endless challenges. Tests are put off; vacancies go unfilled; promotions delayed; any appeal, however groundless, stops the process in its tracks.

Proposition D would take old procedures out of the Charter so they could be changed in an orderly process by the Civil Service Commission, which also would hear appeals.

Day-to-day administration of the tests — the content, scoring, all the myriad details of managing a complex system, would be put into a modern, highly professional personnel office. Tests would be speeded up. Hiring would keep pace with need. Promotions would be on the basis of competence. High performance would be the standard. Discipline could be imposed with working rights fully protected, and women and minorities would be assured equal opportunity.

Proposition D will help improve management and the quality of City services. Vote Yes on D.

Frank Jordan, Chief of Police
Emmet Condon, Fire Chief
Don Birrer, Director, Public Works
Mary Burns, General Manager, Recreation & Park
John Franz, City Librarian
Eugene Gartland, Director, Port
Marvin Geistlinger, Purchaser
Wilbur Hamilton, Executive Director, Redevelopment Agency
Claire Isaac, Director, Arts Commission
Ray King, Director, Parking Authority
Dean Maceix, Director, City Planning
Grant Mickens, Director, Human Rights Commission
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, PUC
Joyce Ream, Director, Aging
Ed Sarsfield, General Manager, Social Services
Thelma Shelley, Managing Director, War Memorial
Moira So, Executive Director, Community Development
Louis Turpen, Director of Airport
Dr. David Werdegar, Director, Health Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The hiring practices outlined in San Francisco City Charter have been virtually unchanged since 1931, a severe handicap in running a modern city. Proposition D is designed to streamline the charter and ensure that the rights of present city employees and candidates for city jobs are protected, while improving the hiring process itself. The initiative also builds management accountability in the city system.

Proposition D Is More Fair, More Efficient, More Economical

The day-to-day personnel functions, including hiring, will be consolidated under a Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. Decisions of the Director of Personnel on examination content and administration are final, unless a decision is stayed during the appeal process by a unanimous vote of the Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D will make it easier to modernize the many archaic Civil Service rules and procedures now included in the Charter, while maintaining a strong and independent Civil Service Commission to safeguard the merit system and protect the rights of city employees. Many detailed rules will come out of the Charter and will become personnel regulations. These regulations can then be modernized, but only through a process which includes public hearings and meet and confer sessions with the union involved. In addition, the Civil Service Commission must approve any changes or new regulations governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfer, resignation and terminations.

Proposition D Will Improve Performance And Public Confidence

The openness and fairness of the proposition will benefit everyone. Well-qualified job candidates will have a better chance of being hired, and well-qualified job holders will have a better chance of being promoted. This means generally better job performance in all departments, resulting in higher employee morale and more public confidence in city government.

Submitted by
Louis Hop Lee, President
Civil Service Commission
Lee Munson, Member Civil Service Commission and Treasurer, San Franciscans for Fair and Efficient Government

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Cities can survive only with strong management. The greatest budgetary restraint must be exercised to assure that full value is received for each tax dollar spent.

With firm limits on what it can spend and faced with a possible loss of Federal funds next year, the City must be managed with the greatest possible efficiency.

Essential to greater efficiency is the need for Civil Service reform. As members of City Commissions, we constantly confront the torturous delays and confused rules that gridlock the present system. The present system simply can’t respond to the City’s personnel needs.

Qualified applicants become frustrated and seek employment elsewhere. Promotions are blocked. Morale suffers. Temporaries fill in; overtime mounts. The ability to plan is crippled; management is weakened.

Proposition D would put the system on a business-like basis. A personnel department would handle day-to-day administration. The Civil Service Commission would be the watchdog to assure the integrity of the merit system.

This streamlined system would replace what is now inflexible and cumbersome. Testing could be accelerated; hiring made more efficient and promotions made on time. The result would be greater efficiency and elimination of costly waste.

Vote Yes on D.

Jerry E. Berg, President, Board of Permit Appeals
Henry Berman, President, Fire Commission
Mo Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Hector Chinchilla, Rent Board
Rev. Harry Chuck, Housing Authority
Dr. Arthur Coleman, President, Port Commission
Owen Davis, Police Commission
J. Edward Fleishell, Airports Commission
H. Welton Flynn, President, Public Utilities Commission
James Foster, Health Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation & Park Commission
James Russell, President, Housing Authority
Anne Halsted, Port Commission
Tommy Harris, Recreation & Park Commission
Tom Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Walter Jaffe, Public Library Commission
Jeffrey Lee, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Philip Lee, President, Health Commission
Bruce W. Lilienthal, Small Business Advisory Commission
Jacqueline Nemerovski, President, Arts Commission
Toby Rosenblatt, President, Planning Commission
Dr. David Sanchez, President, Police Commission
Joan San Jule, Housing Authority
John Patrick Short, President, Parking Authority
Marjorie G. Stern, President, Public Library Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D contains civil service reform measures urged by the League of Women Voters since 1969.

Proposition D will:
— Modernize the City’s outdated personnel system by creating a Director of Personnel, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors
— Preserve the principles of merit through policies set by the Civil Service Commission
— Create a more responsive Civil Service system at no additional cost to the taxpayer

EFFICIENCY AND FLEXIBILITY

Proposition D transfers authority for day-to-day management of the City’s personnel system from the Civil Service Commission to the Director of Personnel. This will:
— Prevent hiring delays
— Ensure only the most qualified individuals are hired and promoted
— Provide City managers with more administrative flexibility

FAIRNESS FOR EMPLOYEES

Proposition D will:
— Safeguard the rights of City workers
— Protect gains made in hiring women and minorities
— Retain the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit appeals board
— Retain the ability of the City’s unions to negotiate working conditions
— Create a system that can respond quickly and fairly to the needs of City workers

Proposition D will bring the Civil Service system into the 20th century by making the Mayor accountable for the management of a system employing more than 25,000 people. Hiring by merit is still guaranteed by the Charter. Please join us in voting for this Reform!

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
Esther Marks, Past President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote Yes on Proposition D the Civil Service Modernization Initiative.

Prevent abuse of a system that was intended to serve the public and protect against favoritism. Prevent situations like this: an employee failed to report to work for a week without explanation; he was telephoned, notified by certified mail and a message left under his door; he was terminated 13 days later; he did not appeal the termination and the civil service commission up-
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Civil Service

held the termination. Two months later, the employee petitioned the commission for reinstatement. The employee got his job back, not because the process of termination was wrong but because the commission had a long standing objection to using “absent without leave” as a reason for firing.

The quality of public services is dependent upon the effectiveness of the staff who deliver them. The primary role of the civil service commission should be to facilitate recruitment and retention of the best available personnel. It must protect against favoritism and must assure that everyone has an equal and fair chance at employment.

The present system does not do that. We feel this initiative will make the system work better, for the managers, for the employees and for the public.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco government is huge, with a budget of more than $1 billion per year and 25,000 employees. It is expected to solve serious problems. This requires that the City have the ability to hire and promote talented people to do the job.

The present civil service system is so tied up in red tape that jobs remain vacant for six months to a year, and all too often someone who is not capable of doing a good job is hired. Your tax dollars are being wasted, and you are not receiving the quality of services you need and deserve.

Proposition D will modernize San Francisco's civil service system. It separates the personnel department from the Civil Service Commission, and puts the department under the Mayor where it belongs. The Mayor is responsible for balancing the budget and delivering city services as efficiently as possible. She cannot do this unless she can find capable people to do the job. That is the task of the personnel department in any organization.

Proposition D will also insure that the independent Civil Service Commission has sufficient authority to require the personnel system to be fair in its treatment of City employees. The Commission will be able to issue subpoenas and require testimony of witnesses on investigations it conducts. Should it find that discrimination has occurred, it can issue orders that must be obeyed.

Most major American cities, and virtually all cities and counties in California, have the kind of civil service system that will be established by Proposition D. San Francisco's present system is still mired in the past. It hobbles the ability of the City to deliver services and spend your tax dollars as efficiently as possible.

SPUR has not placed a statement in the Voter’s Handbook for any other issue over the past 15 years. We feel that Proposition D is so vital for San Francisco’s future that we are making this appeal for your support.

Vote “YES” on Proposition D.

SPUR — The San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Reform Initiative, will give San Francisco citizens the HIGH PERFORMANCE GOVERNMENT necessary to meet the many challenges of the future. Proposition D corrects the outdated and inflexible requirements originally written in San Francisco’s City Charter in 1931. It will eliminate the problems which prevent San Francisco’s personnel system from operating with efficiency the City’s voters and taxpayers deserve:

Proposition D insures City jobs will be filled from current lists of the most qualified employees.

Proposition D prevents ungrounded appeals from delaying for years the appointment or promotion of qualified employees.

Proposition D eliminates the repetitive tasks currently monopolizing the Civil Service Commission meetings and directs the Commission to serve as an appellate body to protect the City’s good employees.

Proposition D centralizes the day-to-day operation of the civil service system and makes the Director of Personnel responsible to the Mayor.

Proposition D simplifies the budgetary process by making the Mayor the City’s chief labor negotiator, responsible for setting working conditions within the City’s financial capacity.

Proposition D is the result of years of painstaking review by the most experienced, able and respected management experts in San Francisco. It is a plan intended to move City government out of the 1930s and equip San Francisco to enter the twenty-first century without being burdened by the red tape of the past.

After ten years of commitment to improving our City, the Mayor’s Fiscal Advisory Committee is convinced adoption of Proposition D is one of the most important issues facing the voters. CHANGE IS LONG OVERDUE. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by,
The Mayor’s Fiscal Advisory Committee

David Ancher
Jerome Anderson
Richard Blum
Charles Chapman
Arthur Cooke, Jr.
Benon Dial
James Edgar
Ruben Garcia

Robert Hayden
Walter Hoadley
John Jacobs
Michael McGill
Ellen Newman
Roy Nordman
Frank Tatum
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PERSONNEL MANAGERS SAY YES ON PROPOSITION D

As the personnel managers for City Departments, we are charged with the responsibility of managing the City's personnel system. The activities include examinations, hiring, training, discipline, union-management relations, affirmative action and compensation. No one knows better than we the frustrations experienced in attempting to monitor an unbelievable sequence of overlapping bureaucratic activities in attempting to get the job done.

Proposition D will bring our personnel system into line with most other public personnel systems. The improved system will create the potential for being more responsive to the needs of operating departments. It will improve labor relations by transferring this function to the executive branch of government where it belongs.

Proposition D will streamline certain routine procedures resulting in a reduction of cost and time. Under the current system delays are experienced due to lengthy appeals during which time the departments' objectives are delayed.

Proposition D will create an atmosphere of increased accountability for department managers in the areas of affirmative action, discipline and job performance.

Proposition D has been endorsed by the San Francisco Council of Human Resource Managers, the association of over one hundred personnel managers in City government.

Proposition D strengthens merit system principles. Civil Service commissioners will have more time to enforce and protect these principles rather than being bogged down in the day-to-day activities of administration.

Proposition D will help bring about improved methods and practices in personnel administration and should result in a more competent and effective workforce which the citizens of San Francisco have a right to expect.

Alvin W. Schaaf
Personnel Director
Recreation and Park Department

Marsha Ramirez
Personnel Officer
San Francisco Port

Edward M. Genzana
Personnel Director
Department of Health

James Horan
Senior Personnel Officer
Department of Social Services

James Binck
Personnel Director
San Francisco International Airport

Andrea R. Gourine
Manager, Bureau of Personnel & Training

Public Utilities Commission

Mori Noguchi
Senior Department Personnel Officer

Mary Smith
Senior Personnel Officer

Laguna Honda Hospital

Thelda Poteet
Senior Personnel Officer
San Francisco General Hospital

John Burke
Personnel Director
Controller's Office

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will assist the Department of Public Works by streamlining the Civil Service process.

- Under the current system, the duration of eligible lists from 2 to 4 years hampers the Department from hiring graduates of colleges and universities on an annual basis. Consequently, many excellent candidates are not entered into the Civil Service System. Passage of the proposition will improve the quality of the pool of applicants and thereby the quality of public service given by the Department.

- The establishment of a Personnel Director to administer the day-to-day tasks of the system will speed up the decision making process to the advantage of employees and management alike.

- The proposition still calls for checks and balances in that the Commission will continue to hear appeals on discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest. The Commission will act as a watchdog while leaving the general administration to the Personnel Director.

The initiative will make for an improved system for employees, management and the citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Donald Birr
Director of Public Works

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Passage of this amendment will update our civil service system. These changes will make it comparable to other merit system agencies. Some of these changes are

(A) removal of administrative details from the charter which inhibit timely and effective personnel actions.

The following subjects will be placed in personnel regulations:

- Protests of written questions and answers
- Protests of tentative employment lists
- Promotional examinations
- Examinations for employees on military leave
- Certification of eligibles — Rule of three
- Duration of employment lists
- Temporary employee appointments
- Allows continuous up-dating of employment lists.
- Allows equitable treatment of job candidates with same test score.
- Realigns responsibilities: the Civil Service Commission dealing primarily with compliance and adjudication activities
while the Personnel Department administers the day-to-day operation of the merit system.

Equally Important the amendment retains important merit system provisions dealing with:
• Employee salary setting procedures
• Positions subject to merit system examinations
• Public hearing and meet and confer requirements
• Penalties for examination fraud
• Seniority, meritorious service and applicable educational credits for promotional examinations in the Police/Fire De-

partsments
• Termination of unsatisfactory employees
• Disciplinary suspensions
• Conflict of interest
• Creation of positions
Proposition “D” merits a ‘YES’ vote.

John J. Walsh
General Manager Personnel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Initiative, is a long-overdue reform to streamline antiquated hiring practices in San Francisco’s fifty-year-old charter. Proposition D will ensure that the best and brightest job candidates are chosen to serve our city, thus promoting excellence in job performance and helping to eliminate incompetence. This initiative builds management accountability in the city system, while giving the Civil Service Commission the independence to protect the rights of women and minorities.

A Better, More Efficient System at Less Cost

Proposition D consolidates personnel functions, including hiring, under a new Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. The Director has final authority over content of examinations given city job applicants, so more flexibility is possible in finding truly qualified candidates.

Proposition D redefines the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit systems appeals board and policy-setting body. The merit principles are spelled out in the Proposition. This allows the Commission to protect the rights of women and minorities at no cost to the public.

More Fair to Everyone

Proposition D greatly improves the city charter. Well-qualified job candidates have a better chance to be hired and well-qualified job holders have a better chance to be promoted. The public is rewarded with the better job performance, efficiency and friendliness one expects from good government employees. All of these improvements are at no additional cost to the taxpayer.

Submitted by
James W. Haas

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service System, as presently constituted, (vintage 1932!), is uncivil, and there is nothing “systematic” about it! It’s pure, unadulterated municipal lunacy and chaos! Remarkably, BOTH Management and Labor despise it. It certainly is NOT producing the best qualified persons to fill City jobs!

Let’s follow Mayor Feinstein’s recommendations. If this operation doesn’t dramatically improve, there are always FUTURE ELECTIONS where additional, more Draconian changes can be considered by the voters.

As matters now stand, it is far better to light a candle than just sit and curse the darkness! Any changes will be an improvement! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

For more than a half-century, San Francisco Mayors have abided by the employee examination, hiring and promotion policies administered by a strong and independent Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D is a deceptive and dangerous scheme that would give future Mayors and top-level bureaucrats the power to ignore competence and reward political loyalty.

Proposition D would take key Civil Service employment rules out of the City Charter and make them subject to wheeling and dealing by City Hall politicians.

There’s an old saying — “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.”

Civil Service has worked well for more than 50 years. Proposition D is unnecessary, ineffective and even counter-productive.

It’s not just deceptive, it’s dangerous.

Joseph L. Alioto
Former Mayor of San Francisco
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Time and time again, different groups have put various propositions on the ballot to weaken our Civil Service System and reintroduce political patronage into City employment practices. And every time the voters have wisely rejected these schemes, no matter how cleverly they have been disguised. Proposition D is just another power grab by bureaucrats at the top in City Hall.

We’ve said NO! loud and clear in the past. Let’s say NO one more time.

Submitted by:
TAXPAYERS FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT
Thomas Scanlon
City Treasurer, Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “D”!!!!
During the eight years while a member of the Board of Supervisors, I fought hard to reform the Civil Service Commission and to bring working conditions and city workers’ pay equitable to both workers and taxpayers. I fought to insure an independent Civil Service Commission that would remain just that— independent and free from political influence and political patronage of particularly the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

I am truly saddened by the Mayor’s insistence in bringing this disastrous Proposition “D” before the voters. Some of the Supervisors rejected this misguided measure for what it is; an unwise consolidation of authority to hire, fire and promote city workers by the Mayor and newly created personnel officer.

My efforts to bring pay equity to both taxpayers and city workers were continually squashed by then Supervisor Feinstein and Supervisor Molinari. Finally, in 1975, shortly after a disastrous city strike, I was able to place on the ballot, for voter approval, a measure that almost eliminates the power of the Mayor and Supervisors to manipulate the pay of city workers. This measure was overwhelmingly passed by the voters that year and we have not had any labor unrest since that date.

Vote No on “D”!
“D” stands for disaster. It will undo many of these reforms. Also, right now, the City is almost broke, thanks to the manipulation of Mayor Feinstein and her chief ally Supervisor Molinari.

If “D” passes the cost of operating our city government will increase in the next 24 months by not less than $60,000,000. Contrary to the provisions of Proposition 13, property taxes would be increased, thus forcing up rents.

Vote No on “D”.
Don’t weaken our Civil Service Commission, whereby least deserving city employees could be promoted because of connection or clout.

Vote No on “D”,
We now almost have more problems than we can handle. We don’t want our city turned into another Chicago, where for nearly half a century a corrupt political system flourished under Mayor Richard Daley.

John Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We join San Franciscans for Fair Employment in opposing the Civil Service Initiative, Proposition D.

This measure will severely hamper the well-being of the San Francisco Fire and Police Departments. These departments are two of the finest in the Country and have consistently protected life and property in a professional manner. They must continue that tradition with a civil service system based on MERIT and not political patronage.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Andrew C. Casper
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Keith W. Cullen
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

William F. Murray
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Thomas J. Cahill
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired

Donald M. Scott
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Our present Civil Service system was designed to keep corruption out of government. It has generally served that purpose well. This proposition would dismantle that system and in my opinion open the doors to nepotism, favoritism, patronage and corruption. Better a city government that is bureaucratic than one that is corrupt. Vote NO on D.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is an attack on the merit system and an attempt to return patronage to the Mayor's office by eliminating the authority of the Civil Service Commission and its built-in checks and balances.

The present Civil Service system is not perfect, but corrections can be made within the Charter without destroying a system that has worked for over 50 years and has been free from fraud and corruption.

This proposition will do nothing to improve the caliber of police performance and could have the opposite effect.

I urge you to vote NO on PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by
The San Francisco Police Supervisors and Investigators Association

Don Goad, Captain SFPD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D could be a dangerous first step toward weakening the independent, impartial administration of our City government.

Proposition D would transfer power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor. The Director's decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline and certification would be final. The Commission would have no right to hear examinations or disciplinary appeals.

With the transfer of duties and responsibilities from the Commission to the Mayor's appointed Personnel Director, the Mayor would have control over personnel functions. Currently, commissioners have independent status and can be dismissed for cause. The Personnel Director could be dismissed at will.

The Merit System could be replaced by a patronage system. Proposition D could open the door to rules permitting the Personnel Director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his or her position on the list.

Chart sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Proposition D is NOT a reform package. The checks and balances for efficient City government would be lopsided, with too much power in the hands of unknown future Mayors.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
John L. Malinart, President
Harry G. Britt
Richard Hongisto
Willie B. Kennedy
Wendy Nelder
Nancy Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Beware of PROPOSITION D!

Powerful special interest groups are attempting to remove key City employees from the independent and impartial Civil Service system in the name of "reform".

They want instead to make these employees answerable directly to future Mayors and politically-appointed Personnel Directors and department heads.

PROPOSITION D got on the ballot because the Chamber of Commerce and such companies as Pacific Bell and PG&E paid a professional southern California campaign firm, $70,000 to collect signatures.

They're trying to destroy the merit system and replace it with an old-fashioned patronage system.

Department heads will be able to ignore examination scores and reward loyalty rather than competence in promotions and hiring.

Don't let the Chamber of Commerce, big business and their allies in the City bureaucracy dictate who's hired, fired and promoted among public employees.

PROPOSITION D is not just deceptive, it's dangerous! Vote NO on PROPOSITION D!

Libby Denebein
Member, S.F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Member, S.F. Community College Governing Board
Ron Huberman
Vice-Chairman, Democratic Central Committee
Jim Wacob
Democratic Central Committee
Roberto Esteves
President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Rick Fuscusar
President, Harvey Milk Lesbian Gay Democratic Club
Walter L. Johnson
Exec. Secy., S. F. Labor Council
Michael Bernick
Sal Roselli
John Mehring
Nancy Walter
Harry Britt
Carole Migden
Jack Morrison

Linda Post
Deborah Stein
Pat Norman
Gwen Craig
Louise Minnick
Agar Jaicks
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D places too much power in the hands of ONE. Proposition D will provide for a personnel director to be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. The Mayor now appoints five members of the Civil Service Commission who also serve at her pleasure.

You work for years to climb the civil service ladder and then somebody comes along with an idea to cut you off at the pockets.

Proposition D will lock in all the employees employed in the Mayor’s office and will control the appointments of any new staff by the next Mayor elect in 1987 and years thereafter. Like controlling your estate from the grave.
Vote NO on D.

Marguerite Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service Merit System has served our City well, giving San Franciscans an equal opportunity. It has helped us obtain employment and earn promotions based on objective examinations.

The Civil Service Merit system replaced the old patronage system that rewarded political loyalty more than competence.

Now the supporters of PROPOSITION D want to create a new Personnel Director, accountable only to the Mayor, and give department heads the absolute power to decide who works for the City and who gets promoted.

If PROPOSITION D passes, equal opportunity would give way to opportunity based on membership in the bureaucratic “establishment”.

Keep our Civil Service Merit System strong and free from the political abuses of the past.
Vote NO on D!

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly
Ben Tom
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Joaanne Miller
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
A. Richard Cerbatos
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Sodonia Wilson
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, President
S. F. Community College Governing Board
Julie Tong
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Alan S. Wong
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Henry Der
Alberto Chung
Rudy Meraz
Robert “Bob” Morales
Yori Wada

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Can you imagine studying for a civil service examination, being rated at the top of the eligible list and never receiving the promotion? That’s exactly what Proposition “D” will do should the electorate adopt this amendment.

The civil service merit system has defects, but to totally eliminate the system and replace it with a patronage system where promotions are based on who you know, rather than what you know is scandalous.

Civil service was put into place to prevent scandal and the “favor seeking” individual from getting a paid position because he/she happened to support the right elected official.

Proposition “D” will allow one person, chosen by the Mayor, to decide who will be promoted, hired and fired. This is awesome power for one single individual to have at any level of government.

Our current Mayor may choose a fair person for this position, but will future Mayors be as careful? As each new Mayor assumes office, the civil service system will again change. The potential to favor one individual or group over others is great.

Proposition “D” has a great potential to diminish the quality of services we now provide to our citizens, as the future of how people are hired and promoted in the San Francisco Police Department is completely unknown.

It’s true our promotional system is fraught with delays and delays frustrate us all, but Proposition “D” is not the answer. Proposition “D” will only add to our existing problems. Several years ago, our citizens elected a Charter Commission to streamline city government and make civil service work more efficiently. The voters eventually rejected those proposals. The checks and balances that made our government stable were no longer present. It simply went too far.

Proposition “D” goes even further. It brings about a system of patronage and should be defeated lest we want to engage in “free-wheeling and dealing” of civil service jobs and promotions.

We urge a strong No vote against Proposition “D”!

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS’ ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry, President
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The purpose of the Civil Service Commission is to ensure that the merit system would be the only criteria in any examination process.

If Proposition D passes, all authority concerning examinations would be taken from the Civil Service Commission and given to a Personnel Director, who is appointed by the Mayor. This Personnel Director would have the authority to hire and fire at his discretion, with no appeal available. This proposition is contrary to everything the Fire Department and all City employees have strived for over the years.

The Civil Service Commission in its present form was instituted to prevent any possibility of a patronage system, where one person has complete control.

This proposition would do nothing to improve your Fire Department. If you are satisfied with the work and make up of the San Francisco Fire Department in its present form, “Vote No On Proposition D”. You will be doing a service for the San Francisco Fire Department, and the people of San Francisco.

Submitted by the San Francisco Fire Chiefs’ Association
John Flaherty, Battalion Chief SFFD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is bad government and bad politics, changing our independent civil service system into a system dominated by the Mayor:

. . . By shortening the six year terms of Civil Service Commission to conform to the Mayor’s four year term of office.

. . . By transferring most of the Commission’s powers to a Personnel Director who serves solely at the Mayor’s pleasure.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D fails to offer enough new and improved procedures to cure the current defects in the civil service system. Charter sections and civil service rules are repealed without specific known replacements.

Proposition D transfers power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created personnel director appointed by, and to serve at the pleasure of, the Mayor. The director’s decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline, and certification would be final. The commission would have no right to hear examination or disciplinary appeals.

There are hidden costs with Proposition D because the new Personnel Administration Department will employ a personnel director, and other employees “as may be necessary to carry out (its) functions and duties.”

The Merit System could be replaced by an old style Patronage System. Proposition D could open the door to rules which permit the personnel director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his/her position on the civil service testing list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Police and Fire Commissions would lose functions as a result of the personnel director’s new power. The director’s unlawful employment discrimination policy would be binding upon department administrators. The director’s procedure for employee dispute resolution must be used by all department heads and appointing officers.

Proposition D is not the answer. The checks and balances for efficient city government would be lopsided.

I urge a no vote on Proposition D.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, 17th Assembly District
Sala Burton
Congresswoman
Art Agnos
16th Assembly District
Milton Marks
State Senator

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Balboa Reservoir
Development Ban

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?

YES 292  NO 293

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission declared Balboa Reservoir South (located across Phelan Avenue from San Francisco City College) surplus in 1984 and made the site available for low, moderate and market rate housing. In July 1985, a City-community advisory committee chose a developer to build 203 single-family homes on the 13 acre site. Construction has not yet begun.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would prohibit granting new building permits and would revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site (Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1) between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit granting any new building permits and you want to revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to allow building permits to be granted for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

Controller's Statement on "E"

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

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

How "E" Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for a three-year ban on development of the Balboa Reservoir site had qualified for the June ballot. Sidney Kass and Jesse David Wall, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 12,430 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985. A random check of the petition showed that 10,012 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 77
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Having been responsible for providing leadership at City College from 1947 to 1977, we cannot stand by and see this site converted to housing. We must speak out. Such a move would preclude forever the logical and much needed campus expansion to what was once our West Campus. We left that site reluctantly to make way for water storage. If it is no longer required for that purpose, let us return it to City College.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 'E'

We question:
1. Why no EIR was required when the proposed development could have a substantial impact.
2. Whether the future needs of City College for classrooms, housing, and parking have been considered.
3. What the impact on taxpayers is with below market land sale and construction financing by bonds.
   This moratorium will permit adequate study of these issues.
   Vote YES on Proposition 'E'.

Bruce Bonacker, President
Board of Directors, Glen Park Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let a developer make a mint on land across from the most overcrowded college in the Bay Area! Parking is already an impossibility for residents near City College...adding 200 homes to this land would make the situation much worse.

It's simple: a college which can't find room for more students at a time when more people are returning to education doesn't serve the community.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This land is being sold at much less than its true value. The development wouldn't do much to ease the City's housing crunch, but it would undercut the future of City College and the peace of mind of the neighborhood.

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

You'd probably be upset. We certainly are. Please help us protect our neighborhood. Please vote YES on proposition E.

Westwood Park Residents:
- Edna Toth
- Minnie Dorwin
- Eugene Eden
- Donna Nicolaletti
- Robert Armstrong
- Pauline Armstrong
- Joel Martinez
- Richard & Lisa Patterson
- David Bean
- H. Boczone
- William Burke
- Richard Robel
- Clyde Thietot
- Danae Manus
- Emma Manus

Sunnyside Residents:
- Ellen Wall
- Melissa Voluntad
- David Wall

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don’t let the greedy developers take this potentially picturesque open space.

A yes vote means you want more time to consider its future use. All we ask is time to think and plan.

John Barbagelata
Former member, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Suppose there was a publicly owned open space across the street from the main U.C. Berkeley Campus.

Can you imagine for one moment that it would be passed into private ownership?

Vote Yes on E for Equality and Excellence in Education

City College Students:
William Lew, Student
Tim McGuire, Student Council Member
Joseph Goldstein, Student Council Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

In 1952, the “Experts” said we needed reservoirs. They felt so strongly that they condemned the City College West Campus, destroyed the buildings, and constructed the reservoirs—all at taxpayer’s expense.

Now, in 1986 with more demand for water, the “Experts” say the reservoir is no longer needed. What is the concerned taxpayer to believe?

When in doubt, the city should hold on to the expensive things already paid for.

Stop the reservoir giveaway. Vote YES on E.

Taxpayers for Preserving the Reservoir.
Richard Patterson
Dorice Murphy
Lucille Carson
Daniel Gutierrez
Franz Witte
Bernhard Scholand
Ruth Hanson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This is a Planning issue

We have been accused of trying to stop housing for poor people. Not true. In the first place, the price levels are certainly middle income and above, but our main objection is that this badly done plan is damaging to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as to the over-crowded community college across the street.

WHAT WE WANT

Even our critics point out that we originally SUGGESTED housing for that site, but they don’t talk about what else we suggested. We want two levels of parking under a City College Library, Bookstore, and Auditorium, with housing on top. Furthermore, let the housing be TRULY affordable—for students and seniors. We are trying to stop the bureaucrats’ subsidized middle income housing project because it makes our dream impossible.

We ask for three years to give the neighborhood and the college a chance to produce a better plan.

SNaP (Sensible Neighborhood Planning Committee)

Helen Crizer, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council, representing 17 neighborhood associations in the area of the surplus reservoir property in question has voted to endorse the three-year stop of private construction on the old West Campus of City College.

Dr. Louis Batmale, Chancellor of City College from 1970-1977, has persuaded us that City College needs the lands.

Juanita Raven, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Be a sport. Give City College a vote of support.

City has 23,000 students and badly needs a library. The only place to put it is in the reservoir site. City College has walked closely with San Francisco for five decades. The reservoir site has always been understood to be reserved for City College.

Until now someone wants it for housing. Housing is important, but it can be anywhere in town. But a City College library can only be located at the College.

Vote yes to support a book—and a reader.

Reading, studying, writing and research make up our town also.

It is hard to understand criticism of City for wanting to keep this area for a library. Sure, housing sites are at a premium—but even more so a library site for City which is one of the largest schools in the Nation.

Some people blast City for wanting a library because of the need for housing. Housing is needed. But some of those very same people want a big battleship stationed here that will bring in 15,000 new family members.

The Educational and cultural growth of San Francisco mandates living space for the City College library.

If this measure gets a no vote, it means there will be no site for a Library. This is the last chance. Vote YES to help out a book—and a reader.

State financing, when approved, will construct this building. It is the top building priority at City College.

A YES vote here means there will be time to think about the use of the site. During that three year period, cooler heads may realize this is the only site for a Library. If the housing goes in there will be no library there.

Vote yes for a book, for a good school and a better City.

John Riordan, Board of Governors
San Francisco Community College District.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Sunnyside Neighborhood Association is not against housing, but we are trying to stop a hasty and short-sighted plan. We are asking for this moratorium to get time for a better plan that will answer a variety of needs and benefit the entire city as well as our community.

This is a planning issue.

The release of the reservoir property as surplus by the water department came as a surprise to our neighborhood. The June 1984 “Residence Element” of the city’s Master Plan did not even list the land as surplus. By 1985 major decisions were being made for use of the land without adequate neighborhood input.

There were some meetings attended by a few people carefully selected for their zealous pro-housing views or potential financial gain. The resulting plan has gone out of control. Now it benefits only the developer and the lucky few who will get houses on free land.

Proposition E is not an attack on housing.

Please help us save our neighborhood against poor planning by voting YES on Proposition E.

Joe Mahoney, President
Sunny Side Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Miraloma Improvement Club urges a YES vote on Proposition E.

Frank Mastro, President
Arnell Rodrigues

Maggie Kroll
Dorothy Evers

B. Sullivan
Dale Jones
Homer Bradford
Kathryn A. Small
Harry Small

Mr. & Mrs. Henry Taylor
Betsy Woo Sum
Susan Piccetti
Dale Brown

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION E

All the talk in the world can’t change the fact that City College has fewer acres of land relative to its student population than any college in the Bay Area.

Enrollment at City College is INCREASING, as is the enrollment of the San Francisco public schools from which City College draws most of its students. It is obvious that City College needs and deserves the reservoir land. The three year moratorium will gave time to produce a better plan which will have in-

put by faculty, students and alumni who know the college’s needs and want to support it.

Sid Kass
Susie Langdon Kass
Phil Kass
City College Student
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The homeowners of Westwood Park, a neighborhood adjacent to the Balboa Reservoir, support the ballot initiative calling for a 3 year development moratorium. We believe that the City and City College should take additional time to determine their needs and how they might be met by using the Reservoir. In the event that City College does not need this property, we support its development as open space or as single family detached housing.

Westwood Park Association
Don C. Swander
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Let’s not aggregate the traffic problem around City College before we first develop solutions for the existing problems. A three-year moratorium only buys our neighborhood and elected officials time to find solutions; it doesn’t say no to housing. A YES vote is a vote for prudent development. A YES vote helps to preserve the family character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ken Hoegger
Realtor and community Activist

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As representatives of the students of City College, we understand first-hand, the intense need to reserve a site for future school expansion. Preservation of the Balboa Reservoir, a site directly adjacent to the campus, is particularly crucial. The facilities that CCSF requires, such as a library and an auditorium, are essential to the main structure of the campus. Unlike classrooms, it would be unreasonable to build an auditorium or a library on an off-campus site, since these facilities are integral to the main function of the school.

In short, opposition to the moratorium based on the notion that alternate sites could be secured, is misleading. Once a site near the college is taken, any hope of expansion would be eliminated.

Associated Student Council of City College
Jack Lee, Vice President of Associated Counsel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Local 2121 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, representing City College faculty, urges a yes vote on Proposition E. Yes on E for continued excellence in community college education.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is twice as crowded as any community college in northern California. It needs a much larger library, bookstore and auditorium, and more parking.

The college has always expected to use the empty SOUTH reservoir for educational needs. That land is finally surplus. Neither the college Governing Board nor the Chancellor attended the Mayor’s planning sessions for the property and the faculty was not informed. When the 12.3 acre site was offered to a developer for $36,900 for subsidized housing, the Chancellor said, “We are at a crossroad and the correct path is for the Board of Supervisors, with the Mayor’s support, to deed this surplus land to City College so that the college may continue to serve the city effectively for the next 50 years as it has for the past half century.” The Mayor refused. Now only Board member John Riordan supports the correct path.

The Water Department says it may need the NORTH reservoir now used for student parking. If that crisis occurs, the Chancellor says, “We’ll deal with the situation then.” How, if the south reservoir is gone?

(continued)
When land is available other community colleges finance large projects through alliances with civic, athletic and cultural organizations, and through property sales. New methods for public funding are being developed.

The faculty would like three years of careful study to unravel misunderstandings and poor management, and to find the best way to be a good neighbor.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College needs land now for desperately needed facilities, one of which is a library. City College has an enrollment of 23,000 students but our library has seating for 450. There are other possible locations for new housing, but City College can't be moved. Give us an opportunity to plan a development for the community and the college.

Annie M. Young
City College Library Faculty and Staff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty and staff members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Virgie Applin
Bill Carpenter

Matthew Castaneda
Hortensia Chang

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Darlene Alito
Mary Allen
Mary Amster
Tom Angelloff
Robert Balestreri
Don Bateni
Diana Bernstein
Joe Berry
Anna Bratton
Thomas Brendel
James Bristol
Richard Brownell
Laurens Brousseau
Philip Brown
Barbara Cabral
John Callen
John Carls

Frank Cerrato
Rosemary Clark
Perry Close
Kurt Common
Walter Crippen
George Crippen
Patricia Davis
Guy DePrimo
Edward Dieruf
Sharon Edwards
Larry Ernst
Mary Erwin
Kwey Pong
William Funke
Jerry Greenfield
Robert Griffin
Michael Gathrie
Mary Hanna
YenKuang Ho
Peter Hoch
Ronald Hochele
Myrna Holden
Katherine Houlden
Michael Houlden
Edward Hunt
Frank Ingersoll
Elaine Johnson
Wendy Kaufman
Jo Kennedy
Mercedes Kow
Rosalind Kwok
Don Laferty
James Lallaz
Steve Levinson
Sue Light
Gary Ling
Amelia Lippi
Dave Lubbert
Leon Loy
Dwayne Macalou
Marion McManus
Patricia Madison
Michiel Malachowski
Mary Mars
Maria Mariani
Sylvia Marshall
Valerie Mehan
Jose Mejia
Margit Michelini
Deanne Mital
Cindy Moody
Thomas Munro
David Myhre
Deborah Nagle
Glenn Nance
Herbert Naylor
William Noff
Dennis Piotkowski
Francine Podenski
Therese Poydassus
Solomon Raja
Mary Riordon
Fariborh Saniee
Martin Schinzerer
Fred Schneider
Earl Scriver
Andy Seal
Ken Shen

Roberto Strickman
MoShuei Tan
Edward Taylor
Pierre Thiery
Barbara Thomas
Clare Thompson
Willie Thompson
Mary Thorber
Robert Tricaro
James Truener
Joanne Tumminia
George Valdez
Cherie Wetzel
Austin White
Joan Wilson
Rosalie Wolf
Christina Yee

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Water Department has begun a resource study of water use, due for completion in two or three years. The study may well indicate that one or both reservoirs will be needed. The American Water Works Association states that reservoirs should be used in pairs. This is particularly important because it is the only reservoir at an elevation of 305 feet.

The Mayor twisted the arm of the Water Department to declare one of these reservoirs surplus before the water resource study is completed. Don’t let her get away with this kind of political manipulation.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Kurt Common
Ken Crizer
Ed Dierauf
Herb Naylor
CSCF Engineering Professors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The South Balboa Basin has been unused since college leased buildings, including a large auditorium, were torn down on that site thirty years ago. We hope that three years of thorough planning would explore the possibility of returning a part of that property to the college for the development of a multi-purpose medium-sized auditorium which could be shared with community groups.

Robert Bozina
Mack Crooks
Bob Davis
Helen Dilworth
Franz Enciso
Richard Esterman
Richard Fenner
Lawrence Ferrara
Ted Fleming
Peggy Garham
William Grothkopf
David Hardiman

Judy Hubbell
Charles Hudspeth
Sieglinde Isham
Baruch Klein
John Kingstom
Joshua Law
Steven Lopez
Jerry Mueller
Madeline Mueller
Marvin Sartak
Franck Townsend
City College Music Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition E. This moratorium is necessary because there are too many worthy uses for this land to make a hasty and potentially very costly decision. Only through careful planning can the limited land available for development be best used.

Jerome Hoxken
Robert Kaar
James Kurek
Duck Lee
Chelcie Liu
William Maynez
Annette Rappeyea
Oleg Reout
David Wall
City College Physics Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, as Physical Education Instructors, have always been committed to a diversified program for our students and community. The reservoir space is a natural land resource for a Multi Educational and Cultural Center.

Your YES vote on E will allow us the freedom to explore ways that this property could most constructively benefit all.

Gail Barton
Curtis Decker
Brad Duggan
Tanako Hagiwara
Joan Hahn
Daniel Hoyes

Lene Johnson
Grover Klemmer
Paula McCullum
Art Octavio
Louise Scourkes

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, full-time faculty of the Computer and Information Science Department of City College, urge a YES vote to postpone the decision until additional planning and surveys can be conducted. The current proposal would negatively impact the College’s enrollment.

William Beaver
Ronald Cerruti, Chairman
Kirk Gibson
Howard Granger
Frank Holden
Michael Kelly

George Lanyi
Norbert Ludkey
Charles Metzler
Charles Miller
Marilyn Schnake
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

A YES vote on Proposition E helps STOP a scheme to GIVE AWAY $12,300,000 worth of City land for $1,800,000 (or less) to a Redwood City real estate developer.

A YES vote will SAVE taxpayers $550,000 per year. The housing project will produce $240,000 in taxes, but supplying City services will cost $790,000 per year.

The Controller's cost estimate does NOT account for the $12,300,000 land value, since land sale below value is NOT technically a cost of government. The Controller also is NOT permitted to assume that the housing project will be constructed, since construction has NOT yet been ordered by the Board of Supervisors.

The plan does NOT restrict housing sales to moderate-income first-time buyers. The plan only restricts use of tax-subsidized funds. Any person favored by the developer or politicians can buy these dwellings and get the benefits of the public land giveaway.

The houses are made “affordable” by giving away the land far below market value, by City-backed low interest, and by cutting construction corners.

The real beneficiaries of the subsidized housing project are the financiers (NOT the project dwellers). Bondholders receive 9.6% average tax-free interest, which is equivalent to 24.6% taxable interest at 61% maximum tax. The developer and bond establishment receive $5,340,000; this is $26,300 (or 22.40%) for each $117,400 unit.

The City loses $51,700 worth of land GIVEN AWAY for each unit.

Vote YES on Proposition E for good fiscal management.

William Marquardt
Financial Analyst, SNaP
Helen Crizer, Treasurer, SNaP

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of College</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Campus (acres)</th>
<th>Area/1000 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City College of SF</td>
<td>22,624</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laney College, Oakland</td>
<td>9,805</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot College, Hayward</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa College</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of San Mateo</td>
<td>13,820</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>11.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Marin</td>
<td>6,663</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given these facts, why does the Governing Board not try to get the old West Campus back? Why don't they support this moratorium to delay the land grab?

The Governing Board is under political pressure from City Hall. They have been threatened with the loss of the north reservoir parking lot and funding for special projects. Forgive them. Vote Yes on E.

Friends of City College
David Newton
Glen Simpson
Jack Baker
Thomas Velasquez
Tillie McCullough

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The student population at City College is increasing. This semester's enrollment is up 1,265 students over last semester.

The enrollment in the San Francisco public schools has been increasing by 1,218 per year for the last three years. City College draws most of its enrollment from public schools in San Francisco.

Obviously, City College will have a larger enrollment in the future years, and will be in desperate need of space if we do not give it back its old West Campus.

Please reserve this public land for the college.
Please vote YES on E.

Barbara Holman

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON E

In 1981, I launched a six-point program to expand San Francisco’s housing supply and the voters had approved a City policy to add 20,000 new housing units within five years. This Proposition would destroy a major portion of the effort to build affordable, single-family housing in our city.

The Balboa Reservoir Site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now a site for development of 203 new single-family homes, most with three bedrooms and two baths. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed as other homes built under the City’s program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom could not afford homeownership. It is believed that these new homes will sell rapidly.

The Balboa Reservoir site is one of the few sites large enough to accommodate a substantial number of new homes. Please do not let a few people stop a major opportunity for new housing. Vote no on Prop E.

Not only would Proposition E halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site, but the 9.8% fixed-rate, 30-year mortgage money set aside for the housing would also be lost.

Nothing constructive is accomplished by this measure—it does not provide additional land or facilities for City College. As a matter of fact, City College has never plans nor money to use the property. Further, the Community College Board of Directors, the governing body for City College, has voted overwhelmingly to oppose the initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No on E.”

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the site of the unused Balboa Reservoir and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost.

These homes are desperately needed for San Franciscans who can’t afford to buy in the city where the average house is selling for over $160,000. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

The homes would be built on land that belongs to the City. Over two years ago, it was declared surplus and available for housing. It is not part of City College, and City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

We urge you to vote no on Proposition E if you want more affordable housing for San Franciscans.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

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

The 203 affordable owner occupied single family units slated for the southern portion of Balboa Reservoir are part of the 1988 total. Our progress in addressing the City’s housing shortage will be curtailed if this ill-advised initiative is approved. SUPPORT OWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Housing production is essential to check rising prices and to maintain our social, economic, and ethnic population diversity. AS A SAN FRANCISCO VOTER, YOU CAN BE PART OF OUR HOUSING PROGRESS BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

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

WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT THE CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY HOUSING BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

Proposition E would halt construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. We need more housing in San Francisco, not less. Please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.

Doris M. Ward, Member
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

A critical issue facing San Francisco today is the lack of housing middle class San Franciscans can afford.

That is why I have joined these neighborhood associations to support the Balboa Reservoir neighborhood housing proposal. Those participating in the development of the proposal includes:

O.M.I. Community Association
Dorado Terrace Association
Outer Mission Ingleside
Political Action Committee
Greater Ingleside Community
Mount Davidson Manor
Ocean Avenue Merchants Association
Ingleside Terrace Association
The San Francisco Open Space Committee
City College of San Francisco

From early in 1985 I worked closely with these neighborhood groups in the discussions between city government and community leaders concerning the development plans for this desperately needed new housing at the unused Balboa reservoir site.

THese ARE THE REASONS YOU SHOULD VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

1. The neighborhood housing proposal that this initiative seeks to stop is the result of months of hard work by the largest coalition of neighborhood associations ever to join together to plan a housing development in San Francisco.

2. The housing at the Balboa Reservoir site was designed with the involvement of the coalition of neighborhood associations to enhance the surrounding community.

3. The governing Board of the Community College District has made clear that they have no plans for the site and no ownership rights to it. City College does not oppose the construction of this development and opposes this initiative.

4. Self-proclaimed “Friends” of City College want to stop the proposal in order to preserve the site for future faculty parking. A clique of City College staffers involved in a neighborhood association pose as community opposition to this development even though a representative from this organization, the Sunnyside Neighborhood Association, had helped plan and support the proposal.

5. By masquerading as concerned neighbors these self-appointed “friends” of City College hope to prevent the construction of 204 critically needed units of housing and pull off one of the biggest land grabs in San Francisco’s history.

DON’T BE FOOLED. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Residence Element of the Comprehensive Plan of the City and County of San Francisco assesses the City’s housing needs and lays out specific steps to meet those needs. This document was adopted by the City Planning Commission in 1984 after extensive public review at neighborhood meetings and public hearings, and consideration of the detailed Environmental Impact Report.

The first objective of the Housing Element is “to provide new Housing for all income groups” in locations appropriate for residential development. To meet this goal, development of housing is to be aggressively pursued and encouraged on surplus, underused and vacant public land.

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

If you want more affordable housing in San Francisco vote no on Proposition E.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Susan J. Bierman, City Planning Commissioner
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on E.

Proposition E deprives San Franciscans of one of their last real chances to become homeowners at an affordable price. At the South Balboa Reservoir we have City-owned land on which 203 units of three-bedroom, two-bath homes can be built at low prices which average San Franciscans can afford to pay. These homes need to be built now, not in three years. In three years the low interest rates on mortgages and the bond financing will be gone. Two hundred families will have lost the opportunity to become homeowners, and the City will have lost the opportunity to ease the tight market in rental housing.

Nor does this ill-conceived initiative help City College in any way. City College does not need this land. Speculation that the College may at some future date find a use for the land is not founded on fact. The College may never be able to build on the reservoir. Their enrollment has dropped by over 4000 students in the last few years.

This initiative is designed to confuse you. It will make our housing shortage worse for three long years. If you support affordable housing in our City, Vote NO on Proposition E.

Bill Maher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Balboa Reservoir site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now planned for development of 203 new single family homes. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed — other homes built under this program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom would not otherwise be able to afford home ownership.

San Francisco has the most expensive housing in the nation where last year the average home sold for over $160,000. Housing is difficult to produce because the obstacles are great — little land on which to build, high construction costs and uncertain interest rates.

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost. The initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional land or facilities for City College. The Community College Board, the governing body of City College, in fact recently voted to oppose this initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No” on Proposition E.

John L. Molinari

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

In 1980, the voters of the City and County of San Francisco approved a measure making it City policy to add 20,000 new units of housing within five years. In 1984 in an effort to satisfy this objective, the Board of Supervisors adopted a policy encouraging the expansion of the City’s housing supply. Making surplus City-owned land, such as the site at Balboa Reservoir, available for affordable housing was an important part of that policy. A proposal to build 203 homes on the unused Balboa Reservoir site was advanced to help implement the pro-housing policy.

Approval of Proposition E would HALT construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.

The Balboa Reservoir homes would be built on land currently belonging to the City and County of San Francisco. The property IS NOT part of the City College, and City College has neither plans or money to buy the property and convert it for City College use.

The only debatable issue is the future of affordable housing on the Balboa Reservoir site.

As we are all aware, San Francisco has the most expensive homes in the United States. The average cost of a home is $152,000. Not many can afford such prices. However, the housing proposed for the Balboa Reservoir will give many more citizens the opportunity to become homeowners. The homes to be built will be sold to first-time buyers at prices ranging from $83,000 to $145,000.

Other homes built in San Francisco under the direction of similar affordable housing programs have been snapped up quickly by San Franciscans. Without the program, most would not have been able to purchase the home and become homeowners.

Again, if you desire to preserve the construction of more affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site, vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Willie B. Kennedy
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

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

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

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

Stop these self-serving no-growth obstructionists! Please vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Prop E would halt affordable housing construction at the Balboa Reservoir site. Many gay people need affordable housing, too, and we join with other community groups urging you to vote NO on Prop E.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Robert Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E, if approved, would block the construction of 203 badly needed single-family homes on the south portion of the Balboa Reservoir in San Francisco. Sixty percent of these homes would be available for purchase by moderate and middle income families at purchase prices between $80,000 and $120,000. They would be constructed on surplus public land and financed by the sale of mortgage revenue bonds to enable the developer to sell the homes at below market prices.

A neighborhood group headed by two city college faculty members is responsible for placing Proposition E on the ballot. The group contends that the land which is intended to be used for the project should be made available instead to City College for the construction of new teaching facilities even though enrollment at City College is declining and the City College Board has voted 6 to 1 to oppose the initiative.

Like many other areas of the country, San Francisco suffers from a shortage of housing. Purchase prices here are among the highest in the nation. The use of surplus public lands and revenue bond financing provide a means for making single family homes available to a broad spectrum of families at affordable prices.

The Balboa Reservoir project is supported by the leaders of 8 neighborhood groups in the area surrounding the location of the proposed project and by a majority of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, as well as by Mayor Dianne Feinstein. We urge you to encourage the construction of this type of housing in San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition E.

San Francisco Board of Realtors
William L. Jansen, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

SAVE OUR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS!
BERNAL HEIGHTS SAYS, "VOTE NO ON PROP E!"

We are residents of Bernal Heights in San Francisco. We've worked hard to build affordable family and senior citizen homes in our neighborhood.

We need more affordable housing in our City to survive. The real issue in Prop E is affordable family housing — a "yes" vote prevents the construction of 203 family homes. That's crazy!

Join us in preserving what's best in our City.
Vote "no" on Prop E!

Sylvia M. Yor, Bernal Heights Community Foundation Board of Directors***
Frank Hutchins, BHCF Board*
Mary Lou Berolletti, BHCF Board*
Lela Havener, BHCF Board*
Elizabeth Egger, BHCF Board*
Sister Janet Simons, BHCF Board*
Stephen Autonaran, BHCF Board*
Lorenzo R. Dill, BHCF Board*
Barbara Bayot, BHCF Board*
Margaret C. Randolph, Northwest Bernal Block Club*
Maureen Lamb, NWBBC*
Tim Mollinare, BHCF Planning & Dev't Committee*
Buck Bayot, BHCF P & D Committee*
***Organization for identification purposes only.

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

San Francisco Needs Affordable Housing—Vote No on Proposition E

Everyone agrees that San Francisco needs affordable housing. The questions are how and where that affordable housing can be built.

The Balboa Reservoir housing development, to be built on the site of a reservoir built thirty years ago and unused since that time, answers those important questions for more than 200 San Francisco first-time homebuying families by providing:
- 203 new affordable three-bedroom, single family homes
- 9.8% fixed-rate financing
- A mix of 30% low-income, 30% moderate-income and 40% market-rate first time buyers
- A convenient site that has been declared “surplus” by the City and “available for development of affordable housing”

The Balboa Reservoir housing development is a small but significant step in the effort to generate affordable housing in our City.

Thousands of San Franciscans from every community, neighborhood group and viewpoint agree that the Balboa Reservoir development is good for San Francisco. Virtually every elected official, including the Governing Board of City College also agree.

All these San Franciscans ask you to say “yes” to affordable housing and “NO” to Proposition E.

San Francisco Coalition for Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar, Executive Director

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The viable plan for affordable single family housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site is being threatened by Proposition E. If Proposition E passes, 203 single family homes will be lost to the citizenry of San Francisco at a time when they are greatly needed.

The facts about the proposed housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site argue strongly against Proposition E. All 203 homes will be for first time home buyers. One-third of the homes will be available to households earning $27,000. Another third of the homes will be available to households earning $36,000. Adequate parking will be provided within the development itself, thus answering any concerns that traffic in the area will be congested.

City College has no need or plan to use South Balboa Reservoir for its facilities. City College’s priority is to develop its existing campus. South Balboa Reservoir should therefore be used for one of the City’s greatest needs: increased and affordable housing which is available to lower and middle income families.

As homeowners who live in the vicinity of South Balboa Reservoir, we welcome its planned use for single family housing and feel it will become an integral and contributing part of the community. We therefore urge you to vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Submitted by:
Stephen Graham, Chairman of the Housing Sub-committee of the Citizen’s Committee for Community Development
Roderick A. McLeod, Vice-Chairman of the Citizen’s Committee on Community Development

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing is a group of neighbors which consists of many of the renters of Westwood Park and Sunnyside neighborhoods as well as owners and renters of Ingleside which are the closest neighbors to the Balboa Reservoir along with some of the students and teachers of City College.

We strongly support the Balboa Reservoir for housing. We believe that the Balboa Reservoir is an ideal spot for housing.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

As Merchants as well as residents of Ocean Avenue, Greater Ingleside and San Francisco, we support the Development of the Balboa Reservoir as housing.

A Traffic Survey has stated that there will be minimal impact on the existing patterns of traffic by this development.

Our neighborhood wants homes in the South Balboa Reservoir.
Vote No On Prop. E.

Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughney
Submitted by Patricia Vaughney

Additional City College Parking is being considered on another location off I-280 to keep the college congestion away from the neighborhood’s streets.

City College has 44 more acres in which to expand and existing buildings at City College have viable means to expand.
We believe that housing on the Balboa Reservoir is the most viable solution to develop a vacant piece of property that is directly adjacent to our stores on a Transpreferential Street.

Affordable housing is in great need in San Francisco and is as much needed here as anywhere. We want to help provide this need. Vote No on Prop. E.

Ocean Avenue Merchants Assoc.
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughney
Submitted by Patricia Vaughney

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction on much-needed affordable, single-family housing at the long vacant south Balboa Reservoir site. This proposition would also block a major housing development that would bring jobs into an area of the city that has little industry or private business.

Sale prices for these units are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the San Francisco housing market, where the average home is selling for $160,000. Construction of these homes will help all young, first-time home buyers and will require only 5% down, instead of the 20% down payment on houses bought with conventional home mortgages.

This plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by nine nearby neighborhood organizations. If Proposition E is approved and this project is blocked, more young adults will purchase their first home in Vallejo or some other outlying area, further draining San Francisco of the young families that every growing community needs.

San Francisco residents will gain apprenticeships, jobs, contracts and subcontracts from this development.

This plan calls for 2 and 3 bedroom, family-sized houses, with space for another bedroom which can be finished when needed. Each house will have 2½ parking spaces in front and would not cause parking problems in the area. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

City College of San Francisco has no plans to buy the property, has no money for institutional expansion, nor any mention of this land in any master plan. Some supporters of this proposition are motivated by racist notions and have said they fear that this development will become another "Geneva Towers." This type of thinking is similar to support for apartheid practiced in South Africa and must be defeated by progressive San Francisco voters. Property values will increase, instead of a decrease as a result of this project.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition E.

Larry Ubali Johnson-Redd — President, O.M.I. Pilgrim Community Center Inc.
Maria Campbell-Casey — Program Director, Bay Area Engineering Societies Committee for Manpower Training, Inc.
Clara Mills-Bradford — Program Director, O.M.I. Senior Center
John C. Jackson
Linda Rose-Gipson
Jon Still — Secretary, Young Adult Committee
Kenneth Butler

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote "No" on Proposition E.

Affordable Housing Alliance — Mitchell Omerberg, Director
Bay Area Urban League — Gregory Best, Field Representative
Bernal Heights Community Foundation — Andre Lennell Daye
Community Educational Services — Dorothy Chen, Executive Director
Japanese Community Youth Council St. Francis Square Apartments, Inc. — Sandra Mayor-Jenkins, Secretary
Minority Contractors Association of Northern California — James Haugabook, Secretary, Board of Directors
National Community Congress — Dr. Eddie C. Welban
Parkmerced Residents Organization, Inc. — Ricardo A. Callejo, Esq.
Potrero Hill Neighborhood House — Enola Maxwell
San Francisco Building Trades Council — Stan Smith
San Francisco Housing & Tenants Council — Joseph Lacey
San Francisco Tenants Union — Jim Raye
Rev. Amos C. Brown — Local Pastor & Community Servant
Greg Day — Chairman, Citizens Committee on Community Development
Polly V. Marshall — Commissioner, San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
Regina A. Sneed
Jim Wachob — San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Michael E. Willis, AIA — Fleming Corporation

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

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Greater Ingleside Political Club—Frank Noto, Treasurer
Housing Conservation and Development Corporation—Lonnie Lawson, Board of Directors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Bayview Baptist Minister Fellowship—Rev. N. B. Mills, President
Bread of Life Missionary Baptist Church—Rev. S. A. Bailey
Cosmopolitan Baptist Church—Rev. A. Ray Gentile
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Raymond M. Howard Sr.
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Carole Nelson
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Corinellus P. O'Reilly
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Paul G. Theiss
Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee—Charles Gale, Chairman
St. Peters Housing Committee—Tessa Rouverol

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: With certain exceptions, City officers, including elected officials and commission members, may represent clients before City boards and commissions other than their own, and be paid for their services. State legislators may represent clients before City boards and commissions, and be paid for their services. Any person may contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would prohibit City officers from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay. This proposition would prohibit State legislators from appearing before City boards, commissions and departments on behalf of clients for pay. City officers would be prohibited from discussing with these officers and legislators matters that the City is deciding. Proposition F would also prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit City officers and State legislators from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to allow City officers and State legislators to represent clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to allow any person to contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 77

How “F” Got on Ballot

On February 26 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for limitations on compensated advocacy and campaign contributions had qualified for the June ballot.

Quentin Kopp, Mark Gillham and Cheryl Arenson, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 9,400 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,986 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The purpose of Proposition F is to cut campaign contributions by large contributors (and thus reduce campaign spending) and eliminate undue influence by officeholders retained as paid lobbyists for projects requiring City approval.

Let's take a minute to analyze the untrue arguments against Proposition F.

- The opponents claim that Proposition F will force half the City's Commissioners to resign. In fact, Proposition F does not force any Commissioner to resign. It simply says they can't be a paid lobbyist and a City Commissioner at the same time. Does a commissioner value making money by lobbying more than public service?
- Some have also alleged that Proposition F will prevent duly-elected union leaders from serving as City Commissioners. No it won't. Proposition F prohibits "compensated advocacy"—that means lobbyists hired by an organization, not members of the organization itself. Proposition F does not apply to salaried employees of labor unions, corporations, or non-profit agencies. Moreover, Section 8.105 of the Charter precludes it specifically from applying to any member serving as a representative of any profession, trade, business, union or association on any board or commission which requires membership of representatives of specific professions, trades, businesses, unions or associations.
- Another untrue argument against Proposition F is that it prohibits City officials only from discussing pending issues with other City officials or State Legislators who are also acting as paid lobbyists in a matter and doesn't stop those officeholding lobbyists from writing City officials about their clients' objectives. That's not so. Proposition F applies to all such lobbying, written or oral. (The dictionary defines "discuss" as "to examine by means of speech or writing'.")

End government decision-making by "insiders" and reduce the influence of money on local campaigns.

VOTE YES ON F.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
San Franciscans for Good Government

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

In all our years of observing San Francisco City government, we have found one maxim to be true time after time: a good idea gets copied, especially among politicians.

For no sooner did Quentin Kopp promise to bring Proposition F to the voters than did Mayor Feinstein come up with an informal, administrative version of her own. Fine, you say (and the Mayor says), then why vote Yes on Proposition F?

(1) The Mayor's remedy of asking City Commissioners who also act as lobbyists before City agencies to resign is nothing more than a hand slap, and is good only as long as she is mayor. It's not binding on future mayors and could be changed without any vote of the Board of Supervisors, let alone the people of San Francisco. Proposition F prohibits this kind of conflict-of-interest, and it will be the law, no matter who is mayor.

(2) The Mayor's action did nothing to state legislators who can also act as lobbyists before City Boards and Commissions, nor did her action stop the law or business partners of City Commissioners from picking up the slack in big-money lobbying. Proposition F will stop these practices in their tracks.

(3) What about the other half of Proposition F, which reduced the campaign contribution limit to $500 so that all San Franciscans can enjoy equal access to City officials, not just the ones with the big bucks? The Mayor can't do anything about this, and she hasn't. Only a Yes vote on Proposition F will reduce the weight of big money and ensure our full voice in City elections and City government.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. If it's important enough for the Mayor to copy part of it administratively, it's important enough to do the job right and make it a law.

John J. Barbogalana
Harry Aleo
Jane Cahn
Dorothy Partridge

Robert Arenson
Rudolph Lohneis
Janet Wentworth

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The worst and most persistent problem in American politics is that politicians and political races can be "bought". Reducing the size of campaign contributions will be a step forward in reducing the role of money in elections. Vote yes for more honest government.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

RESTORE to the people their rightful and equal power as individual voters by reducing the monetary clout and influence of private interests who make the laws and the policies as City officials and Commissioners or State legislators.

TELL the special interests that their money and influence can no longer interfere with representative government.

TELL the special interests that the voters will no longer tolerate the influence-buying which comes with large campaign contributions.

TELL the special interests that this measure will encourage highly talented citizens to serve San Francisco honestly and responsibly.

VOTE YES ON F.

Cheryl Arenson
Anne Renfrew
David Paccheco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

"Government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

These noble words from Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, cast in bronze at the entrance to City Hall, seem to have escaped the attention of some City officials who pass by them every day. For in San Francisco City government, Lincoln's simple formula for representative government would read quite differently: "Government of the powerful, by the lobbyists, and for the wealthy."

Government of, by, and for the privileged few is bad government. Government of, by, and for all the people is good government. It's as simple as that—as simple as Lincoln first put it.

Proposition F, the Good Government Initiative, will help San Franciscans maintain control of their government and will prevent undue influence by City officeholders.

To reduce undue influence, Proposition F outlaws the practice of City Commissioners and State Legislators representing special interests for pay before City Commissions and Boards. City Commissions should render their decisions deliberately and impartially, not be swayed by the political clout of the lobbyists appearing before them, or by any political favors those lobbyist/politicians might promise. "I'll scratch your back if you scratch my back" bargains do not belong in government. And until such backroom bargains are made illegal, City government will not belong to the rest of us either.

Proposition F also reduces the maximum amount that anyone can give to a local candidate from $1,000 to $500. If large contributors and other special interests can't give as much money, they can't buy as much influence with elected officials. And the lower the contribution limit, the less campaign spending and the more City government will be responsive to all San Franciscans.

You can "buy back" City government from the privileged and powerful with the most precious of all political commodities: your vote.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Mary Lohnes
Peter Farooh
Judith Thorson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F, an initiative of the people, is needed to protect the voters and the integrity of the legislative process from being corrupted by the power of money and influence. It prevents City officials and State Legislators from lobbying the City on behalf of high-powered special interests. It also lowers the campaign contribution limit from $1,000 to $500, thus reducing the influence of those same special interests over our elections and elected officials.

The bogus argument that the Mayor won't be able to find qualified people to serve on City commissions if Proposition F is adopted ignores the plain fact that there are 700,000 people in San Francisco, a pool of civic-minded citizens more than large enough to accommodate the 250 commission appointments available in our City government. For example, there are plenty of architects to fill the one architectural appointment on the Art Commission, just as there are plenty of non-lobbyist business people and lawyers available to serve on other commissions.

Thousands of San Franciscans, not just the "insiders", are ready, willing, and able to serve the public.

Proposition F deserves your vote. Restore integrity to City government. Restore the confidence of the citizens of San Francisco in that government. Let's have no more Wilkes Bashford situations.

VOTE YES ON F.

Oscar Sutro
Martha Gillham
Marguerite Warren

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

VOTE "NO" ON F

This proposition disguises itself as "good government" but, in reality, would drive good people out of government. It is so crudely drawn—so sweeping in its implications—that it would bar from government almost anyone with even a remote business or community tie to government.

It would purge from City commissions anyone who "directly or indirectly" receives compensation from any "interests" with an issue before any City agency. Effectively, this could discriminate against employees from community and neighborhood groups, civil rights organizations, non-profit corporations, labor unions, merchant and business groups, as well as architects, lawyers and other professionals.

Actually, there currently are no commissioners who represent any clients before any City agency. All who are appointed in my administration sign a statement saying they will not advocate for any paying client before any official body of the City.

while they are commissioners. This proposition simply is not necessary.

Proposition F also would lower the limit for any individual campaign contribution from $1000 to $500. Although this sounds good, it would permit a wealthy person with various businesses and numerous family members to contribute many thousands of dollars through different sources. This would encourage "hidden" contributions. We must strive for disclosure of contributions, not a system which drives contributions underground. Candidates must be able to raise funds enough to put their message before the voters. Reducing the contribution limit can be a tactic to discourage persons from challenging incumbents.

Vote no on Proposition F.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition F purports to achieve a noble objective: The removal of "influence peddling" from City Hall. In fact, Proposition F is so poorly-crafted, it may have exactly the opposite effect on City government. It is not a "good government" initiative. It is bad legislation.

Proposition F provides no definitions and no standards for the public to judge whether City officials comply with its restrictions. Its uncertainties will be chaotic and lead to endless, needless lawsuits.

A measure similar to Proposition F was rejected by the Board of Supervisors because no public hearings were ever held on the legislation. If the public had had a chance to comment on this initiative, it might not have the critical shortcomings, deficiencies and uncertainties that now warrant its rejection by responsible San Franciscans.

In the coming months, the Board will review good government measures that are comprehensible, effective and, most important, certain. Proposition F is a misguided disaster.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

This should properly have been titled the "SINK WILLIE BROWN ORDINANCE"! The "meat of the coconuts" is in Section 4.

Supervisor Kopp’s intentions are good, however this sloppily drafted and incomprehensible measure succeeds in “burning down the barn” to eliminate a couple of rats!

Under this proposal, to avoid any potential INDIRECT conflict of interest, (which is undefined!), one would have to be a destitute, unemployed welfare recipient to qualify for service on any City Board or Commission! The Mayor has already solved this “hired advocacy” problem with the “conflict of interest” affidavits she demands IN ADVANCE from any prospective appointee.

Quentin’s proposed $500.00 campaign contribution limit is an “inside joke” and he, of all people, knows it! It merely obliges a heavy contributor to have his wife, children, business associates, or friends send in SEPARATE $500.00 checks if he wants to contribute more than $500.00 to a politician’s campaign.

These proposals require additional City employees for enforcement and wind up doing far more harm than good. Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O’Keefe, Sr., President
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Union members and labor officials have legitimate reasons for meeting with City officers. It is unfair and wrong to lump them in the same category as special interest lobbyists, yet that's exactly what Proposition F does. Working people deserve representation on City boards and commissions. VOTE NO!

Walter Johnson
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council

LeRoy King
James Elliot
Keith Eckman
Reeva Olson

Jeff Greendorfer
Stan Smith
Larry Griffin
Steve Rabissa
Terrence Ryan
Jack Beggs
Tony Marovich

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

If you want to ban business owners and executives from serving on City boards and commissions, then vote for Proposition F.

If you think board members of non-profit corporations and employees of community agencies have nothing to contribute to City government, then vote for Proposition F.

If you believe union members and labor officials should not have a voice at City Hall, then vote for Proposition F.

But if you share our belief that these individuals have legitimate concerns and expertise that is valuable in running major City departments, then join us in voting NO on Proposition F.

Proposition F is a simplistic, sloppily-drafted, meat axe approach to a problem already resolved by Mayor Feinstein's ban on commissioners lobbying on behalf of private clients.

Proposition F is not good government and it is not reform. Proposition F is bad legislation. VOTE NO.

Hon. Douglas Engmann
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Eugene Friend
Hon. Phyllis Lyon

Hon. Any Meyer
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Walter Jebe
Hon. Bruce Lilienthal
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Jean Kormun
Hon. Thomas Horn
Hon. Henry Berman
Hon. Robert McCarthy
Hon. Richard Guggenheim
Hon. Toby Rosenthal
Hon. Patrick McGrew
Hon. Kirk Miller
Hon. Melvin Lee
Hon. Jerry Berg
Hon. Bonnie Gibson
Hon. Mary Noel Pepys
Hon. Mark Buell
Hon. Tim Carey
Hon. Jo Hanson
Hon. Kevin Malone
John Sanger
Tom Moore

Donald Disler
Jim Wachob
Anne Daley
Linda Past
Lynne Williams
Todd Dickinson
Peter Hanson
Herbert Kurian
William Scootiris
Van Hart
Iris Pluhlen
Noam Rand
John Schmidt
James Mock
Thomas Karwaki
Wendy Goldberg
Joseph Schwartz
Belle Lazarus
Antonio Barrios
Bruce Barrett
Charles Howell
Walter McGuire
Sharon Duvall
Joyce Mauriello

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

We're sympathetic to the need for political reform. But it's a complicated problem, and Proposition F just isn't the way to go.

Frankly, we can't tell who is and isn't affected by this measure. While a handful of people sometimes might abuse their positions, that's no reason to question the integrity of so many solid citizens who give tirelessly to public service. Proposition F is simply the wrong approach. Please join us in voting NO.

William E. McDonnell
Frances May McAteer
N. A. Sapunar
Caroline and Michael Figoni

Martin D. Murphy
Eugene C. Payne III
Suzanne B. McCarthy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Concerned about elected officials spending $400,000 to run for supervisor and $1 million on a mayor's race? Then vote NO on Proposition F.

That's right. NO.

Proposition F isn't going to do anything about campaign spending. Prop F simply limits the size of contributions, reducing the current limit from $1,000 to $500. Supervisors can and will continue spending outrageous sums on their re-election campaigns. With Proposition F they'll just spend twice as much time raising money from twice as many sources, and that makes special interests even more powerful. They can always find ways around campaign limits.

We need campaign spending reform, but Proposition F doesn't provide it. Please join us in voting No on F.

District 8 Democratic Club
Stephen L. Taber
Ruth Gravanis
Alan Raznick
Miriam Blaustein

Linda Chapman
Dale Carlson
James Firth
Debra Barnes
Lev Serbin
Debra Stein
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

When campaign contributions are limited, political freedom suffers. Your right to free speech includes not only your right to express your views, but also your right to support as much as you want, any candidate who speaks for you.

Minority viewpoints depend heavily on the contribution of a few dedicated supporters to get your message out. To limit your financial support of your beliefs is to silence your political voice.

Only incumbents, who have many opportunities for free media exposure benefit from this assault on free speech. The dangers of a campaign contribution limit far outweigh any possible benefit from this proposition. Defeat Proposition F!

San Francisco Libertarian Party
Michael R. Fowler, Secretary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

You may think Prop F only applies to big-time lawyers and a few legislators who represent developers. Think again!

Prop F would prohibit many community leaders from public service. If it passes, board members and employees of community and charitable organizations could be banned from serving on City boards and commissions.

We appreciate the public need for a government free of "influencing peddling." But restrictions on "compensated advocacy" ought to be clearly and carefully crafted to protect the voices of community leaders who argue on behalf of the public interest, not private special interests.

Vote No.

Hon. Juanita Del Curlo
Mission Hiring Hall

Bob Ross
Publisher, Bay Area Reporter

Hon. Jeffrey Ken Mori
Japanese Community Youth Council, Inc.
Bill O'Callahan
American Red Cross
Hon. George Suncin
Horizons Unlimited
Hon. Jean Rita-Alviar
Mission Education Project
Hon. Greg Day
Pole Street Town Hall
Hon. Naomi Gray
Hon. James Foster
Carol Wong
Marlena Marcelle
Lee Woods
Jo Daly
Dennis Collins
Hon. H. Welton Flynn
(Organizations listed only for purposes of identification.)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will have no effect on developers' lawyers.
None.
It won't make any difference to state legislators either.
Don't kid yourself. This is not "reform" and it isn't "good government." Proposition F will allow the special interests and influence peddlers to continue exercising influence over our elected officials. It has so many loopholes, lobbying will actively continue, untouched, in the back rooms of City Hall.

And developers will always find ways around campaign contribution limits. As Common Cause has noted, Prop F simply makes tracing their dollars more difficult for the public.

Real reform would directly attack the source of huge contributions—the developers and other special interests that employ the lobbyists to peddle their influence.

VOTE NO.

Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
David Looman
Michael Mason

Rich Walter
Susan Klugermun
Rene Carenace
Margie O'Driscoll

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
PROPOSITION G

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?

YES 300
NO 301

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has adopted an ordinance prohibiting the City, with certain exceptions, from purchasing goods or services from companies doing business with South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a declaration of policy that says the City must try to avoid doing business with companies that significantly profit from or help maintain the Apartheid system in South Africa. It calls on other public bodies and private groups to adopt similar policies. It directs the Board of Supervisors to identify the companies which have the greatest ties to Apartheid so that the public can also boycott those companies.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to avoid doing business with companies that help maintain Apartheid, and you want a public boycott of those companies.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

“The proposed Declaration of Policy be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “G” Got on Ballot

On November 6, 1985 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for the City to boycott businesses with significant ties to South Africa had qualified for the June ballot.

Arlo Hale Smith, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,546 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on October 11.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,941 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:
It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This measure calls for a public boycott of companies that aid apartheid.

Any claim of "conflict" between Proposition G and existing anti-apartheid legislation is imaginary: It is the legislative intent of supporters of this measure that it can be construed as a directive for making existing law tougher.

Personal attacks have no legitimate place in a ballot measure campaign. As proponent of this measure, I repudiate all such tactics.

Vote NO on apartheid. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Arlo Hale Smith

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Boycotts are grassroots politics. They've helped the farmworkers, they've helped win integration, and they can help end the legal racism called "Apartheid".

A Gallup poll found 77% of South Africa's black majority favoring international economic boycotts to force the Apartheid regime to accept reform peacefully.

After the Boycott Initiative made the ballot, the San Francisco Supervisors unanimously passed a similar city purchasing policy. The issue that remains is whether to call on the general public to join in, boycotting companies identified by the Supervisors as the worst offenders in each industry.

The companies that would be targeted consider profits to be the "bottom line". Economic pressure is all they understand.

The AFL-CIO, NAACP, and NOW have called a boycott of Shell Oil because of its profiteering from South Africa's oppressive economic conditions. Proposition G supports that and would put the same pressure on other industries as well.

This proposition is supported by the elected county central committee of the Democratic Party, the Peace-and-Freedom Party and the Humanist Party, and by leading attorneys, such as Terry Francois, Terence Hallinan, Tony Serra, Lewis Hope Lee, Marc Van Der Hout, Abby Ginsberg and Terence Redmon.

If South Africa were a democracy, its majority would long ago have voted to end Apartheid. We need to vote Yes—because they can't.

Atty. Arlo Hale Smith, Democratic Party County Central Committee
Paul Kangas, Peace and Freedom Party
Lois Salisbury, Public Advocates
Dr. Kevin Danaher, Food First*
Jesse James, Mission Rebels
Terry Collins, Community Activist
Stone Geberi, Election Action
Robert McCall, Hotel & Restaurant Employees
Executive Board Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Attorneys speak out against Apartheid:
South African police can arrest anyone without charge. They can hold you incommunicado—no contacts with family, lawyers or press.

They regularly censor news, books, music. They have banned Christmas caroling, funerals and other peaceful gatherings. Groups which criticize the government are forbidden to hold meetings.

Blacks are subject to legal segregation; their property and employment rights are greatly restricted; often, they are simply murdered.

As attorneys, we help people who have legal rights that are being violated. But what can we do for those who have no legal rights?

Boycotts and other economic sanctions are the only way to make the Apartheid government accept reform peacefully.

In the Court of World Public Opinion, Apartheid has been convicted of crimes against humanity. By imposing a sentence of economic isolation, we can end Apartheid.

Vote Yes—take a stand for justice.

Trence Hallinan
Arlo Hale Smith
Terry Francois
Karen Anderson Ryer
Robert R. Bryan

Ann Menasche
Rachel Ginsburg
Leo Paoli
Gabriel Gesner
Orn Prouchovnick

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is a moderate, responsible but effective proposal to bring economic pressure on the South African government to establish constitutional rights for all of its citizens. Vote Yes.

Terence Faulkner, Republican
Mike Garza, Republican

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

All decent Americans abhor apartheid. However, boycotting U.S. investment in South Africa is counterproductive; it only penalizes the actual victims of apartheid.

U.S. international firms have acted as progressive agents for change through the Sullivan principles. Their investments have improved the social and economic condition of the labor force. It is improper to penalize their positive contributions.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

We are individuals and organizations working actively to end the racist system of apartheid in South Africa. And we are voting NO on Proposition G.

Why?

(1) Because Proposition G will weaken San Francisco’s present divestment law. This law requires companies doing business with the city to sign affidavits that they will make no new contracts with South Africa.

Proposition G has no such provision.

(2) Proposition G provides no mechanism or funding to carry out its declared purpose of “boycotting” South Africa.

Proposition G will not stop South African products from entering the Port of San Francisco.

Vote against this useless, confusing, and deceptive initiative.

Preserve the stronger divestment law San Francisco already has. Vote NO on Proposition G!

Yvonne Golden
Geraldine Johnson
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
AFT 2121 Anti-Apartheid Committee
Artists Against Apartheid
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Coalition of Conscience
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club Executive Committee
ILWU 10 and SEIU 250 Southern Africa Liberation Support Committees
National Conference of Black Lawyers
San Francisco Anti-Apartheid Committee
Southern Africa Freedom Committee/All Peoples Congress

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1983 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure.

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

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?

YES 303
NO 304

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Several city and private agencies conduct various programs related to AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a declaration of policy that says San Francisco should support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council, consisting of a Committee on Education and a Fund-Raising Committee. The Research Committee would make recommendations on the most useful AIDS research projects and try to prevent duplication of efforts. The Education Committee would inform the public about the latest research and about ways to prevent AIDS. The Fund-Raising Committee would seek donations and grants for AIDS research and education projects.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

“The proposed Declaration of Policy for an AIDS research and education council and the formation of advisory committees of civic leaders would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, additional expenditure of public funds for AIDS research may result, the amount of which cannot be determined.”

How “H” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for AIDS research had qualified for the June ballot.

Stony Gebert, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 10,540 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on December 6, 1985.

A check of each signature on the petition showed that 7,564 of the signatures were valid. This is more than 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We need a council to expose and address major AIDS issues without the impasse of present medical/political bias.

As taxpayers, we are subsidizing a treadmill of continual AIDS casualties. There are major oversights where AIDS is concerned. Only recently was it learned that CDC statistics suggest 79% of early AIDS cases appear drug-related. We hear AIDS is 100% fatal. Perhaps that is because death may also be drug-related in the way of immuno-suppressive antibiotic and radiation overloads to already compromised immunity systems. Prevailing medicine is both tunnel-visioned and high-profit motivated. Also well-funded. This solution may be part of the problem. Some physicians are beginning to feel where AIDS is concerned many current practices are ethically, medically bankrupt.

Remissions occur. Largely through immunity-enhancing, holistic medicine. Significantly, only 1% of AIDS cases occur among people at risk in the Asian community. Perhaps this is due to less drug abuse or use of an unfunded, ignored resource: herbology as part of diet. More options: homeopathy, acupuncture, etc.

If, as anticipated, upwards of 40% of those testing positive come down with AIDS, we may become overburdened. To ignore all of the above becomes part of the problem. Vote Yes on Proposition H.

Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Rich McKirkeby, Former Orderly,
Marketing Associate, Pacific Bell
Joseph P. Clady, AIDS Hospice, Shanti Counselor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There is great need for research and education about AIDS and related conditions.

We need to attack the disease, not its victims.

Knowledge is the only vaccine available today.

Vote Yes.

John Lorenzini, President,
People With AIDS Alliance
Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Jan Beck, Steven Russell, Eugene Ewins, ARC/AIDS Vigil

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There are many possible treatments for AIDS and related conditions which are not being examined by the federal government, especially therapies based on natural substances and processes.

Vote Yes for an AIDS Research Council open to all viewpoints.

Scott Gregory, M.D.
Paul Kangas

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

A tape recording (Talking Book) of the San Francisco Voter Information pamphlet is available from the San Francisco Public Library’s branch for the blind. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

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

Name_________________________________________________________

Address_____________________________________________________ Apt. #________

Telephone No. (required)________________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any)____________________________________

Signature______________________________________________________
PROPOSITION I

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?

YES 307
NO 308

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the Freeway with a surface roadway.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City’s policy to remain as it is, and you want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to change the City’s policy, and you do not want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a policy statement asking whether or not the Embarcadero Freeway should be torn down.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway demolished, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by at least $10.2 million in local funds. Potential private sector financing and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “I” Got on Ballot

On March 3 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy placing the question of demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway before the voters had qualified for the June ballot.

Richard Hongisto, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 11,119 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,720 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

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

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land now under the Broadway ramps is put back on the tax rolls, with low-rise buildings limited by restrictive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when united with Proposition J, recognizes these facts:

1) The Embarcadero Freeway is what is left of a never-completed elevated freeway that would have ringed the City through North Beach and Marina neighborhoods to the Golden Gate Bridge.
2) Today this massive freeway, which separates us from our waterfront, would never be built.
3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.
4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf will be preserved.
5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked for this new system.
6) Only that portion of the Embarcadero Freeway east and north of the Main and Beale Street ramps — basically the portion directly on the waterfront — will be removed to make way for the new system. The removal cost, approximately $10 million to be paid for with privately-generated new revenues, is a relatively small part of the overall new system.

As for Proposition I, vote "YES, let's tear down the Embarcadero Freeway." Then turn to Proposition J and support the plan for a beautiful waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Removing the Embarcadero Freeway will allow San Francisco to:

• Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero.
• Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway.
• Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula.
• Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero.
• Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.
• Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won't benefit San Francisco. Don't let outsiders determine our future. Vote YES on I.

Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Jack Whiteley
Roger Boyer
A. Lee Knight
Robert Bradford
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Donald A. Crosby, AIA
Rui Y. Ohamoto
Robert Meyers
Ralph Hurnado
Hon. Susan Biernan
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Douglas G. Wright
Anita Sanchez

Chuck Forester
Fritz Arko
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones
Randy Ross
Karl Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
Jon Twichell
Jane Winslow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK — VOTE YES ON I

This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY — VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds — without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city's fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.

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

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT — VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree — it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents,

ABSENT VOTER BALLOT APPLICATION
Application must be received by the registrar of voters no later than 5/27/86.

Election Date June 3, 1986

PLEASE PRINT REGISTERED NAME:

FIRST NAME   MIDDLE NAME   LAST NAME

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

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

X

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT (DO NOT PRINT) DATE (AREA CODE) DAYTIME TELEPHONE

I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.

(AREA CODE) RESIDENCE TELEPHONE

THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT PROPER SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

STREET OR BOX

CITY     STATE     ZIP

Date Deputy Registrar

OFFICIAL USE ONLY
Ballot Type/Party Affidavit No.
Signature and Registration Verified as Correct:

Voters with specified disabilities may quality for an EMERGENCY BALLOT. Contact the Registrar of Voters Office for information.

cars a day whizzing by on this high speed downtown elevated waterfront freeway! Where will they all go? Aside from the outrageous demolition costs involved, (some engineers estimate $40,000,000 of taxpayer money!), eyeball observation, logic, and just plain “common sense” dictates that ground level “total gridlock” will result if this expensive freeway is now destroyed.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled. Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN OFFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should which spells out the concept be replaced.

The waterfront plan revisors includes removal in order to make way for growth, will pay for itself as land backs on the tax rolls, width waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when averaged these facts:
1) The Embarcadero completed elevated free through North Beach and Gate Bridge.
2) Today this massive

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PRO:
Removing the Embarcadero to:
• Create a six-lane, ti promenades to speed traf
• Build new on and off set access to the Bay Brk
• Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula.
• Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero.
• Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.
• Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON I
This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY—VOTE YES ON I
Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds — without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city's fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.

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

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT—VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to 15.7 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown, Fisherman's Wharf and the financial district would be reduced.

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:

- Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
- Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
- If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that—By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
- Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
- MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
- Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Tear it down? The concept is preposterous! There are 70,000 cars a day whizzing by on this high speed downtown elevated waterfront freeway! Where will they all go?

Aside from the outrageous demolition costs involved, (some engineers estimate $40,000,000 of taxpayer money!), eyeball observation, logic, and just plain "common sense" dictates that ground level "total gridlock" will result if this expensive freeway is now destroyed.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Nostalgic individuals must realize that the times have changed! We can't bring the Bay back up to Montgomery Street! On behalf of San Francisco's overburdened taxpayers, we urge a NO vote!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION,
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled.
Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYNFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY
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Embarcadero Freeway Policy

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco YES 310 to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it NO 311 would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a policy statement that says that the City would replace the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt a policy statement which says that the Embarcadero Freeway would be torn down if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt a policy statement to replace the Embarcadero Freeway under these conditions.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

"The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway replaced with a tree-lined six lane boulevard and other traffic and transit improvements, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by approximately $27.5 million. This includes a one-time freeway demolition cost of $10.2 million plus $17.3 million required to match potential federally-funded transit improvements. Potential financing by the State and private sector and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost."

How “J” Got on Ballot

On March 5 a declaration of policy regarding the future of the Embarcadero Freeway was delivered to the Registrar from the Mayor and several supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows the Mayor or four or more supervisors to submit a declaration of policy to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

In addition to Mayor Feinstein, the March 5 document was signed by Supervisors Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker, Molinari, Kennedy and Nelder.

POLLS ARE OPEN
FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans now have a chance to remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with an at-grade, six-lane parkway, which will open our waterfront and restore views blocked for years by this large freeway.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for traffic and transit improvements:

* New, shorter freeway ramps connecting directly with the Embarcadero;
* A tree-lined, at-grade, 6-lane Embarcadero Boulevard, with a new waterfront Muni line, a jogging and bicycle path from Fisherman’s Wharf to Mission Bay;
* Extension of Muni Metro south to the Caltrain station at 4th and Townsend;
* New ramps connecting I-280 with the Embarcadero;
* Changes in traffic flow and improvements to existing freeway ramps.

Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman’s Wharf will be preserved and enhanced.

The Board of Supervisors has specified that the Embarcadero Freeway will be torn down only if preliminary engineering during the next two years confirms—as traffic and environmental studies already have—that removal of the freeway will not result in more problems than it solves.

San Francisco became eligible for $88 million in federal highway funds for this new system when the Supervisors approved the plan in 1980. The $10.2 million cost of freeway demolition itself can be paid from revenues from low-rise development of the parcels now under the Broadway ramps and the increased values of nearby properties. Strict waterfront zoning limits the size of any development.

Traffic and environmental studies by the California Department of Transportation since 1980 clearly indicate that the new waterfront transportation system will be vastly superior to the existing situation, and that traffic congestion levels will not be notably different with the elevated structure removed.

Vote Yes on J and let’s remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with a parkway and transit system—once again let us see our waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J gives the voters a chance to be heard on an important and timely issue. This issue is the replacement of a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway as one element of a comprehensive package of transportation improvements in the Waterfront area.

Last fall, the Board of Supervisors adopted for further study a set of traffic and transit improvements for the Waterfront. These improvements include:

* a new landscaped surface-level boulevard
* replacement of the Clay/Washington and Broadway on and off ramps with new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom
* removal of the unused stub of I-280 and construction of new ramps connecting the new waterfront boulevard to Route I-280
* a new light rail transit line linking Fort Mason with the Caltrain Depot
* extension of the Muni Metro to the train depot, improving the Peninsula Commute Service

A YES vote on Proposition J does not allocate funds for these projects. It does allow for further design and engineering studies, including cost analysis, assessment of impacts on traffic, and other matters. The studies will then be presented to the Supervisors so that they can make an informed decision on the plan. If the studies prove positive, San Francisco will be able to transform its Waterfront for the benefit of all.

Proposition J will ensure that the City will not proceed with the removal of any of the Freeway until all the studies are completed and all potential consequences are assessed. This is the responsible approach. Vote YES on J.

SPUR
League of Women Voters
Embarcadero Citizens Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SAN FRANCISCO’S NEIGHBORHOODS ASK YOU TO VOTE YES ON J.

REDUCE TRAFFIC CONGESTION—YES ON J!

Traffic backed up by the Embarcadero Roadway slows travel and creates congestion in North Beach and other nearby neighborhoods. I will speed traffic flow.

IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION—YES ON J!

Proposition J will provide regular streetcar service along the Embarcadero and extend Muni Metro service to the south, ultimately extending to Bayview-Hunters Point.

PROMOTE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY—YES ON J!

If Proposition J does not pass, San Francisco could lose $88 million in federal funds for traffic improvements.

(continued)
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RESTORE THE WATERFRONT—YES ON J!
San Francisco's waterfront could become a focal point for the city, graced by a grand promenade, instead of the dismal, deteriorating eyesore it is now.

San Francisco's neighborhoods join together to ask your support for an improved Embarcadero. We guarantee the freeway will not be removed unless it is replaced by facilities that will assure a smoother, more efficient traffic flow. YES ON J!

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Robert Bradford
Ruth Gravonas
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Anita Sanchez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J
SUPPORT PUBLIC TRANSIT — VOTE YES ON J.
SAVE SAN FRANCISCO FROM GRIDLOCK — VOTE YES ON J.
The revitalization of the Northeastern Waterfront... as included in San Francisco's Master Plan and transit plans, as overwhelmingly approved by the Board of Supervisors and as urged by Mayor Feinstein... will allow almost $90 million in unused federal highway funds to be used for vital downtown and waterfront transit and street improvements which will be a key to reducing needless auto congestion in San Francisco.

PROPOSITION J SUPPORTS IMPORTANT TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS TO THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT. It will:
- extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific/CalTrain depot
- create a new rail line (possibly using historic streetcars) to connect the entire waterfront from Mission Bay to the Ferry Building to Fisherman's Wharf and Fort Mason
- set the stage for a possible streetcar line along Third Street
Since the city of San Francisco adopted the Transit First policy in the early 1970's, transit investments in the Muni Metro,

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J
A SOUND BUSINESS PROPOSITION — YES ON J!
Common sense and good business demand we make the most of our resources. San Francisco's waterfront is an economic and civic asset unrivaled anywhere — yet much of it is cut off by an ugly, noisy, elevated roadway. The traffic improvements called for by Proposition J will benefit workers, tourists, property owners, neighborhoods... and business.

Traffic flow and transit will move quickly on a realigned, reorganized Embarcadero Roadway, allowing easier, more pleasant access to waterfront businesses.

An improved and beautified Embarcadero will create new commercial opportunities and increase the value of existing property and businesses.

New jobs and an expanded tax base will generate increased revenue for the city as several lots now covered by freeway ramps return to productive private ownership. Though limited to low rise development (40 to 65 feet), tax revenues from development will more than make up the city's share of the project.

in new electric trolley an articulated bus service, and in BART and Golden Gate Transit, have saved downtown San Francisco from gridlock!

IF you are concerned about the future of transit in San Francisco, IF you are concerned about reducing needless auto congestion, THEN we urge you to join Mayor Feinstein and the majority of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in voting Yes on Proposition J.

Norman Rolfe
San Francisco Muni Coalition
California Transit League
Jack Wholey
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Regina Sneed
Tony Kilroy
Hon. Jack Morrison
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Bay Area Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Hon. Amy Meyer, Recreation and Park Commissioner
Alan Lubliner

Robert Meyers
Dennis J. Potts
Kenneth R. Lorch
M. Arthur Gestler, Jr., FAIA
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Bernier
H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones
Randall Rossi
Karl A. Linbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
Jon Twichell
Fritz Arko
Michael J. O'Shea
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J OFFERS RESIDENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO A ONCE IN A LIFETIME OPPORTUNITY TO RECAPTURE THEIR WATERFRONT.

Converting the Embarcadero into a tree-lined boulevard and building a new streetcar line will make the waterfront more pedestrian and transit oriented, that is, more people oriented.

A freeway structure that is a source of objectionable noise and casts a pall over a large part of the waterfront will be removed. The waterfront will be opened up to sunlight and fresh air and made more inviting and cheerful to those who wish to walk on one of the world’s outstanding waterfronts. Air pollution that is now retained by the existing elevated structure will be dissipated.

The transit orientation of the new waterfront will encourage energy conservation. Proposition J will:

— Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero
— Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway
— Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula

— Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero
— Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line
— Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won’t benefit San Francisco. Don’t let outsiders determine our future.

VOTE YES ON J FOR A BETTER SAN FRANCISCO.

Sierra Club			A. Lee Knight
Foundation for San Francisco’s
Architectural Heritage
Willinda McCrea
Bob Craner*
Rebecca Evans*
Richard Livingston*
Marilyn Clemens*
Jennie Levi*
Jeffrey Henne*
June Winslow*
Roger Boyer
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Patrick S. Hobin
Monica Halloran
Walter K. Morris
Lisa Klawmont
Jeffrey Heller
Bob Isaacson
George T. Rockrise, FAIA
Jon Twickell
Marc Kasky

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J GIVES US A CHANCE TO CORRECT A COLOSSAL MISTAKE!

The Embarcadero Freeway should never have been built. The original plan was to build a freeway from bridge to bridge, destroying the Northern Waterfront, Fisherman’s Wharf, Fort Mason, and Marina Green in the process. When the people of San Francisco saw what was happening, they stopped it in mid-air—literally.

Walk under it. Hear the noise. Feel the gloom. See how it cuts out light.

It’s time to remove this mistake.

The new waterfront plan will give us a tree-lined boulevard, a new streetcar line, and a Muni Metro extension to the Southern Pacific/Caltrain depot. It will give us a transit and pedestrian oriented waterfront that will give us pride and pleasure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J!

San Francisco Tomorrow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, with a membership of 1700 working architects in San Francisco, urges a “YES” vote on Proposition J. In 1968 the citizens of San Francisco stopped highway planners from ringing our waterfront with freeways. Today voters have another opportunity to return the waterfront to our citizens. Removal of the Embarcadero Freeway is one part of a carefully researched transit plan for San Francisco. This proposition supplies an unique opportunity to carry out a broad range of transportation improvements that will have many positive effects on the City of San Francisco.

Removal of the freeway will:

1. Return the waterfront to the people by removing this barrier to access and view.
2. Facilitate needed MUNI improvements.
3. Encourage development of the Embarcadero as a grand civic boulevard unifying the City of San Francisco.

The members of the American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition I and “YES” on Proposition J.

Donald Kennedy, FAIA
President
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans love Their City, the ambiance, the Bay, waterfront, the views, the healthy neighborhoods.
Freeway builders did their damnest to destroy the City and divide our neighborhoods.
Now we can remove that damned spot, the concrete dinosaur, the hideous barrier that destroys our scenic views, the fence that keeps us from the Bay, the concealer of the Ferry Building.
Correct a mistake.

VOTE YES ON J.
Miriam Blaustein
Charlene Clark
Marie Cleasby
Zach Cowan
Dick Grobboll
Rick Hauptman
Tony Kilroy
Jean Kortum
Ira Kurlander
Jack Morrison
Andy Nash
Norman Rofe

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

NO ON PROPOSITION J.
"I" is for JOKE—a cruel joke on us. What will J really do? Add traffic to every street east of Gough. Delay the construction of waterfront streetcar service. Cost millions in local dollars needed to improve MUNI. Create a ground-level freeway on the waterfront as big as Van Ness, with more cars.
I'm a private citizen who's concerned about traffic and what it's doing to our City. If you are too, vote NO on Proposition J.

Steve Colman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
• Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
• Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
• If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
—By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
—Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
—MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
—Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Blair C. Pascoe
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Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your vote:
1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION A

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by boldface type.

3.202 Office of Risk Management
There is established under the chief administrative officer an office of risk management which shall review, analyze and report to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the finance committee of the board of supervisors the practices of the several departments, boards and commissions of the city and county regarding loss prevention and risk management, including the insurance requirements of the city and county. The office shall also establish and assist in the implementation of planning and operational guidelines regarding risk management and loss prevention for each department, board or commission. The chief administrative officer may appoint, at his or her pleasure, or contract with, a qualified individual or organization for the operation of the office. The qualifications of the individual or organization operating the office shall include, but not be limited to, experience, education, training and experience in insurance and risk management.

3.401 City Attorney
(a) The city attorney shall be an elected office. He shall furnish an official bond in the sum of ten thousand dollars ($10,000). He shall appoint, and at his pleasure may remove, all assistants and employees of his office. He shall devote his entire time and attention to the duties of his office. He must, at the time of his election, be an elector of the city and county, qualified to practice in all the courts of the state, and he must have been so qualified for at least 10 years next preceding his election.

The city attorney must represent the city and county in all actions and proceedings in which it may be legally interested, or, for or against the city and county, or, any officer of the city and county in any action or proceeding, when directed so to do by the supervisors, except where a cause of action exists in favor of the city and county against said officer. Whenever any cause of action exists in favor of the city and county, the city attorney shall commence the same within his knowledge or when directed so to do by the supervisors. He shall give his advice or opinion in writing to any officer, board or commission of the city and county when requested. Except as otherwise provided in this charter, he shall not settle or dismiss any litigation for or against the city and county, unless, upon his written recommendation, he is ordered so to do by ordinance.

The city attorney shall prepare, or approve as to form, all ordinances before they are enacted by the supervisors. He shall approve, by endorsement in writing, the form of all official or other bonds required by this charter or by ordinance before the same are submitted to the proper commission, board or office for final approval, and no such bonds shall be finally approved without such approval as to form by the city attorney. Except as otherwise provided in this charter, he shall prepare in writing the draft or form of all ordinances or other action in behalf of the city and county. He shall examine and approve the title of all real property to be acquired by the city and county.

He shall keep on file in his office copies of all written communications and opinions, also all papers, briefs and transcripts used in matters wherein he appears and books of record and registers of all actions or proceedings in his charge in which the city and county or any officer or board thereof, is a party or is interested.

(b) The duties of the city attorney in connection with the bureau of delinquent revenue collection shall be transferred to and performed by the city attorney for said bureau who shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.
(c) There is established in the office of the city attorney a bureau of claims investigation and administration which shall have the responsibility of investigating, evaluating and processing for the several boards, commissions and departments all claims for money or damages made upon the city and county pursuant to section 7.093 of this charter or the general law of the State of California. Claims investigation functions of the police department in existence on June 4, 1986, shall continue as an adjunct to the bureau established under this section. Claims functions of the public utilities commission shall remain under that commission unless transferred to the bureau of claims investigation and administration by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the bureau shall also have the power to investigate events and occurrences giving rise to potential civil liability against the city and county and adjust and settle demands, within dollar limits to be established by ordinance, prior to their presentation as claims. There shall be established by ordinance a revolving fund to satisfy such demands adjusted prior to their presentation as claims. The bureau shall be responsible for the investigation of all claims and the analysis of city policies and practices upon which the bureau shall report and advise the several departments.

The city attorney shall appoint a chief of the bureau who shall serve at his or her pleasure. The chief of the bureau may appoint, subject to confirmation by the city attorney, investigators who shall serve at the pleasure of the chief; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status in the position of civil claims investigator or any equivalent classification on the date of approval of this amendment by the electorate shall continue to have civil service status to said position under the civil service provisions of this charter.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by boldface type; deletions are indicated by horizontal line.

7.100 Materials, Supplies and Equipment
The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreements for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. The purchase of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract. All purchases in excess of one thousand dollars ($1,000) shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in the case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases and a permanent record of all such quotations shall be kept. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) for materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of materials, supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two or more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned and may advertise for
bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions
limiting manufacturers of or dealers in other
articles made and sold for the same purpose to bid on
such specifications or on the specifications of their
own product. If the purchaser of supplies recom-
mends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stat-
ing his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance
of the other bid, and such propositional articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall
be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require depart-
ments to make adequate inspection of all purchases,
and shall make such other inspections as he deems
necessary. He shall direct the rejection of all articles
which may be below standards, specifications or
samples furnished. He shall not approve any bill or
voucher for articles not in conformity with specifica-
tions, or which are at variance with any contract.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and
warehouses of the city and county. He shall also have
charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of
City and county equipment. All garages and shops
heretofore maintained by departments for the con-
struction, maintenance, and repair of departmental
supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned
thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire
alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufac-
ure and repair operated by the department of elec-
tricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage
and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller,
maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and
equipment purchased for and in use in all depart-
ments and offices of the city and county. He shall be
responsible for the periodic check of such property,
and in case of loss or damage deemed to be due
to negligence, he shall report thereon to the
mayor, the chief administrative officer and the con-
troller. He shall have authority to require the transfer
of surplus property in any department to stores or to
other departments.

7.03 Requisition, Contract and Payment

All purchase orders and contracts shall be based on
written requisitions, or, for materials, or supplies in
common use in the various departments, on the pur-
cessor's records of average use by all departments.

Purchase orders and contracts in excess of fifteen-
thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars
($50,000) must be approved by the chief administra-
tive officer. Beginning with fiscal year 1978-79, the
board of supervisors shall be authorized to in-
crease or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount
of contracts requiring approval of the chief ad-
ministrative officer under this section. The pur-
cessor of supplies shall approve all bids and vouchers
for materials, supplies, equipment, and contractual
services before the controller shall draw and approve
warrants therefor. All contracts for the purchase of
materials, supplies and equipment shall be made after
inviting sealed bids by publication. All sealed bids
received shall be kept on file. When an award of con-
tact is made, notice that the same has been made
shall be given by one publication, and any interested
person may examine the bids and records at the pur-
chaser's office.

The purchaser of supplies shall rule by rules and
regulations, approved by the chief administrative
officer and the controller, designate and authorize
appropriate personnel within the purchasing de-
partment to execute the purchaser's signature powers
for purchase orders and contracts ap-
proved as provided in this charter.

7.200 Public Works and Purchasing Contracts

The construction, reconstruction or repair of pub-
lic buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or
improvements, and the purchasing of supplies, ma-
terials and equipment in connection therewith involved
in each case shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand-
dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000),
shall be done by contract, except as otherwise
provided by this charter. It shall constitute official
misconduct to split or divide any public work or im-
provement or purchase into two or more units for the
purpose of evading the contract provisions of this sec-
tion. In an emergency, provided an actual emergency
be declared by the board of supervisors to exist, and
when authorized by resolution of said board, any pub-
ic work or improvement may be executed in the most
expedient manner. Notwithstanding any other pro-
vision in this section or those of this code, upon the
approval of the chief administrative officer de-
claring the work to be emergency in character,
there may be expended by the department of public
works the sum not to exceed five hundred dollars
($500) for new construction of any type in or upon
unimproved or unaccepted streets.

Any public work or improvement estimated to cost
less than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty
thousand dollars ($50,000) may be performed under
contract or written order or by the employment of the
necessary labor and purchase of the necessary ma-
terials and supplies directly by the city and county.
Any public work or improvement executed by the
city, other than routine repair, shall be autho-
rized by the chief administrative officer when the cost
exceeds fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thou-
sand dollars ($50,000), or by the heads of depart-
ments not under the chief administrative officer, only
after detailed estimates have been prepared and sub-
mitted by the head of the department concerned.
There shall be separate accounting for each work
operation in which expenditures shall include all
direct, indirect and supervisory elements of cost
chargeable to such work or improvement, and each
cost accounting shall be reported to the chief ad-
ministrative officer, or to the mayor when such work
shall have been performed by departments not under
the chief administrative officer. Such accounting shall
be in such forms as the controller may require. Any public work or
improvement costing less than fifteen thousand dol-
ars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) and
not performed by the use of city and county labor,
materials, and supplies shall, if not performed under
contract, be covered by written order or agreement
which shall be based on not less than three bids, to
be opened within three days' posting. Records of such bids shall be kept by the department.

When the expenditure for any public work or im-
provement shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand-
dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000),
the same shall be done by contract, except as other-
wise provided in this charter. The head of the depart-
ment in charge or responsible for the work for
which a contract is to be let, or the purchaser of sup-
plies in the case of purchases of materials, supplies
and equipment, shall let such contract to the lowest
reliable and responsible bidder not less than ten days
after advertising by one publication for sealed pro-
posals for the work, improvements or purchase con-
templated. Each such advertisement shall contain the
reservation of the right to reject any and all bids. The
officer responsible for the awarding of any such con-
tact shall require from all bidders information con-
cerning their experience and financial qualifications,
as provided by general law relative to such investiga-
tions authorized by department of public works.

The purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the
chief administrative officer, shall authorize the pur-
chase in excess of fifteen-
thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand
dollars ($50,000), or the department head concerned,
with the approval of the board or commission to which
he is responsible, may reject any and all bids and
renovisite for bids.

The department head or the purchaser of supplies,
as the case may be, shall have power to sign such con-
tact for the estimated expenditures thereunder not in
excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty
thousand dollars ($50,000). Any contract involving
the expenditure of more than fifteen thousand dol-
ars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), if for
the purchase of materials, supplies or equipment, shall
require the joint approval of the purchaser of supplies
and the chief administrative officer. If such contract
is for any public work or improvement, it shall re-
quire the joint approval of the department head and
the chief administrative officer for amounts in excess of
fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand
dollars ($50,000), and shall be subject to the approval
of the board or commission concerned for departments not under the
chief administrative officer.

The board of supervisors, by ordinance, shall es-
tablish procedure whereby appropriate city and
county departments may file sealed bids for the exe-
cution of any work to be performed under contract.
If such bid is the lowest, the contract shall be awarded to
the department. Accurate units costs shall be kept of
all direct and indirect charges incurred by the depart-
ment under any such contract, which unit costs shall
be reported to and audited by the controller monthly
and on the completion of the work.

In any case where the lowest gross price or unit cost
bid is not accepted, and a contract is entered into with
another bidder, written report shall be made to the
chief administrative officer, the mayor and the con-
troller by the officer authorized to execute the con-
tact, with the reasons for failure to accept such
lowest bid.

This provision of this section is in conflict with any provision of section 7.10 of the charter, the pro-
vision contained in section 7.50 shall govern and
control.

Beginning with fiscal year 1978-79, the board of
supervisors shall be authorized to increase or de-
crease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in
section 7.200 of this section.

7.201 Public Works Contract Procedure by Ordinance

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter
and, in particular, the provisions of section 7.200, the
board of supervisors shall by ordinance determine the
monetary limits not to exceed fifteen thousand
dollars ($15,000), within which the construction,
reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets,
utilities or other public works or improvements may
be done by contract or by written order or by the em-
ployment of the necessary labor and purchase of the
necessary materials and supplies directly by the city
and county, consistent, save as to monetary limits,
with the manner provided for in section 7.200 and
section 7.100.

Beginning with fiscal year 1978-79, the board of
supervisors shall be authorized to increase or de-
crease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in
any provision of this section.

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D, Continued from page 25

point two commissioners to terms of one year each, one commissioner to a term of two years, one commissioner to a term of three years and one commissioner to a term of four years. Thereafter, the terms of the commissioners shall be for four years from the commencement thereof. Not less than one-fourth members of said commission shall be of the same sex, and one member shall have prior experience representing labor and one member shall have prior experience representing management.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following at such time: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges presented by the persons so appointed as in this charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of one hundred dollars ($100).

—Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of considering and adopting examination questions shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to public attendance. The general public and employees of the city and county shall have the opportunity to appear before the commission, after the regular daily working hours of 8am to 5pm, to discuss any matter of possible interest to them. Each person or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such persons.

In accordance with section 3,500, the commission shall have the power and it shall be its duty to appoint an executive assistant to be the administrative head of the affairs under its control who shall serve at its pleasure; provided, however, that any person who has a civil service status to the position of assistant secretary to the civil service commission on the effective date of this section as amended shall continue to have civil service status in the position of executive assistant under the civil service provisions of this charter.

3,661: General Powers and Duties
(a) The civil service commission shall be the employer and exercising control of the city and county and shall determine appointments on the basis of merit and fitness, as shown by appropriate tests.
(b) The commission shall classify, and from time to time may reclassify, in accordance with duties and responsibilities of the employment and training and experience required, all places of employment in the city and county.
(c) The commission shall have power to make changes in the rules, with the approval of the city council, that affect the classification.
(d) The civil service commission shall be the judge of such classification.

The commission shall also, in accordance with duties and responsibilities, allocate, and from time to time may re-allocate, the positions to the various classes of the classification. The allocation or reallocation of a position shall not adversely affect the civil service rights of an occupant regularly holding such position. No person shall hold a position outside of the classification to which he has been appointed, provided that the manner of any department or office shall discharge any of the duties pertaining to such department or office to which his chief may temporarily assign him.

The civil service commission may hear appeals from an action of the personnel director with respect to:

1. Allegations of discrimination. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the civil service commission regarding allegations of discrimination shall be final and shall be binding upon every officer and employee;
2. Allegations of fraud;
3. Allegations of conflict of interest, pursuant to section 3,701.

(d) No action by the personnel director which is the subject of any appeal shall be stayed during the appeal process except by the unanimous vote of the civil service commission.

(e) The commission shall be notified of the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal of personnel regulations and may comment on such proposals. The adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing fraud or allegations of discrimination shall be subject to ratification by the commission. In addition, the adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing merit system principles on promotion, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfers, resignations, lay-offs, reductions in force, and terminations shall be subject to ratification by the commission. The commission shall ratify or reopen any such regulation within 60 days of receipt. The commission's failure to act shall be deemed approval.

3,662 Department of Personnel Administration
The department of personnel administration shall be the department of personnel administration which shall consist of a personnel director and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. The department of personnel administration shall be under the supervision and control of said department and shall place an employee in the department of personnel administration is subject to discharge for cause.

3,663 Personnel Director
(a) A personnel director shall be appointed and serve at the pleasure of the mayor; provided, however, that the personnel director shall be selected from candidates nominated by any civil service commission and that the selection of the personnel director shall be made by the mayor and confirmed by the board of supervisors. The personnel director shall be compensated at a rate of $30,000 per year.
(b) The personnel director shall have the power to appoint such persons as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.
(c) The personnel director shall have the power to make changes in the rules, with the approval of the city council, that affect the classification.

3,664 Personnel Department
The personnel department of personnel administration shall be the personnel department for the city, the county and shall provide a means to recruit, select, certify, appoint, train, evaluate, promote career development, classify positions, administer salaries, administer employee discipline, discharge and other related personnel activities in order to maintain an effective and responsive work force.

3,665 Personnel Director
(a) A personnel director shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the mayor; provided, however, that the personnel director shall be selected from candidates nominated by any civil service commission and that the selection of the personnel director shall be made by the mayor and confirmed by the board of supervisors. The personnel director shall serve at the pleasure of the mayor.
(b) The personnel director shall have the power to appoint such persons as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.
(c) The personnel director shall have the power to make changes in the rules, with the approval of the city council, that affect the classification.

3,666 Personnel Department
The personnel department of personnel administration shall be the personnel department for the city, the county and shall provide a means to recruit, select, certify, appoint, train, evaluate, promote career development, classify positions, administer salaries, administer employee discipline, discharge and other related personnel activities in order to maintain an effective and responsive work force.

73
but not limited to, announcements, minimum qualifications, classes of applicants, comparisons, curriculum, eligibility, general terms and conditions, typewriting, typing, test, length, duration and certification shall be final.

c. The personnel director shall adopt personnel regulations which, except as otherwise provided in this chapter, shall govern both the administrative matters within the jurisdiction of the department of personnel and the adoption and the exercise of the authority granted in this section, including, but not limited to, recruitment; examinations; eligibility; duration of eligible lists; certification of eligibles; permanent, temporary and provisional appointments; regular performance evaluations; promotions; transfers; resignations; the approval of employees for leave of absence, except in the case of leave for death in the family; the determination of the length of service for leave of absence; the determination of employees' status on leave, and the determination of the status of employees who die or are declared dead by the civil service commission. No personnel regulations shall be adopted, amended or repealed without a public hearing upon at least two weeks public notice by the personnel director and at least ten days before the meeting and confer sessions with representatives of employee organizations as required by state law. All civil service commission rules relevant to the foregoing as well as the provisions of former sections 8.331, 8.333, 8.334, 8.336, 8.337, 8.340, all of which sections are hereby repealed in their entirety. Sections 8.338, 8.339, 8.341, 8.342 and 8.343 of this chapter shall become personnel regulations on the effective date of this charter amendment.

d. The personnel director shall conduct the salary surveys for the civil service commission as set forth elsewhere in this chapter.

e. The personnel director by personnel regulations shall establish procedures to review and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, status as a mental, physical or medical condition or other non-merit factors. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this chapter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the personnel director shall forthwith be enforced by every employee and officer, unless the decision is appealed to the civil service commission in accordance with the procedures of this chapter.

f. The personnel director shall investigate all employee complaints concerning job related conduct of City and County employees and shall promptly report to the source of the complaint.

g. The personnel director by personnel regulations shall promote effective and efficient management techniques that will lead to the highest productivity and exemplary performance.

h. The personnel director by personnel regulations shall provide a procedure for resolution of employee disputes which shall be consistent with other provisions of this chapter and shall be utilized by all department heads and appointing officials upon the expiration of the existing term of any otherwise binding agreements.

i. Consistent with the foregoing and other applicable provisions of this charter, the personnel director shall delegate to the various appointing officers appropriate personnel responsibilities, including but not limited to appropriate disciplinary procedures, and consult with appointing officers with respect to personnel regulations affecting their operations.

j. Personal services contracts shall be reviewed and approved by the personnel director in accordance with the provisions of appropriate personnel regulations. Personal services contracts may be expected to involve payment by the city and county of more than twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000) shall also be reviewed and approved by the Commission. Failure of the Commission to act within 30 days of submission of the contract by the personnel director shall be deemed to constitute approval by the commission.

k. The personnel director shall establish a system of job classification. The provisions of section 8.200 shall govern whenever new classifications are created or existing positions are reclassified. The personnel director shall be the judge of such classification determinations.

l. From the requisition of the appointing officer to the other persons, the department of personnel administration shall determine whether a position within a classification is, "in character", temporary or permanent. Appointments may be made on a permanent, temporary or, where confirmation is required, a provisional basis.

m. Excepting sections 8.300, 8.360, 8.361, 8.365, 8.367, all of which sections are hereby repealed in their entirety, section 8.341, section 8.346, the last sentence of section 8.400, all but the last three words in the first sentence of the third paragraph of section 8.401, sections 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.406, 8.407 and this section, wherever the words "civil service commission" or "commission" appear in the personnel regulations of this chapter, they shall be replaced by the words "department of personnel administration", "department", "personnel director" or "director" as the context permits, the word "rule" or "rules" shall be replaced by the words "personnel regulation" or "regulations," the words "general manager, personnel" and "department of personnel administration" shall be replaced by the words personnel director" and the words "section 3.661" shall be replaced by the words "section 3.662" or "section 3.663", as appropriate.

The clerk of the board of supervisors, after consultation with the city attorney, is hereby directed to conform the language of the charter as herein amended and to certify that the charter is submitted for republication.

8.322 Protest of Written Questions and Answers — After the written portion of a civil service examination has been held, the questions used and the answers thereto shall be available for review by the participants. This review period shall not apply to questions and answers that are not identified and designated as examination questions. Examination participants shall file any protests concerning results of the examination within thirty days of the publication of the results of the examination and the protest shall be in writing. The Civil Service Commission shall make a final decision on the protest or, if the protest is denied, the Civil Service Commission shall so inform the party who filed the protest, in writing, within thirty days of the receipt of the protest by the Civil Service Commission. A protest of the written examination results that is not filed within thirty days of final notification of the results of the examination shall be considered a protest of the written examination.
more than the minimum passing mark established by the civil service commission for inclusion on the list of eligibles resulting from the original promotional examination. The civil service commission shall be notified of the eligibility of every individual on the eligible list resulting from the original promotional examination in accordance with the relative excellence obtained by all the qualified participants in the original and similar promotional examinations.

Such employees shall be eligible for appointment from such lists of eligibles in accordance with civil service rules and regulations. The civil service commission shall notify the eligible employee of his appointment by mail at the address shown on the eligible list for a period of four years from the date on which his name is entered on the eligible list and before eligible employees, procuring standing through examinations held subsequent to the original promotional examination.

If it is determined by the civil service commission that the name of such person would have been reached for permanent appointment from the list of eligibles established as a result of the original promotional examination during his term of military service had the name of such person appeared thereon, then such employee, upon appointment to a permanent position as herein provided, shall be granted seniority in such appointment as though such person would have been reached for permanent appointment from the list of eligibles established as a result of the original promotional examination as herein authorized. For all other purposes, seniors—of-administration of similar promotions—will have the right of appointment as a result of—qualifying in the similar promotional examination as herein authorized.

Such employees who qualify for appointment as a result of a similar promotional examination as herein provided, and who are appointed to permanent positions, as herein provided, shall be permitted to participate in other promotional examinations for which they qualify. Persons—on-the-job serving—under probationary appointment in the position to which appointed as a result of the similar promotional examination, provided that certification from lists of eligibles established from such other examinations shall not be made until the employee has satisfactorily completed the aforesaid probationary appointment.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules to govern the regulations of the prior promotional examinations herein authorized, and appointments and other matters resulting therefrom.

8.329 Certification of Eligibles; Rule of Three
Whenever a position controlled by the civil service provisions of this charter is to be filled, the appointing officer shall make a requisition to the civil service commission for a person to fill it. The requisition shall be certified by the civil service commission for a person to fill it. The requisition shall be certified by the commissioner of education, and the civil service commission shall examine the list of eligibles and the position to which appointed, and determine that the person certified is the most qualified candidate, and shall conduct a background check of the candidate to verify his eligibility.

8.330 Duration of Lists of Eligibles
The civil service commission may remove all names from the list of eligibles after they have remained thereon for more than two years and all names thereon shall be removed at the expiration of four years. The commissioner may, however, provide in the examination announcement that the list of eligibles secured thereby shall automatically expire at a date not less than two or more than four years after the adoption of such list.

8.331 Limited-Tenure Appointments
When in time of war declared by the Congress of the United States, the civil service commission is to be performed, and is appointed to permanent positions as herein provided, the same shall be performed in accordance with the regulations of the prior promotional examinations herein authorized, and appointments and other matters resulting therefrom.

8.329 Certification of Eligibles; Rule of Three
Whenever a position controlled by the civil service provisions of this chart is to be filled, the appointing officer shall make a requisition to the civil service commission for a person to fill it. Thereupon, the civil service commission shall notify the appointing officer in writing for the purpose of designating the persons standing highest on the list of eligibles for such position. In case the position is promotive, the civil service commission shall certify the names of the three persons standing highest on such list. If there are fewer than three names on the list from which certification is to be made, there shall be certified the number thereon. The appointing officer shall fill the position by the appointment of one of the persons certified. The provisions of this section as herein amended at the election of November 2, 1976, shall be applicable only to lists of eligibles finally adopted by the civil service commission pursuant to the provisions of Section 8.223 of this charter or on or after the effective date of this section and shall apply to such certification; sex shall be disregarded except where a specific rule of the commission or the appointing officer specifies sex.

From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the commission shall determine whether the position is: in character, temporary, seasonal or permanent; and shall notify the candidate in accordance therewith to the end that the candidate may have knowledge of the probable duration of employment.

The commission shall provide for such waiver of time and performance of work on a part-time or seasonal basis, and the commission shall make every effort consistent with current conditions to maintain adequate registers of eligibles established through the regular examination procedures provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324, and 8.330 hereof.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules to carry out the provisions of the charter and to govern the administration of limited tenure appointments.

In time of national emergency declared by the President of the United States or by the Congress or while any act authorizing compulsory military service or training is in effect, the provisions of this section may also be made operative upon recommendation of the civil service commission and approval of the board of supervisors by ordinance enacted by a two-thirds vote of the board. Authority for limited tenure appointments, if established pursuant to the authority of this paragraph, shall cease six months after repeal by the board of supervisors of the ordinance which authorized such appointments.

8.332 Temporary and Emergency Appointments
When no list of eligibles exists or no eligible is appointed to a position in the class that is required by the appointing officer, and an eligible in a class of administrative service is in the position is required by the appointing officer, and another list exists which is deemed by the civil service commission to be available, the civil service commission may designate a position in the class that is required by the appointing officer and make an appointment in the civil service commission to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment therefor for a period not exceeding one hundred and thirty working days. Non-civil service or emergency appointments extended beyond ninety days must be approved by the civil service commission. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of one hundred and thirty working days at the time at a civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in Section 8.329 of the charter.

If a list of eligibles exists for the position required by the appointing officer, but immediate service is deemed necessary, the civil service commission may make an appointment in the civil service commission to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment therefor for a period not exceeding one hundred and thirty working days. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of thirty working days at the time at a civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in Section 8.329 of this charter.

No person shall be compensated under any non-civil service or emergency appointment or appointment as authorized under the provisions of the foregoes on the basis of any other appointment, bar—excepting one hundred and thirty working days, in any fiscal or calendar year, and no claim or warrant therefor shall be approved, allowed or paid for any compensation in excess of such one hundred and thirty working days in any fiscal or calendar year.

If no eligibles are available for appointment to a position as required by the appointing officer, the commission shall hold an examination and establish an eligible list for such position. If its annual appropriation is insufficient to meet the cost of said examination, it shall report to the mayor the estimated cost thereof, and the
mayor shall request the community to provide supplementary appropriation thereafter in the manner provided herein for supplementary appropriations.

8.340 Dismissal During Probation Period Any person appointed to a permanent position shall serve a probationary period. The civil service commission personnel director shall by rule establish a probationary period of not less than six months' service for any employee. The period shall be twelve months' service for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed rank of the police department, fire department, sheriff's department and San Francisco International Airport police force shall be for twelve months except that, with respect to members of the uniformed rank of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve months' service from the day following completion of the prescribed department field training officer program, but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment; provided further that probationary members of the uniformed ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in section 8.343 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four months may be established for executive and management classifications. At any time during the probationary period the appointing officer may terminate the appointment upon giving written notice of such termination to the employee, and to the civil service commission specifying the reasons for such termination.

Upon termination of the appointment the employee shall have the right of appeal and hearing before the civil service commission. The commission shall render a decision within thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person dismissed; (b) may reduce the position without prejudice; or (c) may terminate the procedure for such review if the appointment resulted from an entrance examination and the commission may deem just. If the appointment resulted from a promotional examination the employee shall have the right of appeal and hearing before the civil service commission. The commission shall render a decision within thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person dismissed; (b) may reduce the position without prejudice; or (c) may terminate the procedure for such review if the appointment resulted from an entrance examination and the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall be final.

8.401 Definition of Generally Prevaling Rates of Wages Notwithstanding any provision of section 8.401 or any provision of any other section of this chapter to the contrary, generally prevailing rates of salaries and wages for those employees covered by section 8.401 of this chapter shall be determined by the civil service commission as set forth below.

The civil service commission personnel director shall conduct a comprehensive investigation and survey of basic pay rates and wages and salaries in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment for like work and like service, based upon job classifications as provided in section 3661.5 and 3662 of this charter and shall make its findings, based on facts and data collected, as to what are the generally prevailing basic pay rates of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, San Francisco and Santa Clara; provided, however, that for any benchmark class of employment for which the civil service commission personnel director determines there is insufficient data from Bay Area public jurisdictions the commission personnel director shall survey major public agencies in the state employing such class, major public agencies to be defined as these employing more than 3,000 persons.

The commission personnel director shall collect basic pay rate data for like work and like service from Bay Area public jurisdictions as follows:

(a) The counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara.
(b) The ten most populous cities in these five Bay Area counties based on the latest federal decennial census.
(c) Agencies of the state and federal governments and from school districts and other special districts in the six Bay Area counties as determined by the civil service commission personnel director.

The civil service commission personnel director shall collect private basic pay rate data from recognized governmental Bay Area salary and wage surveys of private employers in the city and county of San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. The data collected shall be limited to basic rates of pay and salaries actually being paid by private employers for like work and like service.

The term "prevailing rates of wages" for employees governed by this chapter shall be defined as the range developed from the weighted average of the midpoint of the basic pay rates, excluding fringe benefits, for surveyed public employers and the median of the pay rates for private employment to be determined as follows:

(1) Instruct the survey respondents to estimate and the midpoints from public employment data base by the number of employees in the given classification from each data base;
(2) add the products of (1);
(3) divide the sum in (2) by the total number of employees surveyed for that classification; and
(4) extend this figure by 10 percent to establish the maximum of the range and reduce this figure by 10 percent to establish the minimum.

When fixing rates of compensation the board of supervisors shall fix basic pay rates as close as reasonably possible to prevailing rates, provided, however, that the board of supervisors shall not set the maximum rate of pay for any class in excess of the maximum prevailing rate for that class; provided further, however, that no employee shall have his basic pay rate reduced to conform to prevailing rates except as provided for in section 8.406. For those classifications of employees for which the civil service commission determines that the schedules of compensation shall provide for minimum, not less than three intermediate, and maximum salary steps and for a method of advancing the salaries of employees from minimum to intermediate to maximum with due regard for seniority of service.

The term "basic pay rate" as used in this section is hereby defined as applying only to the basic rate of wages, with included range scales, and does not include any other benefits of employment or working condition benefits.

It is the declared intent of the qualified electors of the city and county that neither the board of supervisors nor the qualified electors of the city and county shall provide any benefits of employment except those enumerated already provided for in this charter. And any addition, deletion or modification of benefits of employment except those enumerated already provided for in this charter shall be submitted, as a charter amendment, to the qualified electors of the city and county. The qualified electors expressly state that they understand that benefits of employment are sometimes referred to as "fringe benefits" of employment and the qualified electors expressly reserve the right to either grant or deny such benefits except those conditions of employment commonly referred to as "working conditions". Any reference to "working conditions" shall mean those compensations which must necessarily be provided in order for the employee to perform his job description efficiently and safely, and shall include but not be limited to such working conditions and benefits as are typically included in the administrative provisions of the salary standardization ordinance and the salary ordinance.

The board of supervisors may, in its at his or her discretion, may provide working condition benefits for employees covered under this section and section 8.401 of this charter only in accordance with the following provisions:

(a) The civil service commission personnel director must determine, certify and recommend to the board of supervisors that the working condition benefit is equitable or necessary for the efficient and safe performance of the employee's duties as enumerated in his job description.

(b) The providing of working condition benefits, as recommended by the civil service commission personnel director, is substantially comparable for like work and like service to that provided for the job classification and is provided to not less than 50 percent of the employees of the class in the jurisdiction covered by the salary survey.

9.188 Initiative, Referendum, and Recall

(a) The registered voters shall have power to propose by petition, and to adopt or to reject at the polls, any ordinance, act or other measure which is within the power conferred upon the board of supervisors to enact, or any legislative act which is within the power conferred upon any other board, commission or officer to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinance, act, charter amendment or legislative act may be so proposed by filing with the registrar a petition setting forth said measure in full, signed by registered voters of the city and county as many in number as the percentages hereinafter required of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election.

Any declaration of policy may be submitted to the voters in the manner provided for the submission of ordinances; and when approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting on said declaration, it shall thereon be the duty of the board of supervisors to enact an ordinance or ordinance to carry such policies or principles into effect, subject to the referendum provisions of this charter.

Any ordinance which the supervisors are empowered to pass may be submitted to the electors by a majority of the board at a general election or at a special election called for that purpose, said election to be held not less than thirty days from the date of the call. Any such ordinance may be proposed by one-third of the supervisors, or by the mayor, and when so proposed shall be submitted to the electors at the next succeeding general election. No ordinance passed by the supervisors granting any public utility franchise
or privilege, shall go into effect until the expiration of sixty days from the date it becomes final. At the end of such sixty days such ordinance shall be in force and effect, unless within such period there shall be filed with the registrar a petition signed by registered voters equal in number to five percent of the entire vote cast for mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election, requesting that such ordinance be submitted to the electors. In case such petition is filed, such ordinance shall not go into effect until approved by a majority of the voters voting thereon at a general or special election.

If, before the time any other ordinance involving legislative matters becomes effective, there shall be filed with the board of supervisors a petition signed by qualified electors of the city and county equal in number to at least ten percent of the entire vote cast for all candidates for mayor at the last preceding general municipal election at which a mayor was elected, protesting against the passage of such ordinance the same shall be suspended from going into operation, and it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to reconsider such ordinance, and if the same be not entirely repealed, said board shall submit the ordinance to the vote of said electors either at the next general municipal election or at a special election to be held for that purpose, and such ordinance shall not go into effect or become operative unless and until a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon shall vote in favor thereof. The provisions of sections 9.109 and 9.110 of the charter shall apply to and govern the verification and certification of such petition.

Annual budget and appropriation ordinances, supplemental appropriation ordinances, the annual salary ordinance, or ordinances amending the same, the ordinances levying taxes, any ordinance appropriating money from the emergency reserve fund, ordinances authorizing the city attorney to compromise litigation, and ordinances necessary to enable the mayor to carry out any of the powers vested in him in the case of public emergency as defined in section 3.100 of the charter, ordinances enacted pursuant to section 8.410 of the charter, as well as ordinances relative to purely administrative matters, shall not be subject to the recall.

Any elective official, the chief administrative officer, the controller or any member of the board of education or public utilities commission may be recalled by the electors. The procedure to effect such recall shall be as follows: A petition demanding the recall from office of the person sought to be recalled shall be filed with the registrar. Said petition shall contain a statement of the grounds on which the recall is sought. Any insufficiency of form or substance in such statement shall in no way affect the validity of the election and proceedings held thereunder. No recall petition shall be filed against any officer until he has held his office for at least six months.

(b) If the recall petition is filed against the representative of the board of supervisors or mayor and the representatives of recognized employee organizations do not reach an agreement through the meet-and-confer process on matters contained in the annual salary standardization ordinance by March 15 of any year, the mayor shall recommend and the board shall adopt, approve or reject a schedule of compensation which reflects current-prevailing rates for the classifications covered by Section 8.410 of this Charter; the last good faith offer presented by the mayor or his or her representative.

In any year when an agreement on matters contained in the salary standardization ordinance has not been achieved, the civil service commission personnel director, upon receipt of a written demand from a recognized employee organization made upon the mayor and the personnel director shall prepare, prior to April 1, a schedule of compensation and administrative provisions which reflect additional rates that would be payable, and working conditions, based upon the last demands made by the recognized employee organization(s) which participated in the meet-and-confer process.

 Said schedule shall be transmitted to the registrar of voters for submission to the electors of the city and county at a general election or a special election called for the purpose, and said special election shall be held no less than sixty (60) days from the date of the call. No such schedule shall be withdrawn after it has been received by the registrar of voters. At said election, the ballot shall contain the following two alternatives:

(1) Approval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

(2) Disapproval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

If a majority of the valid votes cast in the election favor paying the additional rates set forth in the schedule of compensation based upon the last demands of the recognized employee organizations which engaged in the meet-and-confer process, it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to amend the salary standardization ordinance to reflect said increased rates.

continued on page 78

**TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE PROPOSITION E**

**NOTE:** All sections are new.

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

Section 1. This ordinance may be called the "City College Public Lands Preservation Ordinance."

Section 2. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall not approve or deny, WITH NO EXEMPTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS, any building permit application for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, located across Phelan Avenue from the presently occupied campus of City College and consisting of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted, between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

Section 3. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall revoke or rescind, WITH NO EXEMPTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS, any building permit application previously granted for the construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, which consists of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

Section 4. The term "building permit" includes building permits, site permits and any other permits for the performance of construction work.

Section 5. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of the ordinance shall not be affected thereby, but shall enunciate in full force and effect. No provision of this ordinance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent implementation of the policy stated above.
rates and the same shall be in lieu of said annual compensation, and notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, said rates shall become effective and be payable as if adopted prior to April 1, of any year.

The provisions of sections 3.100 and 3.100-1, relating to the emergency powers of the mayor, shall not be applicable to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

11.105 Effective Date of Amendments
The effective date of the amendments, additions, and deletions to the civil service provisions of the charter shall be ninety (90) days after the acceptance and filing thereof with the Secretary of State.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION G

We the people of San Francisco declare this to be our policy:
1) IT IS IMPROPER TO PROFIT FROM OR PROVIDE SUPPORT TO THE RACIST POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SYSTEM IN SOUTH AFRICA, KNOWN AS APARTHEID.
Therefore it is necessary to sever commercial ties to South Africa, until people of all races obtain equal rights in that country, including equal voting rights.
2) COMPANIES HAVING SUBSTANTIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH APARTHEID MUST BE CONSIDERED IRRESPONSIBLE.
(a) The Board of Supervisors must determine which companies doing or seeking business with the City have the greatest ties to Apartheid. Companies that have a significant involvement in profiting from or maintaining the Apartheid system, may, on that basis, be deemed "irresponsible bidders."

In purchasing goods and services and awarding other contracts, the city must give priority to avoiding such companies; the degree of the preference must be in proportion to the company's complicity with Apartheid, according to the following criteria:
— how much business the company does in or with South Africa;
— how much the company profits from that business;
— how much support the company provides the Apartheid government in taxes, loans, payments or other funding;
— the nature of the company's South Africa business;
— the degree of the company's cooperation with South African political censorship or secrecy agreements;
— the degree to which the company provides the South African government with the technology, materials and other means to maintain and enforce Apartheid.

(b) City funds must not be deposited or invested with any bank or other company which does business in or with, or makes loans to, South Africa.
(c) If any exception to the above policies is found to be necessary or appropriate, the responsible official must promptly and publicly report it to the Board of Supervisors, clearly describing the exception and the reasons for it.
(d) The term "city" includes all agencies, departments, officials, employees, units and subunits of the city and county of San Francisco, and all funds administered by or on behalf of the city or county.

(3) WE CALL ON ALL OTHER PUBLIC BODIES AND PRIVATE OR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS TO ADOPT SIMILAR POLICIES.
(4) WE CALL A GENERAL PUBLIC BOYCOTT, FOCUSING ON THOSE COMPANIES HAVING THE GREATEST TIES TO APARTHEID.
The Board of Supervisors must determine and announce which company or companies are the worst offenders within each major industry, so that the public can focus its boycott on those companies.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION H

SUMMARY: This initiative states that the AIDS epidemic is a major public health problem of concern to everyone, requiring increased support for related medical research and education. It calls for a council for AIDS research and education or similar united effort to stop AIDS.

We the people of San Francisco hereby adopt the following policy:
The AIDS epidemic has rapidly become a major public health problem, costly both in human lives and in general community resources;
The first steps in dealing with such a crisis are:
— the scientific research needed to discover and understand the nature, causes, co-factors, prevention, diagnosis and treatment of the disease, and
— the education of the public about the lessons of that research;
A proper program of research and education pays for itself in the long run;
Prompt action is urgent, because of the rapidly growing number of persons affected, increasing not only the suffering but also the difficulty of eradicating the disease;
The leadership and support of such an effort is everyone's responsibility;
While San Francisco's role in the overall effort against AIDS has been viewed as a positive example to other areas, the continued rapid increase in the spread of the disease means that we cannot afford to rest on our laurels or leave further responsibility to others.
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:
We call on all appropriate government bodies as well as medical, professional, charitable and community organizations and concerned individuals to join together in an all-out effort to stop AIDS;
We call for support to an organized united effort along the lines of an AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION COUNCIL, including, in some form:
— A COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, to provide informed evaluations as to priorities among research projects and proposals, recommending those which are most cost-effective and most likely to produce early results useful in the prevention or treatment of the disease, to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts or neglect of promising approaches, and to provide the council with complete and up-to-date information regarding comparative results of experimental treatments, prevention programs and other existing research;
— A COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, to inform the public regarding prevention and other research findings, and to inform relevant government officials and the general public, concerning the factual basis for a re-orienting of current public funding priorities toward an increased war against disease, including research and education against AIDS and related conditions;
— A FUND-RAISING COMMITTEE, to solicit donations, lobby for grants, organize benefits and other fund-raising projects spreading the financial burden by appealing to many sources;
We ask the council and committees to be responsive and accessible to public input, to include representation of all interested groups, to consider all viewpoints, and to be capable of prompt action;
We ask appropriate city officials to determine whether a suitable form of such a council already exists; if it does, we wish the city to support it actively; if not, we wish the city to seek to encourage its formation by such means as may appear proper.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION I

SUMMARY: This initiative asks "Shall we tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?" The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated portion of Route 460 known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The initiative declaration of policy will give the voters the opportunity to establish the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco regarding the proposed teardown of the Embarcadero Freeway.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION J

Shall the City replace a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if such replacement would open the Waterfront to its citizens, improve the tax base, and create a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic?
FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER
JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: The Bill of Rights guarantees that every person accused of a crime shall have the effective assistance of counsel. Whether an individual is rich or poor, that person is entitled to a competent and dedicated attorney.
In San Francisco it is the duty of the Public Defender to uphold this sacred right. In every case, we provide the client with the best defense under the law.
In the last 7 years, my outstanding staff has done this work with the highest degree of professionalism. In the next 4 years, that same strong, professional, independent and ethical representation will continue.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John D. Birdin, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Yang Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Sala Burton, 8 Slout Blvd., Representative In Congress, 5th District
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Clerk
Linda T. Fries, 850 35th Ave., Artist/Community Organizer
Brian Getz, 55 22nd Ave., Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson, Sheriff of San Francisco
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., International Vice President, ILGWU
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for Children & Youth
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070 26th Ave., Executive Assistant to Sala Burton M.C.
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Community Health Director
Linda Ann Post, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative
Jim Rivaldo, 430 Steiner St., Political Consultant
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Member, SF Community College District
Governor Board
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel W. Walker, 562 Campbell Ave., President — Local 250-A Transport Workers Union of America
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilirius Ave., Minister
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor
C. R. Zanca, 1966 Pacific Ave., Auto Repair Proprietor

FOR ASSESSOR
SAM DUCA

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I was elected your Assessor in 1978 and re-elected in 1982. My years in the Assessor's Office were spent in a professional appraisal capacity personnel and administration. I have two university degrees, the coveted MAI designation, and am the recipient of a special Congressional Advisory Board award from the United States Congress. I have served in an advisory capacity, both nationally and internationally, in property tax administration and will continue to serve the taxpayers of the City and County of San Francisco in dealing with Article XIII A of the State Constitution. My community involvement includes participation in cultural, civic business organizations.

Sam Duca

The sponsors for Sam Duca are:
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 740 Broadway St., Investor
Eugene L. Friend, 2910 Lake St., Investor
Nancy Felini, 40 Presidio Ter., Housewife and volunteer in politics
Walter H. Shorenstein, 760 El Camino del Mar., Chairman, Milton Meyer & Co.
Stanley Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Emma W. Louise, 1257 Jackson St., Chr. of Exec. Comm. of Diversified Holding Co.
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hinckley Walk, Physician
Gerson Bakur, 2310 Hyde St., Investor
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2235 Washington St., Retired
Joseph C. Orongo, Sr., 856 Faxon Ave., Publicity Dept. — S.F. Giants
James A. Scatena, 101 St. Elmo Way, Chairman of the Board, Scatena York Co.
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher
Frances May McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Recreation & Park Commissioner
Frederick F. Campagnoli, 2609 Larkin St., Attorney
Betty Brooks, 1738 26th St., Field Representative
Jess Teruel Esteva, 5205 Diamond Heights Blvd., Businessman
Cyril I. Magin, 994 California St., Merchant
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John H. Swanson, 145 Lake Merced Hill South, Bowling Alley Owner
Frances G. Goldman, 745 El Camino Del Mar, Child Guidance
Irmu M. Bernardo, 2822 34th Ave., Housewife
Leo J. Murphy, 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Charles M. Cunningham, 475 Connecticut St., Self Employed
Lawrence V. Eppinette, 815 Fell St., Conf. Secretary
Mary M. O’Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Volunteer & Homemaker
Elizabeth R. Duca, 16 Wawona St., Homemaker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Application for Absentee Ballot
is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

Name

Residence Address

Mailing Address

Signature

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

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

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

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

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

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter en route to the polls have not been considered.
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YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 5, 1986.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
• are a U.S. Citizen,
• are at least 18 years of age on election day,
• are a resident of California, and
• are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, such as this one, you can only choose among the candidates of your party.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Senator, State Assemblymember, County Central Committee, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your polling place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 3, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in”. If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

Q—Can a worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
• Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
• mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see enclosed card).

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

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
• your home address,
• the address where you want the ballot mailed,
• then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail by absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 3, 1986.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS CONCERNING VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE: IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

STEP 1

Using both hands, insert the ballot card all the way into the Votomatic.

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

STEP 2

Be sure the two slots in the stub of your card fit down over the two red pins.

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

STEP 3

Hold punch vertical (straight up). Punch straight down through the ballot card to indicate your choice. Do not use pen or pencil.

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

STEP 4

After voting, withdraw the ballot card and place it inside the envelope pocket, with the stub showing.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del “Votomatic” y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

B 第四步

投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。

在封袋上，有空白格預備供投票人應用。
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO UNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CuerDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfure la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfure la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfure la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SI" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borradoras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfura, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

請用附在投票記錄冊上之打孔針在選票上打孔，千萬不要用鋼筆或鉛筆。

選民須知:

投票採所選擇的任何其他候選人，請在選票上對應所指之候選人名打孔。如果兩個或以上
候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上對應所指之所有候選人中，選擇你要投選的候選人打孔，但不
要超過你選票的規定數量。

選舉合格的非候選人，請在非候選人選票信封所提供的規定空白上寫下該候選人
所競選的職位及候選人的姓名。

投票任何形式，請在選票上對應所指 "YES" 或 "NO" 字樣打孔。

選票上若有遺漏未點或撕破者，選票作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔錯了，請取或撕破了；或撕破了、弄損了非候選人選票信封，願
把該選票退還給選舉區的監票員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

 PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>Vote for</th>
<th>Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>EILEEN ANDERSON</td>
<td>81</td>
<td><em>Singer and Dancer, Cantante y Ballarina, Relator y Bailarina</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHARLES &quot;CHUCK&quot; PINEDA, JR.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td><em>State Hearing Officer, Oficial de Audiencias Estatales, Asesor Legal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOM BRADLEY</td>
<td>85</td>
<td><em>Mayor, City of Los Angeles, Alcalde, Ciudad de Los Angeles</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HUGH G. BAGLEY</td>
<td>87</td>
<td><em>Businessman, Hombre de Negocios</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRANK L. THOMAS</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>Vote for</th>
<th>Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>LEO T. McCARTHY</td>
<td>96</td>
<td><em>Lieutenant Governor, Vicegovernador</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>Vote for</th>
<th>Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>MARCH FONG EU</td>
<td>102</td>
<td><em>Secretary of State of California, Secretario de Estado de California</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>GRAY DAVIS</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Legislatura de California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN GARAMENDI</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>State Senator, Businessman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senador Estatal, Hombre de Negocios 千年</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALISTER McALISTER</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Assemblyman, 18th District, California Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asambleísta, Distrito 18, Legislatura de California 加州議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>California State Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tesorero del Estado de California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Attorney General, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procurador General, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MIEBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE IGUALAMIENTO)</td>
<td>請選 1 人</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLIS</td>
<td>133 →</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization, Second District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERT DE LOTTO</td>
<td>135 →</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraiser/Broker/Farmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasador/Intermediario/Agricultor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>137 →</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(SENADOR DE ESTADOS UNIDOS)</th>
<th>請選 1 人</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIAN LANTZ</td>
<td>142 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultor de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN CRANSTON</td>
<td>144 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senador de Estados Unidos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT J. BANUELOS</td>
<td>146 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Technician</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Técnico de Comunicación</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT</td>
<td>148 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Scientist-Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profesor-Especialista en Ciencias Politicas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES GREENE</td>
<td>150 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Senior Legislature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro, Legislatura Superior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>152 →</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**United States Representative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL MOBERG</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALA BURTON</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW KLEIN</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State Senator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOUIS J. PAPAN</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM GONZALEZ</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Member of the State Assembly**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL D. &quot;MIKE&quot; NEVIN</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACKIE SPEIER</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHIRLEY COHELAN BURTON</td>
<td>Photo-Journalist</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOAN M. TWOMEY</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAWN ATKINSON</td>
<td>State Central Committee</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB GEARY</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK J. EPPICH</td>
<td>Economist</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSAN KELLY KENNEDY</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARLO SMITH</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEXA SMITH</td>
<td>Corporation Legal Coordinator</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL FAZIO</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Project Advisor</td>
<td>DANIEL NUSBAUM</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Project Advisor</td>
<td>JEANNE BAIRD</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>SAM DUCA</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $850,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>COMMUNITY PARKLANDS ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for acquiring, developing, improving, rehabilitating, or restoring urgently needed local and regional parks, beaches, recreational areas and facilities, and historical resources.</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>WATER CONSERVATION AND WATER QUALITY BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $150,000,000 to provide funds for water conservation, groundwater recharge and drainage water management, and clarifies language in the Clean Water Bond Law of 1984.</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>DEPOSIT OF PUBLIC MONEYS IN CREDIT UNIONS. Authorizes Legislature to provide for deposit of public moneys in any credit union. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect. Legislation already approved implementing measure could result in greater interest income to state and local governments.</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. Provides exception to property tax limit when acquisition or improvement of real property approved by two-thirds of voters. Fiscal Impact: By itself, measure has no fiscal effect. No increase can occur in local property tax rate unless bond issue is approved by two-thirds vote. State costs for tax relief programs could increase. State income tax revenues could decline as taxpayers deduct greater amounts for property tax payments.</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>ALLOCATION OF VEHICLE LICENSE FEE TAXES TO COUNTIES AND CITIES. Requires allocation of Vehicle License Fee taxes to local governments. Fiscal Impact: Measure would have no direct fiscal effect. Prevents Legislature from changing the law to take vehicle license fees away from counties and cities. Measure would not prevent state reducing other forms of aid to local governments or changing existing formula for dividing vehicle license fee revenues between counties and cities.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>LEGISLATORS' AND JUDGES' RETIREMENT SYSTEMS. Limits retirement allowances for persons entering Legislators' and Judges' Retirement Systems after January 1, 1987. Fiscal Impact: Minor savings to state in future years if rate of inflation exceeds increase in salaries paid to current officeholders.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1988. Esta acta dispone que los veteranos de la guerra podrán emitir bonos por $100,000 para comprar bienes uso de beneficios de la comunidad. 

ACTA DE TERRENOS DE PARQUES DE LA COMUNIDAD DE 1988. Esta acta dispone que los terrenos de parques serán utilizados para la recreación, educación y mejoramiento de los ciudadanos. 


DEPÓSITO DE FONDOS PÚBLICOS EN COOPERATIVAS DE CRÉDITO. Esta acta dispone que los fondos públicos serán depositados en cooperativas de crédito. 

FONCIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD: Las leyes establecen que los impuestos a la propiedad serán aplicados a los bienes inmuebles. 

ASIGNACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS POR PAGOS DE LICENCIA DE VEHÍCULOS A LOS CEDIDOS Y CIUDADES. Esta acta dispone que los impuestos por pagos de licencia de vehículos serán asignados a los cedidos y ciudades. 

SISTEMAS DE JUBILACIÓN DE LOS LEGISLADORES Y JUECES. Esta acta dispone que los sistemas de jubilación para los legisladores y jueces serán establecidos. 

DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATUALES
### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

#### STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>NONPARTISAN OFFICES. Prohibits a political party or party central committee from endorsing, supporting, or opposing a candidate for nonpartisan office. Fiscal Impact: No direct state or local government fiscal impact.</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. DISASTERS. Base-year value of property damaged or destroyed by disaster transferable to comparable replacement property in same county. Fiscal Impact: Local property tax revenues would decrease by an unknown amount. County assessor and tax collectors would have nonsignificant higher administrative costs. State would replace revenues lost by school and community college districts. State income tax revenues could increase due to lower property tax deductions on replacement properties. These state costs and revenues cannot be estimated.</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>MULTIPLE DEFENDANTS TORT DAMAGE LIABILITY. Plaintiff's non-economic damage recovery limited to defendant's liability based on defendant's percentage of fault. Fiscal Impact: Substantial savings to state and local governments. Savings could be several millions of dollars in a year, varying significantly from year to year.</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>COUNTY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county correctional facilities and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of four hundred ninety-five million dollars ($495,000,000).</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgements against the City?</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into-contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>PROPOSITION C HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THE BALLOT BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATUALES

262 SI 贷成
263 NO 反對

CARGOS NO PARTIDARIOS. Prohibe a un partido político o a un comité central de un partido político patrocinar, apoyar o oponerse a un candidato a un cargo no partidario. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo a los gobiernos estatales o locales.

IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE DESASTRES. El valor en tanto base de propiedad inmueble debe ser destruido por un desastre puede ser transferible a propiedad inmueble de menor valor comparado en el mismo condado. Impacto Fiscal: Las redefiniciones de impuestos locales a la propiedad disminuirán en una cantidad desconocida. Las tasaciones y recaudaciones de impuestos del condado tendrán significativas costos administrativos más altos. El estado reembolsará las redefiniciones que los distritos escolares y de alcance de educación superior dejan de percibir. Las redefiniciones del impuesto estadial a la renta podrán aumentar debido a mayores deducciones en el impuesto a la propiedad en las propiedades de remanentes. Estos costos y redefiniciones estatales no pueden ser calculados.

RESPONSABILIDAD CIVIL DE MÚLTIPLES PARTES DEMANDADAS EN JUICIOS DE AGRARIOS INDEMNIZABLES. Limita la indemnización que puede recibir el demandante por daños no económicos a su responsabilidad del demandado beneficios en el porcentaje de la culpabilidad del demandado. Impacto Fiscal: Abrumadores sustanciales para los gobiernos estatales y locales. Los beneficios podrían ser algunos millones de dólares al año, que variarían significativamente de año en año.

ACTA DE BONOS PARA DESEMBOLSO DE CÁPITAL PARA INSTALACIONES CORRIGIDAS DE CONDADOS DE 1998. Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelaciones, y reemplazos de instalaciones correctedas en los condados y la relación del mantenimiento difundido en los mismos en conformidad con una emisión de bonos por contrataciones novas y cinco millones de dólares ($49,000,000).

PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONTADO

278 SI 贷成
279 NO 反對

“¿Debería la Ciudad establecer una oficina de administración del riesgo y un despacho de investigación y administración de demandas, para estudiar y reducir el riesgo de pliegos y sentencias contra la Ciudad?”

281 SI 贷成
282 NO 反對

“¿Debería autorizarse al Comptroller a firmar contratos por menos de $50,000 sin la aprobación del Junta Administrativa y a permitir que sus agentes firmen contratos en su lugar?”

OFFICIALMENTE ELIMINADA

正式撤消
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

**D**
Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?  
**YES 288**  
**NO 289**

**E**
Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?  
**YES 292**  
**NO 293**

**F**
Shall the City prohibit computer any city commission, a candidate for municipal office.

**G**
Shall it be the policy of the people greatest ties with South Africa?

**H**
Shall it be the policy of the people and private organizations to enter and the Council?

**I**
Shall it be the policy of the people Freeway?

**J**
Shall it be the policy of the people Cadero Freeway, if it would it traffic?

---

### VOTER SELECTION CARD

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>County Central Committee*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>5.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td>6.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate (in)</td>
<td>7.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>8.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate</td>
<td>9.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td>10.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. Public Inst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR PROPOSITIONS.

*Refer to your sample ballot for the number of County Central Committee members to be elected. The number varies with each district.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Código</th>
<th>Voto 1</th>
<th>Voto 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Propuestas de la Ciudad y Condado**

1. ¿Debe la Ciudad transferir la administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil a un departamento de administración de personal que tenga poder para cambiar las normas del servicio civil que al presente constan en la Carta Constitucional?

2. ¿Debe la Ciudad negar o revocar cualquier permiso de construcción para edificar en la Represa Salinas en las Avenidas Ocean y Point en los próximos tres años?

3. ¿Debe la Ciudad prohibir la defensa remunerada efectuada por oficiales de la Ciudad y legisladores estatales ante cualquier comisión de la Ciudad, y limitar la cantidad con la que una persona puede contribuir para un candidato a una oferta municipal en 8000?

4. ¿Debe ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el balanzar las empresas que tengan mayor vinculación con la segregación racial sudaficana?

5. ¿Debe ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el apoyar a todas las organizaciones apropiadas, públicas y privadas, para establecer y mantener un Consejo para la Investigación y Educación sobre S.I.D.A. (A.I.D.S.)?

6. ¿Debe ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el demoler el Autopista Embarcadero?

7. ¿Debe ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el aumentar el acceso del público a la zona de los muelles y mejorar el tráfico?
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

**BALLOT** — An official list of candidates and propositions.

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

**VOTE BY MAIL** — See Absentee Ballot, above.

**POLLING PLACE** — The place where you go to vote.

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

**MEASURE** — Another name for proposition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**PERMIT (noun)** — A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building. Proposition E concerns the issuance of a permit.

**COMPENSATED ADVOCACY** — Compensated means being paid for doing something; Advocacy means speaking or writing on behalf of someone else. Proposition F concerns the issue of compensated advocacy.

**RISK MANAGEMENT** — This field covers two areas: (1) deciding on when it is better to buy insurance and when it is better to be self insured or uninsured, then shopping for the insurance; (2) identifying hazardous conditions on one’s property and seeing that they are corrected so that liability and damage claims will be avoided. Proposition A concerns risk management.

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.
2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).
3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.
Proposition A

Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgments against the City?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

The Way It Is Now: Consultants hired by the chief administrative officer are available to city departments that have questions about "risk management," such as how to keep damage claims to a minimum and how to find the best insurance rates. In some cases, the departments use these consultants. In other cases, the departments make their own decisions. When damage claims are filed, some are handled by the city attorney's office and some are handled by city departments.

The Proposal: Proposition A would amend the city charter to create an office of risk management, under the chief administrative officer. The office would set risk management guidelines for all city departments, boards and commissions. Proposition A would also establish a bureau of claims investigation and administration in the city attorney's office. The bureau would be responsible for investigating, evaluating and processing all damage claims made against the city, except those claims made against the public utilities commission and the police department. The bureau would also have the power to investigate potential suits against the city and to make settlements within dollar limits to be set by ordinance.

A Yes Vote Means: If you vote yes, you want to create an office of risk management under the chief administrative officer and a bureau of claims investigation and administration under the city attorney.

A No Vote Means: If you vote no, you want damage claims and risk management decisions to continue to be handled the way they are now.

Controller's Statement on "A"

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not affect the cost of government. However as a result of its potential future application and the exemption of certain employees from the civil service provisions of the Charter, costs may be affected in an amount presently indeterminate."

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On March 10 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The supervisors voted as follows:


No: None of the Supervisors voted "No."

The Text of Proposition A Appears on Page 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON A

Last fiscal year, over 6,400 claims and law suits were filed against the City, costing us more than $10 million in settlements. I believe that it is time to change the way we handle our claims, secure insurance, prevent risks and settle legitimate claims against the City.

Last summer, we appointed a task force of citizens, under San Francisco Bar President Jerry Falk, to make recommendations on how to streamline our procedures and save money at the same time. The present system is very slow, costly, and inefficient.

Currently, all claims are investigated by the department involved. The City Attorney cannot act on any claim until the department is ready. This results in delay and duplication of effort and increased costs. A centralized and accountable Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney would be more efficient, cost-effective, and professional. It would enable the City to settle many claims quickly, before litigation is begun, saving the City the costs of defending itself in court and lowering the average cost of settling a case.

This can be accomplished without creating new jobs by simply moving into one office the city positions presently scattered throughout the government.

Vote "Yes" on A. Reduce the cost of City government.

Adoption of this measure would also formally establish responsibility for Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer, where it has been unofficially since 1978. With this strengthened authority, the Risk Management Office would be responsible for the gathering of claims data on a City-wide basis, the creation of incentives for both reducing the possibility for injuries and damage and the number of claims for each department, the coordination of insurance purchasing and specific suggestions to avoid and reduce risk.

This amendment is presented with the recommendation of the Mayor’s Task Force on Claims and Judgments, the Chief Administrative Officer, City Attorney, the President of the San Francisco Bar Association, and the President of the Lawyers’ Club of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Each year the City spends almost $10 million to settle damage claims. It is estimated that the overall costs to the City for all risk-related activities exceeds $125 million a year. It is time for action to be taken to reduce these huge expenditures. This charter amendment is designed to do just that.

Claims Investigation and Adjustment

Right now, the City claims investigation process is decentralized and largely unorganized. Each department investigates its own claims. Investigators may or may not be specially trained for their duties. There is no uniformity of investigation procedure or claims reporting. In only a few departments do investigators contact injured parties within days of an accident in order to settle the claim quickly and economically.

This amendment will create a claims investigation and adjustment bureau in the Office of the City Attorney. Claims investigation and adjustment activities will be centralized, economized and made much more efficient. The new bureau will be able to respond immediately to accidents and claims, providing quick compensation to deserving persons while at the same time producing a prompt, professional investigation. This reform is greatly needed.

Risk Management

Presently, there is no overall plan for the management of the City’s risk exposure: insurance purchasing, avoidance of industrial accidents, gathering data on accident patterns, etc. Again, risk management as a function is fragmented among the various City departments. As a consequence, departments cannot develop the necessary expertise to manage themselves to reduce risk-related costs.

This measure will establish a risk manager under the Chief Administrative Officer. For the first time, overall City planning will be possible in order to control risk. Departments will be told what activities are producing injuries or damage and advised on corrective measures. Private industry has been utilizing risk managers of this type for years. It is time that the City did the same.

This amendment will reduce the cost of government and insure a more efficient delivery of City services to all San Franciscans. We urge you to give it your unqualified support.

Board of Supervisors

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

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This charter amendment was proposed by a citizens’ task force appointed by Mayor Feinstein. Its mission was to propose ways of reducing the number and financial costs of claims and lawsuits against the City.

The amendment has two principal features. The first is to centralize within the City Attorney’s office the investigation of claims filed against city departments. This will allow for improved training and supervision of the investigators, who presently are scattered throughout city government. The result will be more efficient, cost-effective and professional investigation of claims. By improving the quality of claims investigation, the City can identify those claims which have merit and attempt to reach early — and less costly — settlements. Meritless claims will be denied with greater confidence that if suit is filed it can be defended successfully.

The second major feature of the amendment will establish a Risk Management office under the Chief Administrative Officer. Risk management is a concept widely used in private business. Risk managers are professionals skilled in reducing the overall cost of claims. The Risk Manager would be responsible for coordinating the City’s insurance program, data collection, and correcting problems within the City which lead to claims. The Risk Manager would review those claims which have been filed against the City. Where it appears that an unsafe condition or practice has led to a claim, the Risk Manager would suggest to the affected department that corrective measures be taken. Reports to the Mayor and to the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors of the recommended corrections and the actions taken would ensure that the various departments will be responsive.

The City cannot eliminate claims and lawsuits against it. But it can limit its exposure by managing the claims process more effectively. This measure will reduce injuries and reduce claims, and that is good for everyone.

Jerome B. Falk, Jr.
Chair, Mayor’s Task Force on Claims and Judgments Against the City

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN
KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, May 31, 1986

12 Noon State Senate, Assembly, Congress and State Propositions
1:00 Proposition A—Risk Management & Claims
1:15 Proposition B—Purchaser & Contracts
1:30 Proposition D—Civil Service
2:15 Proposition E—Balboa Reservoir
2:30 Proposition F—Compensated Advocacy
3:00 Proposition G—Apartheid
3:20 Proposition H—AIDS
3:30 Propositions I, J—Embarcadero Freeway
3:50 Statewide Candidates

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

Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchaser must get the approval of the Chief Administrative Officer before signing certain contracts for more than $15,000. Only the voters may change that dollar limit. The Purchaser must personally sign every contract that comes through his office.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer's approval only on contracts for more than $50,000. You also want the Purchaser to be able to name certain people in his office to be able to sign contracts on his behalf.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would raise the limit on contracts requiring the Chief Administrative Officer's approval to $50,000. It would also allow the Board of Supervisors to change that limit by ordinance. Proposition B would also permit the Purchaser to name certain people in his office to sign contracts on his behalf.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to require the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer's approval on contracts for more than $15,000. You also want him to sign all contracts himself.

Controller's Statement on "B"

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On March 3 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON B!

The City’s Charter requires that a permanent, non-elected City official, the Chief Administrative Officer, review all purchases and contracts above $15,000. Of course, CAO approval of major contracts is very important. But, due to inflation, the number of contracts that have to go to the CAO for approval is always increasing. Today there are too many documents requiring CAO approval. This slows down the purchasing process, occupies staff time—and ultimately costs the City money. Proposition B will raise the CAO approval level to $50,000, and help the City to improve the efficiency of its purchasing operations.

The City’s budget includes more than $250 million for purchases on tens of thousands of contracts. At the current $15,000 review limit, the CAO must approve thousands of documents every year—a costly, time-consuming process. In the long run the City loses money because of the inordinate length of time required to complete all the paperwork.

An adjustment must be made to remove the smaller contracts from this cumbersome process. Review and approval of contracts under $50,000 should be under the responsibility of the City Purchaser, a highly trained and experienced professional, who reports directly to the CAO. By changing the present $15,000 to $50,000, it will be possible for the CAO to give each document that comes to him the attention it requires. And, by placing its orders and paying its bills faster, both the City and businesses will benefit—especially small business and those owned by minorities and women.

Proposition B will allow future adjustments to the limit to be made by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility will ensure the City’s ability to adjust to inflation and changes in the market.

This amendment comes to you with the recommendation of auditors, controllers, bankers, and others who exercise top fiduciary responsibility within their own organizations.

VOTE YES ON B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will make essential changes to update the purchasing and payment procedures under the Chief Administrative Officer. These measures are necessary and desirable because they will save the City money by significantly increasing our management efficiency.

Right now, the City loses because it takes too long for contracts to be reviewed and payments okayed, which means that early payment incentives go unutilized. The CAO has to approve every contract greater than $15,000—and with City purchases last year over $250 million, the paperwork logjam is vast and overwhelming.

An increase in the review limit from $15,000 to $50,000 will make an adequate adjustment for inflation—$50,000 now is only about $15,000 in 1967 dollars. Proposition B will also enable the City Purchaser, who reports to the CAO, to maximize potential savings through early payments by designating appropriate personnel to approve contracts up to $50,000. These “Good Business” amendments are consistent with private sector practices and should be incorporated by the CAO in the City’s best interests.

Finally, Proposition B will give the City the ability to respond quickly to changes in the market place by allowing changes in the CAO review limit by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility is necessary to ensure that in the future we will not lose money because of institutional rigidity. Control is maintained with the necessity of Board action and Mayoral approval to adjust the review limit, and this same feature will allow for change when desired.

Vote yes on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
Civil Service

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the civil service system of the City of San Francisco. The structure of the civil service system and certain rules governing its operation are written into the Charter and can only be changed by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would make major changes. A Department of Personnel Administration would run the Civil Service system and would be able to change rules with Commission approval. Major features of Proposition D are described below. The complete charter amendment is printed in this voters' handbook.

Department of Personnel Administration

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Certain civil service rules governing the general operation of the system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs, are written into the Charter and carried out by the Civil Service Commission. Only the voters can change these rules.

THE PROPOSAL: A department of Personnel Administration would be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. A Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor would run the Department. Certain rules governing examination, selection and appointment would be taken out of the Charter. The Personnel Director would be able to change these rules with the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

Civil Service Commission

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the general operation of the civil service system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs. The Commission also hears and decides appeals on civil service matters.

THE PROPOSAL: The Civil Service Commission would no longer be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. The Commission could investigate the operation of the system, approve rule changes proposed by the Personnel Director, and hear and decide appeals only on claims of job discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest.

Employee Relations

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors appoints an Employee Relations Director to negotiate contracts with City employees; the Board approves all contracts.

THE PROPOSAL: The Mayor or his or her agent would negotiate with City employees; the Board of Supervisors would still approve all contracts.

What your vote means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing civil service system.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE
Controller's Statement on "D"

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not directly affect the cost of government, as it removes many civil service policy setting functions from the Charter and an independent Civil Service Commission and transfers responsibility for personnel matters, including labor negotiations, to the Mayor.

"As a product of its inherent flexibility and possible future application, costs could be affected or savings realized in amounts presently indeterminate but probably substantial."

HOW "D" GOT ON BALLOT

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative Charter amendment rewriting the civil service provisions of the Charter had qualified for the June ballot.

Robert Bradford, Jonathan Bulkeley, Lee Munsen and Mary Hilton, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 36,049 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 25,027 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

POLS CLOSE AT 8:00 p.m.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by underlining.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. Consistent with the City's and County's affirmative action goals, no applicant or employee shall be selected, appointed, reduced in rank, removed or removed in any way favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, union activities, political affiliation or sexual orientation.

(b) The purpose of the civil service system is to obtain for the city and county the best qualified persons to fill city and county positions in a timely and economical manner, using professional, fair and equitable personnel selection and personnel management practices with consideration of the following:

1. Recruiting, selecting and advancing employees on the basis of their ability, knowledge, skills and performance relative to the work to be performed.

2. Establishing equitable and adequate compensation, as provided elsewhere in this charter.

3. Training employees, as needed, to promote productivity and high quality performance and to facilitate career development.

4. Retaining employees during good service and separating employees for good cause.

5. Assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration, with proper regard for their privacy and constitutional rights; and assuring equal employment opportunity, based on the person's ability to do the job.

6. Assuring that employees are protected against coercion for political purposes and are prohibited from using their official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the outcome of an election or a nomination for office.

(c) This charter does not limit the power of departments, agencies, or other subdivisions of the city and county in their exercise of management prerogatives including but not limited to:

1. Directing employees in the performance of their duties;

2. Hiring, promoting, transferring and assigning employees from those qualified;

3. Classifying positions in accordance with Section 3.663 (i);

4. Disciplining employees;

5. Laying off employees because of lack of work, lack of funds or other reasonable cause; and

6. Determining the mission of its departments and divisions, and its budget, organization, the number of its employees, and the names, types, classifications and grades of positions or employees assigned to an organization unit, work project, shift or tour of duty, and the methods and technology of performing its work.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. No person shall in any way be favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, age, religion, national origin or other non-merit factors.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in subsection (a) or any other provisions of the charter, it shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, consistent with a policy of acquiring qualified personnel for the service of the city and county, to encourage the hiring of blind persons. It shall further be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that no otherwise qualified blind person shall be discriminated against in examination, re-examination, appointment, re-appointment, waiver of eligibility for appointment or re-appointment, promotion or demotion in any class, subclass or position in the civil service unless its sight is indispensable for the performance of the duties and responsibilities of the class, subclass or position. It shall be the duty of the commission to classify, and from time to time it may reclassify, pieces of employment in the civil service - the duties of which may be efficiently performed by qualified blind persons and to conduct appropriate examinations which will fairly test the capacity of blind persons as well as sighted persons to perform such duties.

2.208-2 Employee Relations Director

—Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3.510 of this charter, the employee relations director shall be appointed by the board of supervisors and shall hold office at the pleasure of said board.

3.102 Employee Relations

It shall be the duty of the mayor to meet and confer with employee representatives on behalf of the city and county and all its constituent boards, commissions, departments and agencies as required by applicable law. These duties may be performed by a designee of the mayor who shall act at the pleasure of the mayor. Nothing herein shall limit the mayor from contracting for the performance of these duties.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the mayor shall submit all memoranda of understanding or ordinances to be enacted pursuant to Article VIII of this charter herein to the Board of Supervisors for its approval or rejection. 3.660 Commission; Composition; Meetings.

There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county shall have the general powers and duties set forth in section 3.661.

The civil service commission shall consist of five members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in office at the time of the adoption of this charter and this charter section as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the last day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981 and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981 and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981 and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981 and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981 and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Vote YES and join 34,000 San Franciscans who signed petitions to get this crucial reform on the ballot. “D” clears the way to modernize Civil Service so that it is fair and efficient. The present system is a 50-year conglomeration of rules that tie the City’s hands—

— A protest by one applicant can hold up hiring for an entire job classification for months—even years.

— Often tests cannot be given frequently enough to maintain current tests of qualified employees. This leads to delays and temporary appointments that make hiring top candidates all but impossible.

— Appointments to jobs are restricted to the top three names on a list even though more than three people have the same score!

— Many provisions are out of date. Some deal with hiring during the Korean War. Others limit our ability to carry out affirmative action.

“D” would remove archaic rules from the Charter so they could be changed as the times require—subject to meet and confer and public hearings. Job tests could be expedited; hiring and promotions speeded up; opportunities opened to women and minorities.

Specifically, Proposition D:

1) Creates a Department of Personnel Administration at no additional cost. Like other U.S. cities, day-to-day administration would be the responsibility of a director, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Supervisors.

2) Makes the Civil Service Commission the oversight body to set policy and hear appeals. Rulings would have to be within 60 days, eliminating endless delays.

3) Moves the office of labor relations from the Supervisors to the Mayor, who must make the tough-minded decisions to balance the budget. Never again could the Board give labor $27 million for “comparable worth.”

This reform is the product of years of work with SPUR, League of Women Voters, Chamber of Commerce. Members of the Board of Supervisors could have put the reform on the ballot last year but bowed to some labor leaders, and 34,000 San Franciscans had to do the job for them.

Proposition D will enable City government to work better for you. Vote YES.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON ‘D’

Proposition D is a complex proposition with a simple goal: remove the archaic restrictions on the hiring, promotion, or firing of city employees and bring San Francisco’s personnel system into the modern age.

Archaic is the only way to describe a system that keeps equally qualified people from competing for a job, and that takes months—sometimes years—to fill vacancies.

For example, if 50 people score equally high on a competitive examination, shouldn’t they all have a chance for any job for which they are eligible? Not under the current system, which requires complicated tie-breaking rules not at all related to a person’s qualifications or abilities.

Or what about being able to hire the best person available for a given job? Currently, eligibility lists are frozen for two years and every person on each list, including the lowest-scoring, must be offered a job before the highest-scoring person on a more recent list. Private businessmen couldn’t function saddled with such absurdities.

Proposition D cuts through the red tape. It creates a modern personnel department, with a director responsible for carrying out rules to ensure fairness and efficiency. Accountable to the Mayor, the director would be selected from a list provided by the Civil Service Commission, and subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.

The Civil Service Commission remains an independent body, with the right to approve new personnel rules and hold hearings on abuses. Also under ‘D’, negotiations with employee unions would be under the Mayor, subject to approval by the Supervisors; providing checks and balances in balancing our budget.

With greater accountability and continued checks and balances, Proposition D will open the way to more efficient government in our City.

Bill Maher, Supervisor
Louise Renne, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON ‘D’

Proposition D is a necessary reform to the City’s Civil System. As the City’s Chief Administrative Officer for almost ten years, I have found that quality employee hiring is difficult and the process causes long delays.

The current system is:

• inflexible. The City cannot hire and promote the most qualified persons.

• inefficiently administered by a commission. Other large
cities do not have such a bureaucratic process.
- antiquated. Civil service rules represent practices of the 1950s rather than the 1980s.

The new system:
- allows the Mayor to appoint an effective personnel director, who controls administration and procedures.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

It's 1986 and we're still trying to manage City business as if it were 1932. As heads of City departments, charged with the daily responsibility of putting out fires, fighting crime, maintaining hospitals, parks, libraries and providing other essential services, we know from bitter experience about shortcomings of the existing Civil Service System.

Enacted with the City Charter in 1932, the system is founder ing in red tape. Outdated rules are the subject of endless challenges. Tests are put off; vacancies go unfilled; promotions delayed; any appeal, however groundless, stops the process in its tracks.

Proposition D would take old procedures out of the Charter so they could be changed in an orderly process by the Civil Service Commission, which would also hear appeals.

Day-to-day administration of the tests—the content, scoring, all the myriad details of managing a complex system, would be put into a modern, highly professional personnel office. Tests would be speeded up. Hiring would keep pace with need. Promotions would be on the basis of competence. High performance would be the standard. Discipline could be imposed with working rights fully protected, and women and minorities would be assured equal opportunity.

Proposition D will help improve management and the quality of City services. Vote Yes on D.

Frank Jordan, Chief of Police
Enniet Condon, Fire Chief
Don Birtner, Director, Public Works
Mary Barns, General Manager, Recreation & Park
John Franz, City Librarian
Eugene Garrand, Director, Port
Marvin Geissinger, Purchaser
William Hamilton, Executive Director, Redevelopment Agency
Claire Issacs, Director, Arts Commission
Ray King, Director, Parking Authority
Dean Macris, Director, City Planning
Grant Mickins, Director, Human Rights Commission
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, PUC
Joyce Bean, Director, Aging
Ed Suttenfield, General Manager, Social Services
Thelma Shelley, Managing Director, War Memorial
Moira So, Executive Director, Community Development
Louis Turpen, Director of Airport
Dr. David Verdegia, Director, Health Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The hiring practices outlined in San Francisco City Charter have been virtually unchanged since 1931, a severe handicap in running a modern city. Proposition D is designed to streamline the charter and ensure that the rights of present city employees and candidates for city jobs are protected, while improving the hiring process itself. The initiative also builds management accountability in the city system.

Proposition D Is More Fair, More Efficient, More Economical

The day-to-day personnel functions, including hiring, will be consolidated under a Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Super visors. Decisions of the Director of Personnel on examination content and administration are final, unless a decision is stayed during the appeal process by a unanimous vote of the Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D will make it easier to modernize the many archaic Civil Service rules and procedures now included in the Charter, while maintaining a strong and independent Civil Service Commission to safeguard the merit system and protect the rights of city employees. Many detailed rules will come out of the Charter and will become personnel regulations. These regulations can then be modernized, but only through a process which includes public hearings and meet and confer sessions with the union involved. In addition, the Civil Service Commission must approve any changes or new regulations governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfer, resignation and terminations.

Proposition D Will Improve Performance And Public Confidence

The openness and fairness of the proposition will benefit everyone. Well-qualified job candidates will have a better chance of being hired, and well-qualified job holders will have a better chance of being promoted. This means generally better job performance in all departments, resulting in higher employee morale and more public confidence in city government.

Submitted by
Louis Hop Lee, President
Civil Service Commission
Lee Muson, Member Civil Service Commission and Treasurer, San Franciscans for Fair and Efficient Government
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Cities can survive only with strong management. The greatest budgetary restraint must be exercised to assure that full value is received for each tax dollar spent.

With firm limits on what it can spend and faced with a possible loss of Federal funds next year, the City must be managed with the greatest possible efficiency.

Essential to greater efficiency is the need for Civil Service reform. As members of City Commissions, we constantly confront the torturous delays and confused rules that gridlock the present system. The present system simply can't respond to the City's personnel needs.

Qualified applicants become frustrated and seek employment elsewhere. Promotions are blocked. Morale suffers. Temporaries fill in; overtime mounts. The ability to plan is crippled; management is weakened.

Proposition D would put the system on a business-like basis. A personnel department would handle day-to-day administration. The Civil Service Commission would be the watchdog to assure the integrity of the merit system.

This streamlined system would replace what is now inflexible and cumbersome. Testing could be accelerated; hiring made more efficient and promotions made on time. The result would be greater efficiency and elimination of costly waste.

Vote Yes on D.

Jerry E. Berg, President, Board of Permit Appeals
Henry Berman, President, Fire Commission
Mo Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Hector Chinchilla, Rent Board
Rev. Harry Chuck, Housing Authority
Dr. Arthur Coleman, President, Port Commission
Owen Davis, Police Commission
J. Edward Fleishhll, Airports Commission
H. Welton Flynn, President, Public Utilities Commission
James Foster, Health Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation & Park Commission
James Fussell, President, Housing Authority
Anne Halsted, Port Commission
Tommy Harris, Recreation & Park Commission
Tom Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Walter Jebe, Public Library Commission
Jeffrey Lee, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Philip Lee, President, Health Commission
Bruce W. Lilienthal, Small Business Advisory Commission
Jacqueline Nemoroski, President, Arts Commission
Toby Rosenblatt, President, Planning Commission
Dr. David Sanchez, President, Police Commission
Joan San Jule, Housing Authority
John Patrick Short, President, Parking Authority
Marjorie G. Stern, President, Public Library Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D contains civil service reform measures urged by the League of Women Voters since 1969.

Proposition D will:
— Modernize the City's outdated personnel system by creating a Director of Personnel, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors
— Preserve the principles of merit through policies set by the Civil Service Commission
— Create a more responsive Civil Service system at no additional cost to the taxpayer

EFFICIENCY AND FLEXIBILITY

Proposition D transfers authority for day-to-day management of the City's personnel system from the Civil Service Commission to the Director of Personnel. This will:
— Prevent hiring delays
— Ensure only the most qualified individuals are hired and promoted
— Provide City managers with more administrative flexibility

FAIRNESS FOR EMPLOYEES

Proposition D will:
— Safeguard the rights of City workers
— Protect gains made in hiring women and minorities
— Retain the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit appeals board
— Retain the ability of the City's unions to negotiate working conditions
— Create a system that can respond quickly and fairly to the needs of City workers

Proposition D will bring the Civil Service system into the 20th century by making the Mayor accountable for the management of a system employing more than 25,000 people. Hiring by merit is still guaranteed by the Charter. Please join us in voting for this Reform!

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
Esther Marks, Past President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote Yes on Proposition D the Civil Service Modernization Initiative.

Prevent abuse of a system that was intended to serve the public and protect against favoritism. Prevent situations like this: an employee failed to report to work for a week without explanation; he was telephoned, notified by certified mail and a message left under his door; he was terminated 13 days later; he did not appeal the termination and the civil service commission up-
Civil Service

held the termination. Two months later, the employee petitioned the commission for reinstatement. The employee got his job back, not because the process of termination was wrong but because the commission had a long standing objection to using "absent without leave" as a reason for firing.

The quality of public services is dependent upon the effectiveness of the staff who deliver them. The primary role of the civil service commission should be to facilitate recruitment and retention of the best available personnel. It must protect against favoritism and must assure that everyone has an equal and fair chance at employment.

The present system does not do that. We feel this initiative will make the system work better, for the managers, for the employees and for the public.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco government is huge, with a budget of more than $1 billion per year and 25,000 employees. It is expected to solve serious problems. This requires that the City have the ability to hire and promote talented people to do the job.

The present civil service system is so tied up in red tape that jobs remain vacant for six months to a year, and all too often someone who is not capable of doing a good job is hired. Your tax dollars are being wasted, and you are not receiving the quality of services you need and deserve.

Proposition D will modernize San Francisco’s civil service system. It separates the personnel department from the Civil Service Commission, and puts the department under the Mayor where it belongs. The Mayor is responsible for balancing the budget and delivering city services as efficiently as possible. She cannot do this unless she can find capable people to do the job. That is the task of the personnel department in any organization.

Proposition D will also insure that the independent Civil Service Commission has sufficient authority to require the personnel system to be fair in its treatment of City employees. The Commission will be able to issue subpoenas and require testimony of witnesses on investigations it conducts. Should it find that discrimination has occurred, it can issue orders that must be obeyed.

Most major American cities, and virtually all cities and counties in California, have the kind of civil service system that will be established by Proposition D. San Francisco’s present system is still mired in the past. It hobbles the ability of the City to deliver services and spend your tax dollars as efficiently as possible.

SPUR has not placed a statement in the Voter’s Handbook for any other issue over the past 15 years. We feel that Proposition D is so vital for San Francisco’s future that we are making this appeal for your support.

Vote “YES” on Proposition D.

SPUR—The San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Reform Initiative, will give San Francisco citizens the HIGH PERFORMANCE GOVERNMENT needed to face the many challenges of the future. Proposition D corrects the outdated and inflexible requirements originally written in San Francisco’s City Charter in 1931. It will eliminate the problems which prevent San Francisco’s personnel system from operating with efficiency the City’s voters and taxpayers deserve:

Proposition D insures City jobs will be filled from current lists of the most qualified employees.

Proposition D prevents ungrounded appeals from delaying for years the appointment or promotion of qualified employees.

Proposition D eliminates the repetitive tasks currently monopolizing the Civil Service Commission meetings and directs the Commission to serve as an appellate body to protect the City’s good employees.

Proposition D centralizes the day-to-day operation of the civil service system and makes the Director of Personnel responsible to the Mayor.

Proposition D simplifies the budgetary process by making the Mayor the City’s chief labor negotiator, responsible for setting working conditions within the City’s financial capacity.

Proposition D is the result of years of painstaking review by the most experienced, able and respected management experts in San Francisco. It is a plan intended to move City government out of the 1930s and equip San Francisco to enter the twenty-first century without being burdened by the red tape of the past.

After ten years of commitment to improving our City, the Mayor’s Fiscal Advisory Committee is convinced adoption of Proposition D is one of the most important issues facing the voters. CHANGE IS LONG OVERDUE. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by,
The Mayor’s Fiscal Advisory Committee

David Anarcher
Jerome Anderson
Richard Blum
Charles Chapman
Arthur Cooke, Jr.
Benton Dial
James Edgar
Ruben Garcia

Robert Hayden
Walter Haldy
John Jacobs
Michael McGill
Ellen Newman
Roy Nordman
Frank Ruvim

Argumenta printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PERSONNEL MANAGERS SAY YES ON PROPOSITION D

As the personnel managers for City Departments, we are charged with the responsibility of managing the City's personnel system. The activities include examinations, hiring, training, discipline, union-management relations, affirmative action and compensation. No one knows better than we the frustrations experienced in attempting to monitor an unbelievable sequence of overlapping bureaucratic activities in attempting to get the job done.

Proposition D will bring our personnel system into line with most other public personnel systems. The improved system will create the potential for being more responsive to the needs of operating departments. It will improve labor relations by transferring this function to the executive branch of government where it belongs.

Proposition D will streamline certain routine procedures resulting in a reduction of cost and time. Under the current system delays are experienced due to lengthy appeals during which time the departments' objectives are delayed.

Proposition D will create an atmosphere of increased accountability for department managers in the areas of affirmative action, discipline and job performance.

Proposition D has been endorsed by the San Francisco Council of Human Resource Managers, the association of over one hundred personnel managers in City government.

Proposition D strengthens merit system principles. Civil Service commissioners will have more time to enforce and protect these principles rather than being bogged down in the day-to-day activities of administration.

Proposition D will help bring about improved methods and practices in personnel administration and should result in a more competent and effective workforce which the citizens of San Francisco have a right to expect.

Alvin W. Schaaf
Personnel Director
Recreation and Park Department
Marsha Ramirez
Personnel Officer
San Francisco Port
Edward M. Gazzano
Personnel Director
Department of Health
James Horan
Senior Personnel Officer
Department of Social Services
James Ilinicki
Personnel Director
San Francisco International Airport

Andrea R. Gouridine
Manager, Bureau of Personnel & Training
Public Utilities Commission
Mori Nagachi
Senior Department Personnel Officer
Mary Smith
Senior Personnel Officer
Laguna Honda Hospital
Theida Poteet
Senior Personnel Officer
San Francisco General Hospital
John Burke
Personnel Director
Controller's Office

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will assist the Department of Public Works by streamlining the Civil Service process.

- Under the current system, the duration of eligible lists from 2 to 4 years hampers the Department from hiring graduates of colleges and universities on an annual basis. Consequently, many excellent candidates are not entered into the Civil Service System. Passage of the proposition will improve the quality of the pool of applicants and thereby the quality of public service given by the Department.

- The establishment of a Personnel Director to administer the day-to-day tasks of the system will speed up the decision making process to the advantage of employees and management alike.

- The proposition still calls for checks and balances in that the Commission will continue to hear appeals on discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest. The Commission will act as a watchdog while leaving the general administration to the Personnel Director.

The initiative will make for an improved system for employees, management and the citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Donald Birrer
Director of Public Works

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

- Examinations for employees on military leave
- Certification of eligibles—Rule of three
- Duration of employment lists
- Temporary employee appointments
- Allows continuous up-dating of employment lists.
- Allows equitable treatment of job candidates with same test score.
- Redefines responsibilities: the Civil Service Commission dealing primarily with compliance and adjudication activities (continued)

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

while the Personnel Department administers the day-to-day operation of the merit system.

Equally important the amendment retains important merit system provisions dealing with:
- Employee salary setting procedures
- Positions subject to merit system examinations
- Public hearing and meet and confer requirements
- Penalties for examination fraud
- Seniority, meritorious service and applicable educational credits for promotional examinations in the Police/Fire De-

partment
- Termination of unsatisfactory employees
- Disciplinary suspensions
- Conflict of interest
- Creation of positions

Proposition “D” merits a ‘YES’ vote.

John J. Walsh
General Manager Personnel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Initiative, is a long-overdue reform to streamline antiquated hiring practices in San Francisco’s fifty-year-old charter. Proposition D will ensure that the best and brightest job candidates are chosen to serve our city, thus promoting excellence in job performance and helping to eliminate incompetence. This initiative builds management accountability in the city system, while giving the Civil Service Commission the independence to protect the rights of women and minorities.

A Better, More Efficient System at Less Cost

Proposition D consolidates personnel functions, including hiring, under a new Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. The Director has final authority over content of examinations given city job applicants, so more flexibility is possible in finding truly qualified candidates.

Proposition D redefines the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit systems appeals board and policy-setting body. The merit principles are spelled out in the Proposition. This allows the Commission to protect the rights of women and minorities at no cost to the public.

More Fair to Everyone

Proposition D greatly improves the city charter. Well-qualified job candidates have a better chance to be hired and well-qualified job holders have a better chance to be promoted. The public is rewarded with the better job performance, efficiency and friendliness one expects from good government employees. All of these improvements are at no additional cost to the taxpayer.

Submitted by
James W. Haas

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service System, as presently constituted, (vintage 1932!), is uncivil, and there is nothing “systematic” about it! It’s pure, unadulterated municipal lunacy and chaos! Remarkably, BOTH Management and Labor despise it. It certainly is NOT producing the best qualified persons to fill City jobs!

Let’s follow Mayor Feinstein’s recommendations. If this operation doesn’t dramatically improve, there are always FUTURE ELECTIONS where additional, more Draconian changes can be considered by the voters. As matters now stand, it is far better to light a candle than just sit and curse the darkness! Any changes will be an improvement! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

For more than a half-century, San Francisco Mayors have abided by the employee examination, hiring and promotion policies administered by a strong and independent Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D is a deceptive and dangerous scheme that would give future Mayors and top-level bureaucrats the power to ignore competence and reward political loyalty.

Proposition D would take key Civil Service employment rules out of the City Charter and make them subject to wheeling and dealing by City Hall politicians. There’s an old saying—“if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.” Civil Service has worked well for more than 50 years. Proposition D is unnecessary, ineffective and even counter-productive. It’s not just deceptive, it’s dangerous.

Joseph L. Alioto
Former Mayor of San Francisco

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

Time and time again, different groups have put various propositions on the ballot to weaken our Civil Service System and reintroduce political patronage into City employment practices. And every time the voters have wisely rejected these schemes, no matter how cleverly they have been disguised. Proposition D is just another power grab by bureaucrats at the top in City Hall.

We've said NO! loud and clear in the past. Let's say NO one more time.

Submitted by:
TAXPAYERS FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT
Thomas Scanlon
City Treasurer, Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "D"!!!!

During the eight years while a member of the Board of Supervisors, I fought hard to reform the Civil Service Commission and to bring working conditions and city workers' pay equitable to both workers and taxpayers. I fought to insure an independent Civil Service Commission that would remain just that — independent and free from political influence and political patronage of particularly the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

I am truly saddened by the Mayor's insistence in bringing this disastrous Proposition "D" before the voters. Some of the Supervisors rejected this misguided measure for what it is; an unwise consolidation of authority to hire, fire and promote city workers by the Mayor and newly created personnel officer.

My efforts to bring pay equity to both taxpayers and city workers were continually squashed by then Supervisor Feinstein and Supervisor Molinari. Finally, in 1975, shortly after a disastrous city strike, I was able to place on the ballot, for voter approval, a measure that almost eliminates the power of the Mayor and Supervisors to manipulate the pay of city workers. This measure was overwhelmingly passed by the voters that year and we have not had any labor unrest since that date.

Vote No on "D"!
"D" stands for disaster. It will undo many of these reforms.
Also, right now, the City is almost broke, thanks to the manipulation of Mayor Feinstein and her chief ally Supervisor Molinari.
If "D" passes the cost of operating our city government will increase in the next 24 months by not less than $60,000,000.
Contrary to the provisions of Proposition 13, property taxes would be increased, thus forcing up rents.

Vote No on "D".
Don't weaken our Civil Service Commission, whereby least deserving city employees could be promoted because of connection or clout.

Vote No on "D".
We now almost have more problems than we can handle. We don't want our city turned into another Chicago, wherefor nearly half a century a corrupt political system flourished under Mayor Richard Daley.

John Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We join San Franciscans for Fair Employment in opposing the Civil Service Initiative, Proposition D.

This measure will severely hamper the well-being of the San Francisco Fire and Police Departments. These departments are two of the finest in the Country and have consistently protected life and property in a professional manner. They must continue that tradition with a civil service system based on MERIT and not political patronage.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.
Andrew C. Casper
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired
Keith P. Calden
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired
William F. Murray
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Our present Civil Service system was designed to keep corruption out of government. It has generally served that purpose well. This proposition would dismantle that system and in my opinion open the doors to nepotism, favoritism, patronage and corruption. Better a city government that is bureaucratic than one that is corrupt. Vote NO on D.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is an attack on the merit system and an attempt to return patronage to the Mayor's office by eliminating the authority of the Civil Service Commission and its built-in checks and balances.

The present Civil Service system is not perfect, but corrections can be made within the Charter without destroying a system that has worked for over 50 years and has been free from fraud and corruption.

This proposition will do nothing to improve the caliber of police performance and could have the opposite effect.

I urge you to vote NO on PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by
The San Francisco Police Supervisors and Investigators Association

Don Goad, Captain SFPD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D could be a dangerous first step toward weakening the independent, impartial administration of our City government.

Proposition D would transfer power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor. The Director's decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline and certification would be final. The Commission would have no right to hear examinations or disciplinary appeals.

With the transfer of duties and responsibilities from the Commission to the Mayor's appointed Personnel Director, the Mayor would have control over personnel functions. Currently, commissioners have independent status and can be dismissed for cause. The Personnel Director could be dismissed at will.

The Merit System could be replaced by a patronage system. Proposition D could open the door to rules permitting the Personnel Director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his or her position on the list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Proposition D is NOT a reform package. The checks and balances for efficient City government would be lopsided, with too much power in the hands of unknown future Mayors.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
John L. Molinari, President
Harry G. Britt
Richard Hongisto
Willie B. Kennedy
Wendy Nelder
Nancy Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Beware of PROPOSITION D!

Powerful special interest groups are attempting to remove key City employees from the independent and impartial Civil Service system in the name of "reform".

They want instead to make these employees answerable directly to future Mayors and politically-appointed Personnel Directors and department heads.

PROPOSITION D got on the ballot because the Chamber of Commerce and such companies as Pacific Bell and PG&E paid a professional southern California campaign firm, $70,000 to collect signatures.

They're trying to destroy the merit system and replace it with an old-fashioned patronage system.

Department heads will be able to ignore examination scores and reward loyalty rather than competence in promotions and hiring.

Don't let the Chamber of Commerce, big business and their allies in the City bureaucracy dictate who's hired, fired and promoted among public employees.

PROPOSITION D is not just deceptive, it's dangerous!

Vote NO on PROPOSITION D!

Libby Derebeim
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Ron Hoberman
Vice-Chairman, Democratic Central Committee
Jim Wacob
Democratic Central Committee
Roberto Esteves
President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Rick Pacurari
President, Harvey Milk Lesbian Gay Democratic Club
Walter L. Johnson
Exec. Secty., S. F. Labor Council
Michael Bernick
Sal Roselli
John Melving
Nancy Walker
Harry Britt
Carole Migden
Jack Morrison
Linda Post
Deborah Stein
Pat Norman
Gwen Creig
Louise Minnick
Agar Jaicks
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D places too much power in the hands of ONE. Proposition D will provide for a personnel director to be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. The Mayor now appoints five members of the Civil Service Commission who also serve at her pleasure.

You work for years to climb the civil service ladder and then somebody comes along with an idea to cut you off at the pockets.

Proposition D will lock in all the employees employed in the Mayor’s office and will control the appointments of any new staff by the next Mayor elect in 1987 and years thereafter.

Like controlling your estate from the grave.

Vote NO on D.

Marguerite Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service Merit System has served our City well, giving San Franciscans an equal opportunity. It has helped us obtain employment and earn promotions based on objective examinations.

The Civil Service Merit system replaced the old patronage system that rewarded political loyalty more than competence.

Now the supporters of PROPOSITION D want to create a new Personnel Director, accountable only to the Mayor, and give department heads the absolute power to decide who works for the City and who gets promoted.

If PROPOSITION D passes, equal opportunity would give way to opportunity based on membership in the bureaucratic “establishment”.

Keep our Civil Service Merit System strong and free from the political abuses of the past.

Vote NO on D!

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly
Ben Tom
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
JoAnne Miller
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
A. Richard Cermak
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Sadonia Wilson
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, President
S. F. Community College Governing Board
Julie Tang
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Alan S. Wong
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Henry Der
Albert Chung
Rudy Meraz
Robert “Bobi” Morales
Yori Wada

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Can you imagine studying for a civil service examination, being rated at the top of the eligible list and never receiving the promotion? That’s exactly what Proposition “D” will do should the electorate adopt this amendment.

The civil service merit system has defects, but to totally eliminate the system and replace it with a patronage system where promotions are based on who you know, rather than what you know is scandalous.

Civil service was put into place to prevent scandal and the “favor seeking” individual from getting a paid position because he/she happened to support the right elected official.

Proposition “D” will allow one person, chosen by the Mayor, to decide who will be promoted, hired and fired. This is awesome power for one single individual to have at any level of government.

Our current Mayor may choose a fair person for this position, but will future Mayors be as careful? As each new Mayor assumes office, the civil service system will again change. The potential to favor one individual or group over others is great.

Proposition “D” has a great potential to diminish the quality of services we now provide to our citizens, as the future of how people are hired and promoted in the San Francisco Police Department is completely unknown.

It’s true our promotional system is fraught with delays and delays frustrate us all, but Proposition “D” is not the answer. Proposition “D” will only add to our existing problems. Several years ago, our citizens elected a Charter Commission to streamline city government and make civil service work more efficiently. The voters eventually rejected those proposals. The checks and balances that make our government stable were no longer present. It simply went too far.

Proposition “D” goes even further. It brings about a system of patronage and should be defeated lest we want to engage in “free-wheeling and dealing” of civil service jobs and promotions.

We urge a strong No vote against Proposition “D”!

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS’ ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry, President
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The purpose of the Civil Service Commission is to ensure that the merit system would be the only criteria in any examination process.

If Proposition D passes, all authority concerning examinations would be taken from the Civil Service Commission and given to a Personnel Director, who is appointed by the Mayor. This Personnel Director would have the authority to hire and fire at his discretion, with no appeal available. This proposition is contrary to everything the Fire Department and all City employees have strived for over the years.

The Civil Service Commission in its present form was instituted to prevent any possibility of a patronage system, where one person has complete control.

This proposition would do nothing to improve your Fire Department. If you are satisfied with the work and make up of the San Francisco Fire Department in its present form, “Vote No On Proposition D”. You will be doing a service for the San Francisco Fire Department, and the people of San Francisco.

Submitted by the San Francisco Fire Chiefs’ Association
John Flaherty, Battalion Chief SFFD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is bad government and bad politics, changing our independent civil service system into a system dominated by the Mayor:

...By shortening the six year terms of Civil Service Commission to conform to the Mayor’s four year term of office.

...By transferring most of the Commission’s powers to a Personnel Director who serves solely at the Mayor’s pleasure.

Keep politics out of employment services. Vote NO on Proposition D!

Alice B. Toklas, Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Roberto Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D fails to offer enough new and improved procedures to cure the current defects in the civil service system. Charter sections and civil service rules are repealed without specific known replacements.

Proposition D transfers power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created personnel director appointed by, and to serve at the pleasure of, the Mayor. The director’s decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline, and certification would be final. The commission would have no right to hear examination or disciplinary appeals.

There are hidden costs with Proposition D because the new Personnel Administration Department will employ a personnel director, and other employees “as may be necessary to carry out (its) functions and duties.”

The Merit System could be replaced by an old style Patronage System. Proposition D could open the door to rules which permit the personnel director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his/her position on the civil service testing list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Police and Fire Commissions would lose functions as a result of the personnel director’s new power. The director’s unlawful employment discrimination policy would be binding upon department administrators. The director’s procedure for employee dispute resolution must be used by all department heads and appointing officers.

Proposition D is NOT the answer. The checks and balances for efficient city government would be lopsided.

I urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, 17th Assembly District
Sala Burton
Congresswoman
Art Agnos
16th Assembly District
Milton Marks
State Senator

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
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Balboa Reservoir
Development Ban

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?

YES 292
NO 293

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission declared Balboa Reservoir South (located across Phelan Avenue from San Francisco City College) surplus in 1984 and made the site available for low, moderate and market rate housing. In July 1985, a City-community advisory committee chose a developer to build 203 single-family homes on the 13 acre site. Construction has not yet begun.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would prohibit granting new building permits and would revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site (Assessor’s Block 3180, Lot 1) between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit granting any new building permits and you want to revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to allow building permits to be granted for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

How “E” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for a three-year ban on development of the Balboa Reservoir site had qualified for the June ballot.

Sidney Kass and Jesse David Wall, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 12,430 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 10,012 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 77.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Having been responsible for providing leadership at City College from 1947 to 1977, we cannot stand by and see this site converted to housing. We must speak out. Such a move would preclude forever the logical and much needed campus expansion to what was once our West Campus. We left that site reluctantly to make way for water storage. If it is no longer required for that purpose, let us return it to City College.

Thousands of San Franciscans—high school graduates, dropouts, veterans, re-entering women—representing all of the city’s diverse ethnic groups, have been prepared for transfer to four-year colleges, profitable careers, and have had their lives enriched at the City College of San Francisco. Without City College’s open door and easy access, many would have been deprived of these opportunities.

Its 56 acre campus originally housed 3,000 students. Now it serves over 23,000. This campus, compared to other community colleges, can be best described as cramped, inadequate, and second rate. The condition of the campus is to be contrasted with the excellence of its programs—which are recognized as among the best in the nation.

Lou Batmale
Chancellor 1970-1977
Louis G. Conlan
President 1947-1970

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION ‘E’

We question:
1. Why no EIR was required when the proposed development could have a substantial impact.
2. Whether the future needs of City College for classrooms, housing, and parking have been considered.
3. What the impact on taxpayers is with below market land sale and construction financing by bonds.
   This moratorium will permit adequate study of these issues.
   Vote YES on Proposition ‘E’.

Bruce Bonacker, President
Board of Directors, Glen Park Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don’t let a developer make a mint on land across from the most overcrowded college in the Bay Area! Parking is already an impossibility for residents near City College...adding 200 homes to this land would make the situation much worse.

It’s simple: a college which can’t find room for more students at a time when more people are returning to education doesn’t serve the community.

This land is being sold at much less than its true value. The development wouldn’t do much to ease the City’s housing crunch, but it would undercut the future of City College and the peace of mind of the neighborhood.

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred

Westwood Park Residents: Sunnyside Residents:
Edna Tooker
Minnie Dorwin
Eugene Eden
Donna Nicolotti
Robert Armstrong
Pauline Armstrong
Joel Martinez
Richard & Lisa Patterson
David Bean
H. Bozzone
William Burke
Richard Robel
Clyde Theriot
Danae Manus
Esma Manus

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let the greedy developers take this potentially picturesque open space.
A yes vote means you want more time to consider its future use. All we ask is time to think and plan.

John Barbagelata
Former member, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Suppose there was a publicly owned open space across the street from the main U.C. Berkeley Campus.
Can you imagine for one moment that it would be passed into private ownership?
Vote Yes on E for Equality and Excellence in Education

City College Students:
William Lew, Student
Tim McGuire, Student Council Member
Joseph Goldstein, Student Council Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

In 1952, the "Experts" said we needed reservoirs. They felt so strongly that they condemned the City College West Campus, destroyed the buildings, and constructed the reservoirs—all at taxpayer's expense.
Now, in 1986 with more demand for water, the "Experts" say the reservoir is no longer needed. What is the concerned taxpayer to believe?
When in doubt, the city should hold on to the expensive things already paid for.

Stop the reservoir giveaway. Vote YES on E.

Taxpayers for Preserving the Reservoir.
Richard Patterson
Dorice Murphy
Lucille Carson
Daniel Gutierrez
Franz Witte
Bernhard Scholand
Ruth Hanson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This is a Planning issue
We have been accused of trying to stop housing for poor people. Not true. In the first place, the price levels are certainly middle income and above, but our main objection is that this badly done plan is damaging to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as to the over-crowded community college across the street.

WHAT WE WANT
Even our critics point out that we originally SUGGESTED housing for that site, but they don't talk about what else we suggested. We want two levels of parking under a City College Li-

brary, Bookstore, and Auditorium, with housing on top. Furthermore, let the housing be TRULY affordable—for students and seniors. We are trying to stop the bureaucrats' subsidized middle income housing project because it makes our dream impossible.
We ask for three years to give the neighborhood and the college a chance to produce a better plan.
SNaP (Sensible Neighborhood Planning Committee)

Helen Crizer, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council, representing 17 neighborhood associations in the area of the surplus reservoir property in question has voted to endorse the three-year stop of private construction on the old West Campus of City College.

Dr. Louis Batmale, Chancellor of City College from 1970-1977, has persuaded us that City College needs the lands.

Juana Raven, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Be a sport.
Give City College a vote of support.
City has 23,000 students and badly needs a library. The only place to put it is in the reservoir site. City College has walked closely with San Francisco for five decades. The reservoir site has always been understood to be reserved for City College.

Until now when someone wants it for housing. Housing is important, but it can be anywhere in town. But a City College library can only be located at the College.

Vote yes to support a book — and a reader.
Reading, studying, writing and research make up our town also.

It is hard to understand criticism of City for wanting to keep this area for a library. Sure, housing sites are at a premium — but even more so a library site for City which is one of the largest schools in the Nation.

Some people blast City for wanting a library because of the need for housing. Housing is needed. But some of those very same people want a big battleship stationed here that will bring in 15,000 new family members.

The Educational and cultural growth of San Francisco mandates living space for the City College library.

If this measure gets a no vote, it means there will be no site for a Library. This is the last chance. Vote YES to help out a book — and a reader.

State financing, when approved, will construct this building.
It is the top building priority at City College.

A YES vote here means there will be time to think about the use of the site. During that three year period, cooler heads may realize this is the only site for a Library. If the housing goes in there will be no library there.

Vote yes for a book, for a good school and a better City.

John Riordan, Board of Governors
San Francisco Community College District.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Sunnyside Neighborhood Association is not against housing, but we are trying to stop a hasty and short-sighted plan. We are asking for this moratorium to get time for a better plan that will answer a variety of needs and benefit the entire city as well as our community.

This is a planning issue.
The release of the reservoir property as surplus by the water department came as a surprise to our neighborhood. The June 1984 "Residence Element" of the city's Master Plan did not even list the land as surplus. By 1985 major decisions were being made for use of the land without adequate neighborhood input.

There were some meetings attended by a few people carefully selected for their zealous pro-housing views or potential financial gain. The resulting plan has gone out of control. Now it benefits only the developer and the lucky few who will get houses on free land.

Proposition E is not an attack on housing.
Please help us save our neighborhood against poor planning by voting YES on Proposition E.

Joe Mahoney, President
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Miraloma Improvement Club urges a YES vote on Proposition E.

Frank Mastro, President
Amell Rodrigues

Maggie Kiroll
Dorothy Evers

B. Sullivan
Dale Jones
Homer Bradford
Kathryn A. Small
Harry Small

Mr. & Mrs. Henry Taylor
Beryn Wou Suen
Susan Fischell
Dale Brown

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION E

All the talk in the world can't change the fact that City College has fewer acres of land relative to its student population than any college in the Bay Area.

Enrollment at City College is INCREASING, as is the enrollment of the San Francisco public schools from which City College draws most of its students. It is obvious that City College needs and deserves the reservoir land. The three year moratorium will give time to produce a better plan which will have in-

put by faculty, students and alumni who know the college's needs and want to support it.

Sid Kass
Susie Langdon Kass
Phil Kass
City College Student
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The homeowners of Westwood Park, a neighborhood adjacent to the Balboa Reservoir, support the ballot initiative calling for a 3 year development moratorium. We believe that the City and City College should take additional time to determine their needs and how they might be met by using the Reservoir. In the event that City College does not need this property, we support its development as open space or as single family detached housing.

Westwood Park Association
Don C. Swander
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Let’s not aggregate the traffic problem around City College before we first develop solutions for the existing problems. A three-year moratorium only buys our neighborhood and elected officials time to find solutions; it doesn’t say no to housing. A YES vote is a vote for prudent development. A YES vote helps to preserve the family character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ken Hoegger
Realtor and community Activist

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As representatives of the students of City College, we understand first-hand, the intense need to reserve a site for future school expansion. Preservation of the Balboa Reservoir, a site directly adjacent to the campus, is particularly crucial. The facilities that CCSF requires, such as a library and an auditorium, are essential to the main structure of the campus. Unlike classrooms, it would be unreasonable to build an auditorium or a library on an off-campus site, since these facilities are integral to the main function of the school.

Associated Student Council of City College
Jack Lee, Vice President of Associated Counsel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Local 2121 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, representing City College faculty, urges a yes vote on Proposition E.

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

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is twice as crowded as any community college in northern California. It needs a much larger library, bookstore and auditorium, and more parking.

The college has always expected to use the empty SOUTH reservoir for educational needs. That land is finally surplus. Neither the college Governing Board nor the Chancellor attended the Mayor’s planning sessions for the property and the faculty was not informed. When the 12.3 acre site was offered to a developer for $36,900 for subsidized housing, the Chancellor said, “We are at a crossroad and the correct path is for the Board of Supervisors, with the Mayor’s support, to deed this surplus land to City College so that the college may continue to serve the city effectively for the next 50 years as it has for the past half century.” The Mayor refused. Now only Board member John Riordan supports the correct path.

The Water Department says it may need the NORTH reservoir now used for student parking. If that crisis occurs, the Chancellor says, “We’ll deal with the situation then.” How, if the south reservoir is gone?

(continued)
When land is available other community colleges finance large projects through alliances with civic, athletic and cultural organizations, and through property sales. New methods for public funding are being developed.

The faculty would like three years of careful study to unravel misunderstandings and poor management, and to find the best way to be a good neighbor.

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E**

City College needs land now for desperately needed facilities, one of which is a library. City College has an enrollment of 23,000 students but our library has seating for 450. There are other possible locations for new housing, but City College can't be moved. Give us an opportunity to plan a development for the community and the college.

_Annie M. Young_

City College Library Faculty and Staff

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E**

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty and staff members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs.

_Vote YES on Proposition E_

_Agnes Bulewicz_

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E**

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs.

_Vote YES on Proposition E_

_Armin Vagabasic_
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Water Department has begun a resource study of water use, due for completion in two or three years. The study may well indicate that one or both reservoirs will be needed. The American Water Works Association states that reservoirs should be used in pairs. This is particularly important because it is the only reservoir at an elevation of 305 feet.

The Mayor twisted the arm of the Water Department to declare one of these reservoirs surplus before the water resource study is completed. Don’t let her get away with this kind of political manipulation. Vote YES on Proposition E

Kurt Common
Ken Crizer
Ed Dierauf
Herb Naylor
CCSF Engineering Professors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The South Balboa Basin has been unused since college leased buildings, including a large auditorium, were torn down on that site thirty years ago. We hope that three years of thorough planning would explore the possibility of returning a part of that property to the college for the development of a multi-purpose medium-sized auditorium which could be shared with community groups.

Robert Bogina
Mack Crooks
Bob Davis
Helen Dillworth
Franz Enzio
Richard Esterman
Richard Fenner
Lawrence Ferrara
Ted Fleming
Peggy Gorham
William Grahekopp
David Hardiman

Judy Hubbell
Charles Hudspeth
Sieglinde Isham
Baruch Klein
John Kongismark
Joshua Law
Steven Lopez
Jerry Mueller
Madeline Mueller
Marvin Taruk
Frank Townsend
City College Music Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition E. This moratorium is necessary because there are too many worthy uses for this land to make a hasty and potentially very costly decision. Only through careful planning can the limited land available for development be best used.

Jerome Hasken
Robert Kaar
James Kurck
Dack Lee
Chelece Liu
William Maynez
Annette Rappleyea
Oleg Reuert
David Wall
City College Physics Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, as Physical Education Instructors, have always been committed to a diversified program for our students and community. The reservoir space is a natural land resource for a Multi-Educational and Cultural Center.

Your YES vote on E will allow us the freedom to explore ways that this property could most constructively benefit all.

Gail Barton
Curtis Decker
Brad Duggan
Tanaka Hagiwara
Johnn Hahn
Daniel Hayes

Lene Johnson
Grover Klemmer
Paula McCallum
Art Octavio
Louise Scouries

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, full-time faculty of the Computer and Information Science Department of City College, urge a YES vote to postpone the decision until additional planning and surveys can be conducted. The current proposal would negatively impact the College’s enrollment.

William Beaver
Ronald Cerri, Chairman
Kirk Gibson
Howard Granger
Frank Holden
Michael Kelly

George Lanzi
Norbert Ludkey
Charles Metzler
Charles Miller
Marilyn Schnake
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

A YES vote on Proposition E helps STOP a scheme to GIVE AWAY $12,300,000 worth of City land for $1,800,000 (or less) to a Redwood City real estate developer.

A YES vote will SAVE taxpayers $550,000 per year. The housing project will produce $240,000 in taxes, but supplying City services will cost $790,000 per year.

The Controller's cost estimate does NOT account for the $12,300,000 land value, since land sale below value is NOT technically a cost of government. The Controller also is NOT permitted to assume that the housing project will be constructed, since construction has NOT yet been ordered by the Board of Supervisors.

The plan does NOT restrict housing sales to moderate-income first-time buyers. The plan only restricts use of tax-subsidized funds. Any person favored by the developer or politicians can buy these dwellings and get the benefits of the public land giveaway.

The houses are made "affordable" by giving away the land far below market value, by City-backed low interest, and by cutting construction corners.

The real beneficiaries of the subsidized housing project are the financiers (NOT the project dwellers). Bondholders receive 9.6% average tax-free interest, which is equivalent to 24.6% taxable interest at 61% maximum tax. The developer and bond establishment receive $5,340,000; this is $263,000 (or 22.40%) for each $117,400 unit.

The City loses $51,700 worth of land GIVEN AWAY for each unit.

Vote YES on Proposition E for good fiscal management.

William Marquardt
Financial Analyst, SNaP
Helen Critzer, Treasurer, SNaP

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of College</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Campus (acres)</th>
<th>Area/1000 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City College of SF</td>
<td>22,624</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laney College, Oakland</td>
<td>9,805</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot College, Hayward</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa College</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of San Mateo</td>
<td>13,820</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>11.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Marin</td>
<td>6,663</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given these facts, why does the Governing Board not try to get the old West Campus back? Why don't they support this moratorium to delay the land grab?

The Governing Board is under political pressure from City Hall. They have been threatened with the loss of the north reservoir parking lot and funding for special projects. Forgive them. Vote Yes on E.

Friends of City College
David Newton
Glen Simpson
Jack Baker
Thomas Velasquez
Tillie McCullough

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The student population at City College is increasing. This semester's enrollment is up 1,265 students over last semester.

The enrollment in the San Francisco public schools has been increasing by 1,218 per year for the last three years. City College draws most of its enrollment from public schools in San Francisco.

Obviously, City College will have a larger enrollment in the future years, and will be in desperate need of space if we do not give it back its old West Campus.

Please reserve this public land for the college.

Please vote YES on E.

Barbara Holman

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

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
VOTE NO ON E

In 1981, I launched a six-point program to expand San Francisco's housing supply and the voters had approved a City policy to add 20,000 new housing units within five years. This Proposition would destroy a major portion of the effort to build affordable, single-family housing in our city.

The Balboa Reservoir Site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now a site for development of 203 new single-family homes, most with three bedrooms and two baths. These homes will be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed as other homes built under the City's program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom could not afford homeownership. It is believed that these new homes will sell rapidly.

The Balboa Reservoir site is one of the few sites large enough to accommodate a substantial number of new homes. Please do not let a few people stop a major opportunity for new housing. Vote no on Prop E.

Not only would Proposition E halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site, but the 9.8% fixed-rate, 30-year mortgage money set aside for the housing would also be lost.

Nothing constructive is accomplished by this measure—it does not provide additional land or facilities for City College. As a matter of fact, City College has neither plans nor money to use the property. Further, the Community College Board of Directors, the governing body for City College, has voted overwhelmingly to oppose the initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting "No on E."

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the site of the unused Balboa Reservoir and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost.

These homes are desperately needed for San Franciscans who can't afford to buy in the city where the average house is selling for over $160,000. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

The homes would be built on land that belongs to the City. Over two years ago, it was declared surplus and available for housing. It is not part of City College, and City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

We urge you to vote no on Proposition E if you want more affordable housing for San Franciscans.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

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

The 203 affordable owner occupied single family units slated for the southern portion of Balboa Reservoir are part of the 1988 total. Our progress in addressing the City's housing shortage will be curtailed if this ill-advised initiative is approved. SUPPORT OWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Housing production is essential to check rising prices and to maintain our social, economic, and ethnic population diversity. AS A SAN FRANCISCO VOTER, YOU CAN BE PART OF OUR HOUSING PROGRESS BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

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

WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT THE CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY HOUSING BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

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

Doris M. Ward, Member
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

A critical issue facing San Francisco today is the lack of housing middle class San Franciscans can afford.

That is why I have joined these neighborhood associations to support the Balboa Reservoir neighborhood housing proposal. Those participating in the development of the proposal includes:

- O.M.I. Community Association
- Dorado Terrace Association
- Outer Mission-Ingleside
- Political Action Committee
- Greater Ingleside Community
- Mount Davidson Manor
- Ocean Avenue Merchants Association
- Ingleside Terrace Association
- The San Francisco Open Space Committee
- City College of San Francisco

From early in 1985 I worked closely with these neighborhood groups in the discussions between city government and community leaders concerning the development plans for this desperately needed new housing at the unused Balboa reservoir site.

THESE ARE THE REASONS YOU SHOULD VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

1. The neighborhood housing proposal that this initiative seeks to stop is the result of months of hard work by the largest coalition of neighborhood associations ever to join together to plan a housing development in San Francisco.

2. The housing at the Balboa Reservoir site was designed with the involvement of the coalition of neighborhood associations to enhance the surrounding community.

3. The governing Board of the Community College District has made clear that they have no plans for the site and no ownership rights to it. City College does not oppose the construction of this development and opposes this initiative.

4. Self-proclaimed “Friends” of City College want to stop the proposal in order to preserve the site for future faculty parking. A clique of City College staffers involved in a neighborhood association pose as community opposition to this development even though a representative from this organization, the Sunnydale Neighborhood Association, had helped plan and support the proposal.

5. By masquerading as concerned neighbors these self-appointed “friends” of City College hope to prevent the construction of 204 critically needed units of housing and pull off one of the biggest land grabs in San Francisco’s history.

DON’T BE FOOLLED. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Residence Element of the Comprehensive Plan of the City and County of San Francisco assesses the City’s housing needs and lays out specific steps to meet those needs. This document was adopted by the City Planning Commission in 1984 after extensive public review at neighborhood meetings and public hearings, and consideration of the detailed Environmental Impact Report.

The first objective of the Housing Element is “to provide new Housing for all income groups” in locations appropriate for residential development. To meet this goal, development of housing is to be aggressively pursued and encouraged on surplus, underused and vacant public land.

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

If you want more affordable housing in San Francisco vote no on Proposition E.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Susan J. Biernan, City Planning Commissioner

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

Vote NO on E.

Proposition E deprives San Franciscans of one of their last real chances to become homeowners at an affordable price. At the South Balboa Reservoir we have City-owned land on which 203 units of three-bedroom, two-bath homes can be built at low prices which average San Franciscans can afford to pay. These homes need to be built now, not in three years. In three years the low interest rates on mortgages and the bond financing will be gone. Two hundred families will have lost the opportunity to become homeowners, and the City will have lost the opportunity to ease the tight market in rental housing.

Nor does this ill-conceived initiative help City College in any way. City College does not need this land. Speculation that the College may at some future date find a use for the land is not founded on fact. The College may never be able to build on the reservoir. Their enrollment has dropped by over 4000 students in the last few years.

This initiative is designed to confuse you. It will make our housing shortage worse for three long years. If you support affordable housing in our City, Vote NO on Proposition E.

Bill Maher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Balboa Reservoir site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now planned for development of 203 new single family homes. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed—other homes built under this program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom would not otherwise be able to afford home ownership.

San Francisco has the most expensive housing in the nation where last year the average home sold for over $160,000. Housing is difficult to produce because the obstacles are great—little land on which to build, high construction costs and uncertain interest rates.

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost. The initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional land or facilities for City College. The Community College Board, the governing body of City College, in fact recently voted to oppose this initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No” on Proposition E.

John L. Molinari

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

In 1980, the voters of the City and County of San Francisco approved a measure making it City policy to add 20,000 new units of housing within five years. In 1984 in an effort to satisfy this objective, the Board of Supervisors adopted a policy encouraging the expansion of the City’s housing supply. Making surplus City-owned land, such as the site at Balboa Reservoir, available for affordable housing was an important part of that policy. A proposal to build 203 homes on the unused Balboa Reservoir site was advanced to help implement the pro-housing policy.

Approval of Proposition E would HALT construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.

The Balboa Reservoir homes would be built on land currently belonging to the City and County of San Francisco. The property IS NOT part of the City College, and City College has neither plans or money to buy the property and convert it for City College use.

The only debatable issue is the future of affordable housing on the Balboa Reservoir site.

As we are all aware, San Francisco has the most expensive homes in the United States. The average cost of a home is $152,000. Not many can afford such prices. However, the housing proposed for the Balboa Reservoir will give many more citizens the opportunity to become homeowners. The homes to be built will be sold to first-time buyers at prices ranging from $83,000 to $145,000.

Other homes built in San Francisco under the direction of similar affordable housing programs have been snapped up quickly by San Franciscans. Without the program, most would not have been able to purchase the home and become homeowners.

Again, if you desire to preserve the construction of more affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site, vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Willie B. Kennedy
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

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

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

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

Stop these self-serving no-growth obstructionists! Please vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Prop E would halt affordable housing construction at the Balboa Reservoir site. Many gay people need affordable housing, too, and we join with other community groups urging you to vote NO on Prop E.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Robert Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E, if approved, would block the construction of 203 badly needed single-family homes on the south portion of the Balboa Reservoir in San Francisco. Sixty percent of these homes would be available for purchase by moderate and middle income families at purchase prices between $80,000 and $120,000. They would be constructed on surplus public land and financed by the sale of mortgage revenue bonds to enable the developer to sell the homes at below market prices.

A neighborhood group headed by two city college faculty members is responsible for placing Proposition E on the ballot. The group contends that the land which is intended to be used for the project should be made available instead to City College for the construction of new teaching facilities even though enrollment at City College is declining and the City College Board has voted 6 to 1 to oppose the initiative.

Like many other areas of the country, San Francisco suffers from a shortage of housing. Purchase prices here are among the highest in the nation. The use of surplus public lands and revenue bond financing provide a means for making single family homes available to a broad spectrum of families at affordable prices.

The Balboa Reservoir project is supported by the leaders of 8 neighborhood groups in the area surrounding the location of the proposed project and by a majority of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, as well as by Mayor Diane Feinstein. We urge you to encourage the construction of this type of housing in San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition E.

San Francisco Board of Realtors
William L. Jansen, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

SAVE OUR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS!
BERNAL HEIGHTS SAYS, "VOTE NO ON PROP E!"

We are residents of Bernal Heights in San Francisco. We've worked hard to build affordable family and senior citizen homes in our neighborhood.

We need more affordable housing in our City to survive. The real issue in Prop E is affordable family housing—a "yes" vote prevents the construction of 203 family homes. That's crazy! Join us in preserving what's best in our City.

Vote "no" on Prop E!

Sylvia M. Yee, Bernal Heights Community Foundation Board of Directors***
Frank Hutchins, BHCF Board*
Mary Lou Bernoletti, BHCF Board*
Lela Havener, BHCF Board*
Elizabeth Egger, BHCF Board*
Sister Janet Simons, BHCF Board*
Stephen Antonaros, BHCF Board*
Lorenzo R. Dill, BHCF Board*
Barbara Bagot, BHCF Board*
Margaret C. Randolph, Northwest Bernal Block Club*
Maureen Lamb, NWBBC*
Tim Molinares, BHCF Planning & Dev't Committee*
Buck Bagot, BHCF P & D Committee*
***Organization for identification purposes only.

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

San Francisco Needs Affordable Housing—
Vote No on Proposition E

Everyone agrees that San Francisco needs affordable housing. The questions are how and where that affordable housing can be built.

The Balboa Reservoir housing development, to be built on the site of a reservoir built thirty years ago and unused since that time, answers those important questions for more than 200 San Francisco first-time homebuying families by providing:
- 203 new affordable three-bedroom, single family homes
- 9.8% fixed-rate financing
- A mix of 30% low-income, 30% moderate-income and 40% market-rate first time buyers
- A convenient site that has been declared “surplus” by the City and “available for development of affordable housing”

The Balboa Reservoir housing development is a small but significant step in the effort to generate affordable housing in our City.

Thousands of San Franciscans from every community, neighborhood group and viewpoint agree that the Balboa Reservoir development is good for San Francisco. Virtually every elected official, including the Governing Board of City College also agree.

All these San Franciscans ask you to say “yes” to affordable housing and “NO” to Proposition E.

San Francisco Coalition for Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar, Executive Director

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The viable plan for affordable single family housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site is being threatened by Proposition E. If Proposition E passes, 203 single family homes will be lost to the citizenry of San Francisco at a time when they are greatly needed.

The facts about the proposed housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site argue strongly against Proposition E. All 203 homes will be for first time home buyers. One-third of the homes will be available to households earning $27,000. Another third of the homes will be available to households earning $36,000. Adequate parking will be provided within the development itself, thus answering any concerns that traffic in the area will be congested.

City College has no need or plan to use South Balboa Reservoir for its facilities. City College’s priority is to develop its existing campus. South Balboa Reservoir should therefore be used for one of the City’s greatest needs: increased and affordable housing which is available to lower and middle income families.

As homeowners who live in the vicinity of South Balboa Reservoir, we welcome its planned use for single family housing and feel it will become an integral and contributing part of the community. We therefore urge you to vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Submitted by:
Stephen Graham, Chairman of the Housing Sub-committee of the Citizen's Committee for Community Development
Roderick A. McLeod, Vice-Chairman of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing is a group of neighbors which consists of many of the renters of Westwood Park and Sunnyridge neighborhoods as well as owners and renters of Ingleside which are the closest neighbors to the Balboa Reservoir along with some of the students and teachers of City College.

We strongly support the Balboa Reservoir for housing. We believe that the Balboa Reservoir is an ideal spot for housing.

Our neighborhood wants homes in the South Balboa Reservoir.
Vote No On Prop. E.

Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughney
Submitted by Patricia Vaughney

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

As Merchants as well as residents of Ocean Avenue, Greater Ingleside and San Francisco, we support the Development of the Balboa Reservoir as housing.
A Traffic Survey has stated that there will be minimal impact on the existing patterns of traffic by this development.

Additional City College Parking is being considered on another location off I-280 to keep the college congestion away from the neighborhood’s streets.

City College has 44 more acres in which to expand and existing buildings at City College have viable means to expand.
We believe that housing on the Balboa Reservoir is the most viable solution to develop a vacant piece of property that is directly adjacent to our stores on a Transpreferential Street.

Affordable housing is in great need in San Francisco and is as much needed here as anywhere. We want to help provide this need. Vote No on Prop. E.

Ocean Avenue Merchants Assoc.
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughery
Submitted by Patricia Vaughery

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction on much-needed affordable, single-family housing at the long vacant south Balboa Reservoir site. This proposition would also block a major housing development that would bring jobs into an area of the city that has little industry or private business.

Sale prices for these units are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the San Francisco housing market, where the average home is selling for $160,000. Construction of these homes will help all young, first-time home buyers and will require only 5% down, instead of the 20% down payment on homes bought with conventional home mortgages.

This plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by nine nearby neighborhood organizations. If Proposition E is approved and this project is blocked, more young adults will purchase their first home in Vallejo or some other outlying area, further draining San Francisco of the young families that every growing community needs.

San Francisco residents will gain apprenticeships, jobs, contracts and subcontracts from this development.

This plan calls for 2 and 3 bedroom, family-sized houses, with space for another bedroom which can be finished when needed.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote "No" on Proposition E.

Affordable Housing Alliance — Mitchell Rosenberg, Director
Bay Area Urban League — Gregory Best, Field Representative
Bernal Heights Community Foundation — Andre Lemelle Daye
Community Educational Services — Dorothy Chen, Executive Director
Japanese Community Youth Council St. Francis Square Apartments, Inc. — Sandra Mayor-Jenkins, Secretary
Minority Contractors Association of Northern California — James Haughsbook, Secretary, Board of Directors
National Community Congress — Dr. Eddie C. Welburn
Parkmerced Residents Organization, Inc. — Ricardo A. Callejo, Esq.
Potrero Hill Neighborhood House — Ethel Maxwell
San Francisco Building Trades Council — Stan Smith
San Francisco Housing & Tenants Council — Joseph Lacey
San Francisco Tenants Union — Jim Faye
Rev. Anox C. Brown — Local Pastor & Community Servant
Greg Day — Chairman, Citizens Committee on Community Development
Polly V. Marshall — Commissioner, San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
Regina A. Sneed
Jim Wuchter — San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Michael E. Wills, AIA — Fleming Corporation
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote "No" on Proposition E.

Greater Ingleside Political Club — Frank Noto, Treasurer
Housing Conservation and Development Corporation — Lonnie Lawson, Board of Directors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote "No" on Proposition E.

Bayview Baptist Minister Fellowship — Rev. N. B. Mills, President
Bread of Life Missionary Baptist Church — Rev. S. A. Bailey
Cosmopolitan Baptist Church — Rev. A. Roy Gentle
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Raymond M. Howard Sr.
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Carole Nelson
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Cornelius P. O'Reilly
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Paul G. Theiss
Old St. Mary's Housing Committee — Charles Gale, Chairman
St. Peters Housing Committee — Tessa Rouverot

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: With certain exceptions, City officers, including elected officials and commission members, may represent clients before City boards and commissions other than their own, and be paid for their services. State legislators may represent clients before City boards and commissions, and be paid for their services. Any person may contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would prohibit City officers from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay. This proposition would prohibit State legislators from appearing before City boards, commissions and departments on behalf of clients for pay. City officers would be prohibited from discussing with these officers and legislators matters that the City is deciding. Proposition F would also prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit City officers and State legislators from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to allow City officers and State legislators to represent clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to allow any person to contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

Controller's Statement on "F"

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

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 77

How "F" Got on Ballot

On February 26 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for limitations on compensated advocacy and campaign contributions had qualified for the June ballot.

Quentin Kopp, Marth Gillham and Cheryl Arenson, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 9,400 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,986 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The purpose of Proposition F is to cut campaign contributions by large contributors (and thus reduce campaign spending) and eliminate undue influence by officeholders retained as paid lobbyists for projects requiring City approval.

Let’s take a minute to analyze the untrue arguments against Proposition F.

- The opponents claim that Proposition F will force half the City’s Commissioners to resign. In fact, Proposition F does not force any Commissioner to resign. It simply says they can’t be a paid lobbyist and a City Commissioner at the same time. Does a commissioner value making money by lobbying more than public service?

- Some have also alleged that Proposition F will prevent duly-elected union leaders from serving as City Commissioners. No it won’t. Proposition F prohibits “compensated advocacy” — that means lobbyists hired by an organization, not members of the organization itself. Proposition F does not apply to salaried employees of labor unions, corporations, or non-profit agencies. Moreover, Section 8.105 of the Charter precludes it specifically from applying to any member serving as a representative of any profession, trade, business, union or association on any board or commission which requires membership of representatives of specific professions, trades, businesses, unions or associations.

- Another untrue argument against Proposition F is that it prohibits City officials only from discussing pending issues with other City officers or State Legislators who are also acting as paid lobbyists in a matter and doesn’t stop those officeholding lobbyists from writing City officials about their clients’ objectives. That’s not so. Proposition F applies to all such lobbying, written or oral. (The dictionary defines “discuss” as “to examine by means of speech or writing.”)

End government decision-making by “insiders” and reduce the influence of money on local campaigns.

VOTE YES ON F.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
San Franciscans for Good Government

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

In all our years of observing San Francisco City government, we have found one maxim to be true time after time: a good idea gets copied, especially among politicians.

For no sooner did Quentin Kopp promise to bring Proposition F to the voters than did Mayor Feinstein come up with an informal, administrative version of her own. Fine, you say (and the Mayor says), then why vote Yes on Proposition F?

(1) The Mayor’s remedy of asking City Commissioners who also act as lobbyists before City agencies to resign is nothing more than a hand slap, and is good only as long as she is mayor. It’s not binding on future mayors and could be changed without any vote of the Board of Supervisors, let alone the people of San Francisco. Proposition F prohibits this kind of conflict-of-interest, and it will be the law, no matter who is mayor.

(2) The Mayor’s action did nothing to state legislators who can also act as lobbyists before City Boards and Commissions, nor did her action stop the law or business partners of City Commissioners from picking up the slack in big-money lobbying. Proposition F will stop these practices in their tracks.

(3) What about the other half of Proposition F, which reduced the campaign contribution limit to $500 so that all San Franciscans can enjoy equal access to City officials, not just the ones with the big bucks? The Mayor can’t do anything about this, and she hasn’t. Only a Yes vote on Proposition F will reduce the weight of big money and ensure our full voice in City elections and City government.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. If it’s important enough for the Mayor to copy part of it administratively, it’s important enough to do the job right and make it a law.

John J. Barbagelata
Harry Aleo
June Cahn
Dorothy Fartridge

Robert Aronson
Rudolph Lohnes
Janet Wentworth

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The worst and most persistent problem in American politics is that politicians and political races can be “bought”. Reducing the size of campaign contributions will be a step forward in reducing the role of money in elections. Vote yes for more honest government.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

RESTORE to the people their rightful and equal power as individual voters by reducing the monetary clout and influence of private interests who make the laws and the policies as City officials and Commissioners or State legislators.

TELL the special interests that their money and influence can no longer interfere with representative government.

TELL: the special interests that the voters will no longer tolerate the influence-buying which comes with large campaign contributions.

TELL the special interests that this measure will encourage highly talented citizens to serve San Francisco honestly and responsibly.

VOTE YES ON F.

Cheryl Arenson
Anne Renfrew
David Pacheco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

"Government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

These noble words from Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, cast in bronze at the entrance to City Hall, seem to have escaped the attention of some City officials who pass by them every day. For in San Francisco City government, Lincoln's simple formula for representative government would read quite differently: "Government of the powerful, by the lobbyists, and for the wealthy."

Government of, by, and for the privileged few is bad government. Government of, by, and for all the people is good government. It's as simple as that—as simple as Lincoln first put it.

Proposition F, the Good Government Initiative, will help San Franciscans maintain control of their government and will prevent undue influence by City officeholders.

To reduce undue influence, Proposition F outlaws the practice of City Commissioners and State Legislators representing special interests for pay before City Commissions and Boards. City Commissions should render their decisions deliberately and impartially, not be swayed by the political clout of the lobbyists appearing before them, or by any political favors those lobbyist/politicians might promise. "I'll scratch your back if you scratch my back" bargains do not belong in government. And until such backroom bargains are made illegal, City government will not belong to the rest of us either.

Proposition F also reduces the maximum amount that anyone can give to a local candidate from $1,000 to $500. If large contributors and other special interests can't give as much money, they can't buy as much influence with elected officials. And the lower the contribution limit, the less campaign spending and the more City government will be responsive to all San Franciscans.

You can "buy back" City government from the privileged and powerful with the most precious of all political commodities: your vote.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Mary Lohnes
Peter Fatool
Judith Thorson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F, an initiative of the people, is needed to protect the voters and the integrity of the legislative process from being corrupted by the power of money and influence. It prevents City officials and State Legislators from lobbying the City on behalf of high-powered special interests. It also lowers the campaign contribution limit from $1,000 to $500, thus reducing the influence of those same special interests over our elections and elected officials.

The bogus argument that the Mayor won't be able to find qualified people to serve on City commissions if Proposition F is adopted ignores the plain fact that there are 700,000 people in San Francisco, a pool of civic-minded citizens more than large enough to accommodate the 250 commission appointments available in our City government. For example, there are plenty of architects to fill the one architectural appointment on the Art Commission, just as there are plenty of non-lobbyist business people and lawyers available to serve on other commissions.

Thousands of San Franciscans, not just the "insiders", are ready, willing, and able to serve the public.

Proposition F deserves your vote. Restore integrity to City government. Restore the confidence of the citizens of San Francisco in that government. Let's have no more Wilkes Bashford situations.

VOTE YES ON F.

Oscar Sutro
Martha Gillham
Marguerite Warren

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

VOTE "NO" ON F

This proposition disguises itself as "good government" but, in reality, would drive good people out of government. It is so crudely drawn—so sweeping in its implications—that it would bar from government almost anyone with even a remote business or community tie to government.

It would purge from City commissions anyone who "directly or indirectly" receives compensation from any "interests" with an issue before any City agency. Effectively, this could discriminate against employees from community and neighborhood groups, civil rights organizations, non-profit corporations, labor unions, merchant and business groups, as well as architects, lawyers and other professionals.

Actually, there currently are no commissioners who represent any clients before any City agency. All who are appointed in my administration sign a statement saying they will not advocate for any paying client before any official body of the City while they are commissioners. This proposition simply is not necessary.

Proposition F also would lower the limit for any individual campaign contribution from $1,000 to $500. Although this sounds good, it would permit a wealthy person with various businesses and numerous family members to contribute many thousands of dollars through different sources. This would encourage "hidden" contributions. We must strive for disclosure of contributions, not a system which drives contributions underground. Candidates must be able to raise funds enough to put their message before the voters. Reducing the contribution limit can be a tactic to discourage persons from challenging incumbents.

Vote no on Proposition F.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition F purports to achieve a noble objective: The removal of "influence peddling" from City Hall. In fact, Proposition F is so poorly-crafted, it may have exactly the opposite effect on City government. It is not a "good government" initiative. It is bad legislation.

Proposition F provides no definitions and no standards for the public to judge whether City officials comply with its restrictions. Its uncertainties will be chaotic and lead to endless, needless lawsuits.

A measure similar to Proposition F was rejected by the Board of Supervisors because no public hearings were ever held on the legislation. If the public had had a chance to comment on this initiative, it might not have the critical shortcomings, deficiencies and uncertainties that now warrant its rejection by responsible San Franciscans.

In the coming months, the Board will review good government measures that are comprehensive, effective and, most important, certain. Proposition F is a misguided disaster.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

This should properly have been titled the "SINK WILLIE BROWN ORDINANCE"! The "meat of the cocoanut" is in Section 4.

Supervisor Kopp's intentions are good, however this sloppily drafted and incomprehensible measure succeeds in "burning down the barn" to eliminate a couple of rats.

Under this proposal, to avoid any potential INDIRECT conflict of interest, (which is undefined!), one would have to be a destitute, unemployed welfare recipient to qualify for service on any City Board or Commission! The Mayor has already solved this "hired advocacy" problem with the "conflict of interest" affidavits she demands IN ADVANCE from any prospective appointee.

Quentin's proposed $500.00 campaign contribution limit is an "inside joke" and he, of all people, knows it! It merely obliges a heavy contributor to have his wife, children, business associates, or friends send in SEPARATE $500.00 checks if he wants to contribute more than $500.00 to a politician's campaign.

These proposals require additional City employees for enforcement and wind up doing far more harm than good. Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr., President
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Union members and labor officials have legitimate reasons for meeting with City officers. It is unfair and wrong to lump them in the same category as special interest lobbyists, yet that's exactly what Proposition F does. Working people deserve representation on City boards and commissions. VOTE NO!

Hon. Amy Meyer
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Walter Jabe
Hon. Bruce Lilienthal
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Jean Kurihara
Hon. Thomas Horn
Hon. Henry Berman
Hon. Robert McCarthy
Hon. Richard Guggenheim
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Hon. Patrick McGrew
Hon. Kirk Miller
Hon. Melvin Lee
Hon. Jerry Berg
Hon. Bonnie Gibson
Hon. Mary Noel Pappas
Hon. Mark Buechel
Hon. Tim Carrico
Hon. Jo Hanson
Hon. Kevin Muntone
John Sanger
Tom Moore

Donald Disler
John Wachob
Anne Daley
Linda Post
Lyone Williams
Todd Dickinson
Peter Haxton
Herbert Kurlan
William Scouris
Van Hart
Iris Fleissler
Noam Rand
John Schmidt
James Mock
Thomas Karwski
Wendy Goldberg
Joseph Schwartz
Belle Lazarus
Antonio Barrios
Bruce Barrett
Charles Howell
Walter McGuire
Sharon Duvall
Joyce Mauriello

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

If you want to ban business owners and executives from serving on City boards and commissions, then vote for Proposition F.
If you think board members of non-profit corporations and employees of community agencies have nothing to contribute to City government, then vote for Proposition F.
If you believe union members and labor officials should not have a voice at City Hall, then vote for Proposition F.
But if you share our belief that these individuals have legitimate concerns and expertise that is valuable in running major City departments, then join us in voting NO on Proposition F.
Proposition F is a simplistic, sloppily-drafted, meat axe approach to a problem already resolved by Mayor Feinstein's ban on commissioners lobbying on behalf of private clients.
Proposition F is not good government and it is not reform. Proposition F is bad legislation. VOTE NO.

Hon. Douglas Engmann
Hon. Charlotte Berk

Hon. Eugene Friend
Hon. Phyllis Lyon

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

We're sympathetic to the need for political reform. But it's a complicated problem, and Proposition F just isn't the way to go.
Frankly, we can't tell who is and isn't affected by this measure. While a handful of people sometimes might abuse their positions, that's no reason to question the integrity of so many solid citizens who give tirelessly to public service. Proposition F is simply the wrong approach. Please join us in voting NO.

William E. McDonnell
Frances May McAteer
N. A. Sapunar
Caroline and Michael Figoni

Martin D. Murphy
Eugene C. Payne III
Suzanne B. McCarthy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Concerned about elected officials spending $400,000 to run for supervisor and $1 million on a mayor's race? Then vote NO on Proposition F.
That's right. NO.
Proposition F isn't going to do anything about campaign spending. Prop F simply limits the size of contributions, reducing the current limit from $1,000 to $500. Supervisors can and will continue spending outrageous sums on their re-election campaigns. With Proposition F they'll just spend twice as much time raising money from twice as many sources, and that makes special interests even more powerful. They can always find ways around campaign limits.
We need campaign spending reform, but Proposition F doesn't provide it. Please join us in voting NO on F.

District 8 Democratic Club
Stephen L. Taber
Ruth Gravitis
Alan Raznick
Miriann Blaustein

Linda Chapman
Dale Carlson
James Firth
Debra Barnes
Lee Serbin
Debra Stein
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

When campaign contributions are limited, political freedom suffers. Your right to free speech includes not only your right to express your views, but also your right to support as much as you want, any candidate who speaks for you.

Minority viewpoints depend heavily on the contribution of a few dedicated supporters to get your message out. To limit your financial support of your beliefs is to silence your political voice.

Only incumbents, who have many opportunities for free media exposure benefit from this assault on free speech. The dangers of a campaign contribution limit far outweigh any possible benefit from this proposition. Defeat Proposition F!

San Francisco Libertarian Party
Michael R. Fowler, Secretary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

You may think Prop F only applies to big-time lawyers and a few legislators who represent developers. Think again!

Prop F would prohibit many community leaders from public service. If it passes, board members and employees of community and charitable organizations could be banned from serving on City boards and commissions.

We appreciate the public need for a government free of “influencing peddling.” But restrictions on “compensated advocacy” ought to be clearly and carefully crafted to protect the voices of community leaders who argue on behalf of the public interest, not private special interests.

Vote No.

Hon. Juanita Del Carlo
Mission Hiring Hall

Bob Ross
Publisher, Bay Area Reporter

Hon. Jeffrey Ken Mori
Japanese Community Youth Council, Inc.

Bill O'Callahan
American Red Cross

Hon. George Suncin
Horizons Unlimited

Hon. Jean Ria Alviar
Mission Education Project

Hon. Greg Day
Polk Street Town Hall

Hon. Naomi Gray
Hon. James Foster
Carol Wong
Marlena Marseille
Lee Woods
Jo Daly
Dennis Collins
Hon. H. Welton Flynn

(Organizations listed only for purposes of identification.)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will have no effect on developers' lawyers. None.

It won't make any difference to state legislators either.

Don't kid yourself. This is not "reform" and it isn't "good government." Proposition F will allow the special interests and influence peddlers to continue exercising influence over our elected officials. It has so many loopholes, lobbying will actively continue, untouched, in the back rooms of City Hall.

And developers will always find ways around campaign contribution limits. As Common Cause has noted, Prop F simply makes tracing their dollars more difficult for the public.

Real reform would directly attack the source of huge contributions—the developers and other special interests that employ the lobbyists to peddle their influence.

VOTE NO.

Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
David Looman
Michael Mason

Rich Waller
Susan Klugerman
Rene Cazenave
Margie O'Driscoll

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
PROPOSITION G

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?  

YES 300  NO 301

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has adopted an ordinance prohibiting the City, with certain exceptions, from purchasing goods or services from companies doing business with South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a declaration of policy that says the City must try to avoid doing business with companies that significantly profit from or help maintain the Apartheid system in South Africa. It calls on other public bodies and private groups to adopt similar policies. It directs the Board of Supervisors to identify the companies which have the greatest ties to Apartheid so that the public can also boycott those companies.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to avoid doing business with companies that help maintain Apartheid, and you want a public boycott of those companies.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

“The proposed Declaration of Policy be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “G” Got on Ballot

On November 6, 1985 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for the City to boycott businesses with significant ties to South Africa had qualified for the June ballot.

Arlo Hale Smith, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,546 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on October 11.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,941 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:
It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
South Africa Boycott

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This measure calls for a public boycott of companies that aid apartheid.

Any claim of "conflict" between Proposition G and existing anti-apartheid legislation is imaginary: It is the legislative intent of supporters of this measure that it can be construed as a directive for making existing law tougher.

Personal attacks have no legitimate place in a ballot measure campaign. As proponent of this measure, I repudiate all such tactics.

Vote NO on apartheid. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Arlo Hale Smith

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Boycotts are grassroots politics. They've helped the farm-workers, they've helped win integration, and they can help end the legal racism called "Apartheid".

A Gallup poll found 77% of South Africa's black majority favoring international economic boycotts to force the Apartheid regime to accept reform peacefully.

After the Boycott Initiative made the ballot, the San Francisco Supervisors unanimously passed a similar city purchasing policy. The issue that remains is whether to call on the general public to join in, boycotting companies identified by the Supervisors as the worst offenders in each industry.

The companies that would be targeted consider profits to be the "bottom line". Economic pressure is all they understand.

The AFL-CIO, NAACP, and NOW have called a boycott of Shell Oil because of its profiteering from South Africa's oppressive economic conditions. Proposition G supports that and would put the same pressure on other industries as well.

This proposition is supported by the elected county central committee of the Democratic Party, the Peace-and-Freedom Party and the Humanist Party, and by leading attorneys, such as Terry Francois, Terence Hallinan, Tony Serra, Lewis Hope Lee, Marc Van Der Hout, Abby Ginsberg and Terence Redmond.

If South Africa were a democracy, its majority would long ago have voted to end Apartheid. We need to vote Yes — because they can't.

Arlo Hale Smith, Democratic Party County Central Committee
Paul Kangas, Peace and Freedom Party
Lois Sallahby, Public Advocates*
Dr. Kevin Danaher, Food First
Jesse James, Mission Rebels
Terry Collins, Community Activist
Stony Gebert, Election Action
Robert McCall, Hotel & Restaurant Employees
Executive Board Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Attorneys speak out against Apartheid:

South African police can arrest anyone without charge. They can hold you incommunicado — no contacts with family, lawyers or press.

They regularly censor news, books, music. They have banned Christmas caroling, funerals and other peaceful gatherings. Groups which criticize the government are forbidden to hold meetings.

Blacks are subject to legal segregation; their property and employment rights are greatly restricted; often, they are simply murdered.

As attorneys, we help people who have legal rights that are being violated. But what can we do for those who have no legal rights?

Boycotts and other economic sanctions are the only way to make the Apartheid government accept reform peacefully.

In the Court of World Public Opinion, Apartheid has been convicted of crimes against humanity. By imposing a sentence of economic isolation, we can end Apartheid.

Vote Yes — take a stand for justice.

Terence Hallinan
Arlo Hale Smith
Terry Francois
Karen Anderson Ryer
Robert R. Bryan

Ann Menasche
Rachel Ginsburg
Leo Paoli
Gabriel Geamer
Ona Prouchtovnick

*Attachments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is a moderate, responsible but effective proposal to bring economic pressure on the South African government to establish constitutional rights for all of its citizens. Vote Yes.

Terence Faulkner, Republican
Mike Garza, Republican

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

All decent Americans abhor apartheid. However, boycotting U.S. investment in South Africa is counterproductive; it only penalizes the actual victims of apartheid.
U.S. international firms have acted as progressive agents for change through the Sullivan principles. Their investments have improved the social and economic condition of the labor force. It is improper to penalize their positive contributions.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

We are individuals and organizations working actively to end the racist system of apartheid in South Africa. And we are voting NO on Proposition G.
Why?
(1) Because Proposition G will weaken San Francisco’s present divestment law. This law requires companies doing business with the city to sign affidavits that they will make no new contracts with South Africa.
Proposition G has no such provision.
(2) Proposition G provides no mechanism or funding to carry out its declared purpose of “boycotting” South Africa.
Proposition G will not stop South African products from entering the Port of San Francisco.
Vote against this useless, confusing, and deceptive initiative.

Preserve the stronger divestment law San Francisco already has. Vote NO on Proposition G!

Yvonne Golden
Geraldine Johnson
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
AFT 2121 Anti-Apartheid Committee
Artists Against Apartheid
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Coalition of Conscience
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club Executive Committee
ILWU 10 and SEIU 250 Southern Africa Liberation Support Committees
National Conference of Black Lawyers
San Francisco Anti-Apartheid Committee
Southern Africa Freedom Committee/All Peoples Congress

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.
The Registrar charges $30 plus $.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.
The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.
Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1983 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!

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

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Several city and private agencies conduct various programs related to AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a declaration of policy that says San Francisco should support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council, consisting of a Committee on Education and a Fund-Raising Committee. The Research Committee would make recommendations on the most useful AIDS research projects and try to prevent duplication of efforts. The Education Committee would inform the public about the latest research and about ways to prevent AIDS. The Fund-Raising Committee would seek donations and grants for AIDS research and education projects.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

Controller's Statement on "H"

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

"The proposed Declaration of Policy for an AIDS research and education council and the formation of advisory committees of civic leaders would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, additional expenditure of public funds for AIDS research may result, the amount of which cannot be determined."

How "H" Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for AIDS research had qualified for the June ballot.

Stony Gebert, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 10,540 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on December 6, 1985.

A check of each signature on the petition showed that 7,564 of the signatures were valid. This is more than 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We need a council to expose and address major AIDS issues without the impasse of present medical/political bias.

As taxpayers, we are subsidizing a treadmill of continual AIDS casualties. There are major oversights where AIDS is concerned. Only recently was it learned that CDC statistics suggest 79% of early AIDS cases appear drug-related. We hear AIDS is 100% fatal. Perhaps that is because death may also be drug-related in the way of immuno-suppressive antibiotic and radiation overloads to already compromised immunity systems. Prevailing medicine is both tunnel-visioned and high-profit motivated. Also well-funded. This solution may be part of the problem. Some physicians are beginning to feel where AIDS is concerned many current practices are ethically, medically bankrupt.

Remissions occur. Largely through immunity-enhancing, holistic medicine. Significantly, only 1% of AIDS cases occur among people at risk in the Asian community. Perhaps this is due to less drug abuse or use of an unfunded, ignored resource: herbology as part of diet. More options: homeopathy, acupuncture, etc.

If, as anticipated, upwards of 40% of those testing positive come down with AIDS, we may become overburdened. To ignore all of the above becomes part of the problem. Vote Yes on Proposition H.

Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Rich McKirkeby, Former Orderly, Marketing Associate, Pacific Bell
Joseph P. Clady, AIDS Hospice, Shanti Counselor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There is great need for research and education about AIDS and related conditions.

We need to attack the disease, not its victims.

Knowledge is the only vaccine available today.

Vote Yes.

John Lorenzini, President,
People With AIDS Alliance
Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Jan Beck, Steven Russell, Eugene Ewings, ARC/AIDS Vigil

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There are many possible treatments for AIDS and related conditions which are not being examined by the federal government, especially therapies based on natural substances and processes.

Vote Yes for an AIDS Research Council open to all viewpoints.

Scott Gregory, M.D.
Paul Kangas

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

A tape recording (Talking Book) of the San Francisco Voter Information pamphlet is available from the San Francisco Public Library’s branch for the blind. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

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

Name______________________________________________
Address__________________________________________Apt. #_________
Telephone No. (required)______________________________
Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:
I want to work in the following area(s): _____________________________
Second choice locations (if any)______________________________
Signature______________________________________________
PROPOSITION I
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the Freeway with a surface roadway.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City’s policy to remain as it is, and you want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to change the City’s policy, and you do not want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a policy statement asking whether or not the Embarcadero Freeway should be torn down.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway demolished, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by at least $10.2 million in local funds. Potential private sector financing and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “I” Got on Ballot

On March 3 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy placing the question of demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway before the voters had qualified for the June ballot.

Richard Hongisto, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 11,119 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,720 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

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

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land now under the Broadway ramps is put back on the tax rolls, with low-rise buildings limited by restrictive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when united with Proposition J, recognizes these facts:

1) The Embarcadero Freeway is what is left of a never-completed elevated freeway that would have ringed the City through North Beach and Marina neighborhoods to the Golden Gate Bridge.
2) Today this massive freeway, which separates us from our waterfront, would never be built.
3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.
4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman’s Wharf will be preserved.
5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked for this new system.
6) Only that portion of the Embarcadero Freeway east and north of the Main and Beale Street ramps — basically the portion directly on the waterfront — will be removed to make way for the new system. The removal cost, approximately $10 million to be paid for with privately-generated new revenues, is a relatively small part of the overall new system.

As for Proposition I, vote “YES, let’s tear down the Embarcadero Freeway.” Then turn to Proposition J and support the plan for a beautiful waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Removing the Embarcadero Freeway will allow San Francisco to:

- Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero.
- Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway.
- Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula.
- Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero.
- Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.
- Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won’t benefit San Francisco. Don’t let outsiders determine our future. Vote YES on I.

Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Jack Wholey
Roger Bayer
A. Lee Knight
Robert Bradford
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Donald A. Crosby, AIA
Rai Y. Okamoto
Robert Meyers
Ralph Hurrado
Hon. Susan Berman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Douglas G. Wright
Anita Sanchez
Chuck Forester
Fritz Arko
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones
Randall Rossi
Karl Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsed
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
Jon Twickehl
Jane Winslow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK — VOTE YES ON I

This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY — VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds — without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city’s fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT—VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled. Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 1

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION 1
In voting YES on Proposition 1, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for growth that will pay for itself as land development back on the tax rolls, with revenue from the active waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when considered with these facts:
1) The Embarcadero completed elevated freeway through North Beach and the Gate Bridge.
2) Today this massive waterfront, would never be built.
3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.
4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman’s Wharf will be preserved.
5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked for this new system.
6) Only that section of the Embarcadero Freeway next to the waterfront, would never be built.

FROM:

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?
(SFIRMO SU APLICACION?)

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 1

STOP GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON I
This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY—VOTE YES ON I
Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds—without costing San Francisco a dime.

The city’s fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.

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

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT—VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

Hon. Doris W. Kohn
Monica H. Halloran
Lisa Klairemont
Jeffrey Heller
Nancy Katz
Robert Katz
Bob Isaacson
John Behanna
City Lights Books, Inc.
Kenneth R. Lerch

Alan Lubliner
Norman Rolfe
Jerry Hurtado
Gregory E. Jones
Marc Kasky
James W. Haas
Richard Reinhardt
Mrs. Bland Platt
Donald Black
David M. Hartley

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to 15.7 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown, Fisherman's Wharf and the financial district would be reduced.

Travel within the city would be slowed down at all hours. Vote no to the destruction of the freeway.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
- Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
- Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
- If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
  - By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
  - Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
  - MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
  - Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Judith Tornese

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Tear it down? The concept is preposterous! There are 70,000 cars a day whizzing by on this high speed downtown elevated waterfront freeway! Where will they all go?

Aside from the outrageous demolition costs involved, (some engineers estimate $40,000,000 of taxpayer money!), eyeball observation, logic, and just plain "common sense" dictates that ground level "total gridlock" will result if this expensive freeway is now destroyed.

Nostalgic individuals must realize that the times have changed! We can't bring the Bay back up to Montgomery Street! On behalf of San Francisco's overburdened taxpayers, we urge a NO vote!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled.
Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

Anna M. Guth
Republican Committeewoman
K. Martin Keller
State Central Committeeman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

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

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic? YES 310 NO 311

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a policy statement that says that the City would replace the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt a policy statement which says that the Embarcadero Freeway would be torn down if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt a policy statement to replace the Embarcadero Freeway under these conditions.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway replaced with a tree-lined six lane boulevard and other traffic and transit improvements, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by approximately $27.5 million. This includes a one-time freeway demolition cost of $10.2 million plus $17.3 million required to match potential federally-funded transit improvements. Potential financing by the State and private sector and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “J” Got on Ballot

On March 5 a declaration of policy regarding the future of the Embarcadero Freeway was delivered to the Registrar from the Mayor and several supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows the Mayor or four or more supervisors to submit a declaration of policy to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

In addition to Mayor Feinstein, the March 5 document was signed by Supervisors Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker, Molinari, Kennedy and Nelder.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans now have a chance to remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with an at-grade, six-lane parkway, which will open our waterfront and restore views blocked for years by this large freeway.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for traffic and transit improvements:

- New, shorter freeway ramps connecting directly with The Embarcadero;
- A tree-lined, at-grade, 6-lane Embarcadero Boulevard, with a new waterfront Muni line, a jogging and bicycle path from Fisherman's Wharf to Mission Bay;
- Extension of Muni Metro south to the Caltrain station at 4th and Townsend;
- New ramps connecting I-280 with The Embarcadero;
- Changes in traffic flow and improvements to existing freeway ramps.

Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf will be preserved and enhanced.

The Board of Supervisors has specified that the Embarcadero Freeway will be torn down only if preliminary engineering during the next two years confirms—as traffic and environmental studies already have—that removal of the freeway will not result in more problems than it solves.

San Francisco became eligible for $88 million in federal highway funds for this new system when the Supervisors approved the plan in 1980. The $10.2 million cost of freeway demolition itself can be paid from revenues from low-rise development of the parcels now under the Broadway ramps and the increased values of nearby properties. Strict waterfront zoning limits the size of any development.

Traffic and environmental studies by the California Department of Transportation since 1980 clearly indicate that the new waterfront transportation system will be vastly superior to the existing situation, and that traffic congestion levels will not be notably different with the elevated structure removed.

Vote Yes on J and let's remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with a parkway and transit system—one again let us see our waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J gives the voters a chance to be heard on an important and timely issue. This issue is the replacement of a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway as one element of a comprehensive package of transportation improvements in the Waterfront area.

Last fall, the Board of Supervisors adopted for further study a set of traffic and transit improvements for the Waterfront. These improvements include:

- a new landscaped surface-level boulevard
- replacement of the Clay/Washington and Broadway on and off ramps with new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom
- removal of the unused stub of I-280 and construction of new ramps connecting the new waterfront boulevard to Route I-280
- a new light rail transit line linking Fort Mason with the Caltrain Depot
- extension of the Muni Metro to the train depot, improving the Peninsula Commute Service

A YES vote on Proposition J does not allocate funds for these projects. It does allow for further design and engineering studies, including cost analysis, assessment of impacts on traffic, and other matters. The studies will then be presented to the Supervisors so that they can make an informed decision on the plan. If the studies prove positive, San Francisco will be able to transform its Waterfront for the benefit of all.

Proposition J will insure that the City will not proceed with the removal of any of the Freeway until all the studies are completed and all potential consequences are assessed. This is the responsible approach. Vote YES on J.

SPUR
League of Women Voters
Embarcadero Citizens Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SAN FRANCISCO'S NEIGHBORHOODS ASK YOU TO VOTE YES ON J.

REDUCE TRAFFIC CONGESTION—YES ON J!

Traffic backed up by the Embarcadero Roadway slows travel and creates congestion in North Beach and other nearby neighborhoods. J will speed traffic flow.

IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION—YES ON J!

Proposition J will provide regular streetcar service along the Embarcadero and extend Muni Metro service to the south, ultimately extending to Bayview-Hunters Point.

PROMOTE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY—YES ON J!

If Proposition J does not pass, San Francisco could lose $88 million in federal funds for traffic improvements.

(continued)
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

in new electric trolley an articulated bus service, and in BART and Golden Gate Transit, have saved downtown San Francisco from gridlock!

IF you are concerned about the future of transit in San Francisco, IF you are concerned about reducing needless auto congestion, THEN we urge you to join Mayor Feinstein and the majority of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in voting Yes on Proposition J.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

—Other projects in the area, such as upgrading piers 1½, 3, and 5 as well as the Ferry Building and existing facilities like the YMCA will benefit from the proposed improvements.

—Traffic studies show overall access to the downtown will be improved by Proposition J. Federal money has been set aside for this proposal and cannot be used for other projects in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON THIS CAREFULLY PLANNED PROJECT TO REVITALIZE OUR WATERFRONT!

Robert Meyers
Dennis J. Potts
Kenneth R. Lerch
M. Arthur Gensler, Jr., FAIA
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Graul Dehart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones

Randall Rossi
Karl A. Lindbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
Jon Twichell
Fritz Arko
Michael J. O'Shea
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J OFFERS RESIDENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO A ONCE IN A LIFETIME OPPORTUNITY TO RECAPTURE THEIR WATERFRONT.

Converting the Embarcadero into a tree-lined boulevard and building a new streetcar line will make the waterfront more pedestrian and transit oriented, that is, more people oriented.

A freeway structure that is a source of objectionable noise and casts a pall over a large part of the waterfront will be removed. The waterfront will be opened up to sunlight and fresh air and made more inviting and cheerful to those who wish to walk on one of the world’s outstanding waterfronts. Air pollution that is now retained by the existing elevated structure will be dissipated.

The transit orientation of the new waterfront will encourage energy conservation. Proposition J will:

—Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero.
—Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway.
—Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula.

—Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero.
—Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.
—Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won’t benefit San Francisco. Don’t let outsiders determine our future.

VOTE YES ON J FOR A BETTER SAN FRANCISCO.

Sierra Club
Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage
Willinda McCrea*
Bob Cramer*
Rebecca Evans*
Richard Livingston*
Marilyn Clements*
Jennie Lev*
Jeffrey Hennessey*
Jane Winslow*
Roger Boyer

A. Lee Knight
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Patrick S. Hobin
Monica Hultman
Walter K. Morris
Lisa Klarimont
Jeffrey Heller
Bob Isaacson
George T. Rockrise, FAIA
Jon Twitchell
Marc Kauty

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J GIVES US A CHANCE TO CORRECT A COLOSSAL MISTAKE!

The Embarcadero Freeway should never have been built. The original plan was to build a freeway from bridge to bridge, destroying the Northern Waterfront, Fisherman’s Wharf, Fort Mason, and Marina Green in the process. When the people of San Francisco saw what was happening, they stopped it in mid-air—literally.

Walk under it. Hear the noise. Feel the gloom. See how it cuts out light.

It’s time to remove this mistake.

The new waterfront plan will give us a tree-lined boulevard, a new streetcar line, and a Muni Metro extension to the Southern Pacific/Caltrain depot. It will give us a transit and pedestrian oriented waterfront that will give us pride and pleasure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

San Francisco Tomorrow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, with a membership of 1700 working architects in San Francisco, urges a “YES” vote on Proposition J. In 1968 the citizens of San Francisco stopped highway planners from ring our waterfront with freeways. Today voters have another opportunity to return the waterfront to our citizens. Removal of the Embarcadero Freeway is one part of a carefully researched transit plan for San Francisco. This proposition supplies an unique opportunity to carry out a broad range of transportation improvements that will have many positive effects on the City of San Francisco.

Removal of the freeway will:

1. Return the waterfront to the people by removing this barrier to access and view.
2. Facilitate needed MUNI improvements.
3. Encourage development of the Embarcadero as a grand civic boulevard unifying the City of San Francisco.

The members of the American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition I and “YES” on Proposition J.

Donald Kennedy, FAIA
President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans love Their City, the ambiance, the Bay, waterfront, the views, the healthy neighborhoods.

Freeway builders did their damnest to destroy the City and divide our neighborhoods.

Now we can remove that damned spot, the concrete dinosaur, the hideous barrier that destroys our scenic views, the fence that keeps us from the Bay, the concealer of the Ferry Building.

Correct a mistake.

VOTE YES ON J.

Miriam Blaustein
Chlarlene Clark
Marie Cleasby
Zack Cowan
Dick Grashell
Rick Hauptman

Tony Kilroy
Jean Kormier
Ira Karluller
Jack Morrison
Andy Nash
Norman Rolfe

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

NO ON PROPOSITION J.

"J" is for JOKE—a cruel joke on us. What will J really do? Add traffic to every street east of Gough. Delay the construction of waterfront streetcar service. Cost millions in local dollars needed to improve MUNI. Create a ground-level freeway on the waterfront as big as Van Ness, with more cars.

I'm a private citizen who's concerned about traffic and what it's doing to our City. If you are too, vote NO on Proposition J.

Steve Colman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:

- Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
- Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
- If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
  - By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
  - Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
  - MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
  - Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Blair C. Pascoe

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

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

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

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.
NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by boldface type.

3.202 Office of Risk Management
There is established under the chief administrative officer an office of risk management which shall review, analyze and report to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the finance committee of the board of supervisors the practices of the several departments, boards and commissions of the city and county regarding loss prevention and risk management, including the insurance requirements of the city and county. The office shall also establish and assist in the implementation of planning and operational guidelines regarding risk management and loss prevention for each department, board or commission. The chief administrative officer may appoint, at his or her pleasure, or contract with, a qualified individual or organization for the operation of the office. The qualifications of the individual or organization operating the office shall include relevant education, training and experience in insurance and risk management. 3.401 City Attorney
(a) The city attorney shall be an elective officer. He shall furnish an official bond in the sum of ten thousand dollars ($10,000). He shall appoint, and at his pleasure may remove, all assistants and employees of his office. He shall devote his entire time and attention to the duties of his office. He must, at the time of his election, be an elector of the city and county, qualified to practice in all the courts of the state, and he must have been so qualified for at least 10 years next preceding his election.

The city attorney must represent the city and county in all actions and proceedings in which it may be legally interested, or, for or against the city and county, or, any officer of the city and county in any action or proceeding, when directed so to do by the supervisors, except where a cause of action exists in favor of the city and county against said officer. Whenever any cause of action exists in favor of the city and county, the city attorney shall commence the same when within his knowledge or when directed so to do by the supervisors. He shall give his advice or opinion in writing to any officer, board or commission of the city and county when requested. Except as otherwise provided in this charter, he shall not settle or dismiss any litigation for or against the city and county, unless, upon his written recommendation, he is ordered so to do by ordinance.

The city attorney shall prepare, or approve as to form, all ordinances before they are enacted by the supervisors. He shall approve, by endorsement in writing, the form of all official or other bonds required by this charter or by ordinance before the same are submitted to the proper commission, board or office for final approval, and no such bonds shall be finally approved without such approval as to form by the city attorney. Except as otherwise provided in this charter, he shall in writing the draft or form of all contracts before their execution on behalf of the city and county. He shall examine and approve the title of all real property to be acquired by the city and county.

He shall keep on file in his office copies of all written communications and opinions, also all papers, briefs and transcripts used in matters wherein he appears; and books of record and register of all actions, proceedings in his charge in which the city and county or any officer or board thereof, is a party or is interested.

(b) The duties of the city attorney in connection with the bureau of delinquent revenue collection shall be transferred to and performed by the attorney for said bureau who shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

(c) There is established in the office of the city attorney a bureau of claims investigation and administration which shall have the responsibility of investigating, evaluating and processing for the several boards, commissions and departments all claims for money or damages made upon the city and county pursuant to section 7.703 of this charter or the general law of the State of California. Claim investigation functions of the police department in existence on June 4, 1986, shall continue as an adjunct to the bureau established under this section. Claims functions of the public utilities commission shall remain under that commission unless transferred to the bureau of claims investigation and administration by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the bureau shall also have the power to investigate events and occurrences giving rise to potential civil liability against the city and county and adjust and settle demands, within dollar limits to be established by ordinance, prior to their presentation as claims. There shall be established by ordinance a revolving fund to satisfy such demands adjusted prior to their presentation as claims. The bureau shall be responsible for the investigation of all claims and the analysis of city policies and practices upon which the bureau shall report and advise the several departments.

The city attorney shall appoint a chief of the bureau who shall serve at his or her pleasure. The chief of the bureau may appoint, subject to confirmation by the city attorney, investigators who shall serve at the pleasure of the chief; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status in the position of civil claims investigator or any equivalent classification on the date of approval of this amendment by the electorate shall continue to have civil service status at said position under the civil service provisions of this charter.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by boldface type; deletions are indicated by horizontal strikethrough.

7.100 Materials, Supplies and Equipment
The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreements for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county, may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract. All purchases in excess of one thousand dollars ($1,000) shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases and a permanent record of all such quotations shall be kept. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) for materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of materials, supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two or more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments. Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning the same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned and may advertise for
bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. The department of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departmental approval or an inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall direct the rejection of all articles which may be below standards, specifications or samples furnished. He shall not approve any bill or voucher for articles not in conformity with specifications, or which are at variance with any contract.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall also have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for and in use in all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed to be due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.

7.03 Requisition, Contract and Payment
All purchase orders and contracts shall be based on written requisitions, or, for materials, or supplies in common use in the various departments, on the purchaser's requisition, approved by all departments. Purchase orders and contracts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) must be approved by the chief administrative officer. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall approve all bids and vouchers for materials, supplies, equipment, and contractual services before the controller shall draw and approve warrants therefor. All contracts for the purchase of materials, supplies and equipment shall be made after inviting sealed bids by publication. All sealed bids received shall be kept on file. When an award of contract is made, notice that the same has been made shall be given by one publication, and any interested person may examine the bids and records at the purchaser's office.

The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to accept bids and contracts when the purchase price of the item bid for or the contract price is less than the lowest bid or the lowest contract price. The person responsible for the purchase of such supplies shall have authority to accept any bid or contract in his discretion.

The purchase of supplies shall be reviewed by the departmental administrator and the chief administrative officer to ensure the correct purchasing of items as described.

The purchase of supplies shall be reviewed by the departmental administrator and the chief administrative officer to ensure the correct purchasing of items as described.
point two commissioners to terms of one year each, one commissioner to a term of two years, one commissioner to a term of three years and one commissioner to a term of four years. Thereafter, the terms of the commissioners shall be for four years from the commencement thereof. Not less than one-four members of said commission shall be of the same sex, and one member shall have prior experience representing labor and one member shall have prior experience representing management.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred in the same manner as in this charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of one hundred dollars ($100).

Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of considering and adopting examination questions shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public at such times as the general public and emeritus of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission. After the regular daily working hours of 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., such persons or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such persons.

In accordance with section 3500, the commission shall have the power and it shall be its duty to appoint an executive assistant to be the administrative head of the affairs under its control who shall serve at its pleasure; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of assistant secretary to the civil service commission on the effective date of this section as amended shall continue to have civil service status in the position of executive assistant under the civil service provisions of this charter.

3.661 General Powers and Duties

(a) The civil service commission shall be the employment and personnel department of the city and county, and shall determine appointments on the basis of merit and fitness, as shown by appropriate tests.

The commission shall classify, and from time to time may reclassify, in accordance with duties and responsibilities of the employment and training and experience requirements, all places of employment in the departments and offices of the city and county, specifically and charters for purposes of classification as directed by law, and by the provisions of section 8-401, thereof, by general law, and more specifically exempted from said civil service provisions of the commission. The commission shall likewise classify all other positions or other places of employment in the city and county service, specifically exempted from the civil service provisions of the charter, but which, by the provisions of section 8-401, thereof, are made subject to classification for salary standardization purposes on the basis of duties and responsibilities of the employment and training and experience required. The civil service commission shall be the judge of such classification.

(b) The commission shall, also, in accordance with duties and responsibilities, allocate, and from time to time may re-allocate, the positions to the various classes of the classification. The allocation or re-allocation of a position shall not adversely affect the civil service rights of an occupant regularly holding such position. No position shall hold a position outside of the classification to which he has been appointed; provided that every employee of any department or office shall discharge any of the duties pertaining to such department or office to which his chief may temporarily assign him.

The class titles and class numbers assigned to positions by the commission shall be used in all records, reports, statements and communications, including the compensation schedule, annual budget and salary ordinance, payroll, and all other personnel and administrative regulations.

The commission shall adopt rules to carry out the civil service provisions of this charter and, except as otherwise provided in this charter, such rules shall govern applications, examinations, eligibility, duration of eligible lists, certification of eligibles, appointments, promotions, transfers, resignations, layoffs or reductions in force, both permanent and temporary, due to lack of work or funds, reemployment, or completion of work; the filling of positions, temporary, seasonal, and permanent; classification and approval of payrolls, and such other matters as are not in conflict with this charter. The commission may, upon one week's notice, make changes in the rules, which changes shall become effective when approved by the mayor and council and be in force; provided that no such changes in rules shall affect a case pending before the commission. The secretary may certify eligibles and payrolls and conduct examinations under the rules of the commission.

The commissioners shall have power to institute and prosecute legal proceedings for the violation of any of the civil service provisions of this charter.

(b) The civil service commission shall establish an inspection service for the purpose of investigating the conduct of and action of appointees in all positions and of securing records of service for promotion and other purposes. All departments shall cooperate with the commission in making its investigations and any person withholding information, or impeding the commission or its agents shall be subject to suspension.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the civil service commission shall be the rule to establish procedures to review and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, political affiliation, party, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. The determination reached under civil service commission procedures shall be final and shall be enforced by every employee and officer.

3.661 General Powers and Duties

(a) The civil service commission shall have the power to inquire into the operation of the personnel system of the city and county and to ensure compliance with the principles set forth in section 8.310. After such inquiry, the Commission may recommend to the personnel director, as established pursuant to section 3.663, the mayor or any other officer of the city and county such action as the commission believes necessary to carry out the civil service provisions of this charter. In any hearing conducted by the civil service commission or by any hearing officer it appoints, the commission or the hearing officer shall have the power to subpoena and require the attendance of witnesses and the production of records as provided in section 3.701.

(b) The civil service commission may require periodic reports from the personnel director in a manner and form which it shall prescribe.

(c) The civil service commission may hear appeals from an action of the personnel director with respect to:

1. Allegations of discrimination. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the civil service commission regarding allegations of discrimination shall be final and be enforced by every officer and employee;

2. Allegations of fraud; and

3. Allegations of conflict of interest, pursuant to section 8.105.

(d) No action by the personnel director which is the subject of any appeal shall be stayed during the appeal process except by the unanimous vote of the civil service commission.

(e) The commission shall be notified of the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal of personnel regulations and may comment on such proposals. The adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing fraud or allegations of discrimination shall be subject to ratification by the commission. In addition, the adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfers, resignations and terminations shall be subject to ratification by the commission. The commission may ratify or reject any such regulation within 60 days of receipt. The commission's failure to act shall be deemed approval.

3.662 Department of Personnel Administration

There is hereby established a department of personnel administration which shall consist of a personnel director appointed by the mayor with the concurrence of the council, who shall be responsible for the administration of civil service system and all personnel matters necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the civil service commission and whose job function is placed under the department of personnel administration shall be continued without loss in status and rights already established, but not by amendment to this charter, have been placed under the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration.

The department of personnel administration shall be the personnel department for the city and county and shall provide a means to recruit, select, cooperate with and develop, classify positions, administer salaries, administer employee discipline, discharge and other related personnel activities in order to maintain an effective and responsive work force.

3.663 Personnel Director

(a) A personnel director shall be appointed by and take the oath of the mayor; provided, however, that the personnel director shall be selected from candidates nominated by any civil service commission and confirmed by vote of the board of supervisors. The nominee of the mayor may be appointed acting personnel director pending confirmation. The personnel director shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am appointed to all personnel for the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of personnel director in the spirit of this charter.

(b) The personnel director shall conduct appropriate examinations for employment, establish eligible lists based on their results and provide for certification of eligibles. The action of the personnel director on examination matters including,
but not limited to, announcements, minimum qualifications, classes of applicants, components, construction, weighting, content, type, list length, duration and certification shall be final.

(c) The personnel director shall adopt personnel regulations which, except as otherwise provided in this charter, shall govern both the administrative matters within the jurisdiction of the department of personnel and the exercise of the authority granted in this section, including, but not limited to, recruitment; examinations; examinations; eligibility; duration of eligible lists; certification of eligibles; permanent, temporary and provisional appointments; regular performance evaluations; and employee layoffs or reduction in force due to lack of work or lack of funds, reorganization, retraining or completion of work; and the classification. No personnel regulations shall be adopted, amended or repealed without a prior public hearing upon at least two weeks public notice by the personnel director and after meet and confer sessions with recognized employee organizations as required by state law. All civil service commission rules relevant to the foregoing as well as the provisions of former sections 8.322, 8.323, 8.326, 8.328, 8.329, 8.330, 8.331, 8.335 and 8.348 of this charter shall become effective on the effective date of this charter amendment.

(d) The personnel director shall conduct the salary surveys for the civil service commission as set forth elsewhere in this charter.

(e) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall establish procedures to review and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the personnel director shall forthwith be enforced by every employee and officer, unless the decision is appealed to the civil service commission in accordance with personnel regulations.

(f) The personnel director shall investigate all employee complaints concerning job related conduct of City and County employees and shall provide public notice of its findings.

(g) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall promote effective and efficient management through personnel programs that encourage high productivity and exemplary performance.

(h) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall provide for resolution of employee disputes which shall be consistent with other provisions of this charter and shall be utilized by all department heads and appointing officers upon the expiration of the existing term of any otherwise binding agreements.

(i) Consistent with the foregoing and other applicable provisions of this charter, the personnel director shall delegate to the various appointing officers appropriate personnel responsibilities, including but not limited to appropriate disciplinary procedures, and consult with appointing officers with respect to personnel regulations affecting their operations.

(j) Personal services contracts shall be reviewed and approved by the personnel director in accordance with the provisions of appropriate personnel regulations. Personal services contracts reasonably expected to involve payment by the city and county of twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000) shall be reviewed and approved by the Commission. Failure of the Commission to act within 30 days of submission of the contract by the personnel director shall be deemed to constitute approval by the commission.

(k) The personnel director shall establish a system of job classification. The provisions of section 8.200 shall govern whenever new classifications are created or existing positions are reclassified. The personnel director shall be the judge of such classification determinations.

(l) From the regulation of the appointing officer or other department of personnel administration shall determine whether a position within a classification is, in character, temporary or permanent. Appointments may be made on a permanent, temporary or, where confirmation is required, a provisional basis.

(m) The director of the Civil Service Commission, or his designee, shall be appointed to serve as the "secretary of the personnel department." The "secretary of the personnel department" shall have the authority to: make the reports called for in section 8.402; conduct and control the departments and the personnel of the department; provide advice, information and assistance to the personnel director in all matters relating to his duties; and make all of the rules, regulations and orders necessary to the efficient operation of the department and any part thereof.

(n) The clerk of the board of supervisors, after consultation with the city attorney, is hereby directed to confer the salary of the charter as herein amended when the next charter is submitted for ratification.

(o) 8.322: Written Questions and Answers—After the written portion of a civil service examination has been held, the questions and answers thereto shall be available for review by the participants. The review period shall not apply to questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional tests. During the period, participants shall have an opportunity to protest questions and answers dealing with the results or, if required proper. After all protested items have been acted upon and the official rating key has been adopted, the identification sheets have been opened; further changes in the rating key shall not be made.

(p) 8.323: Protest of Tentative List of Eligibles—Following the completion of any examination, a tentative list of eligibles shall be posted in the press of the public and of participants. The posting period shall be for a minimum of three (3) working days for the entrance examinations of five (5) working days for promotional or combined entrance and promotional examinations. During this period a fee for the inspection of the papers of each eligible shall be charged to the candidate. The amount of such fee shall be established by the director of the personnel department. The fee shall be waivered for eligibles who wish to inspect his own papers. Inspection of papers shall include all documents supporting the eligibles rank and score except those pertinent to the eligibility of the examinee as an applicant or grade in an examination or the questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written test. Only participants in the examination may request the questions and answers for a grade in an examination or any questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written test. Only participants in the examination may request the questions and answers for a grade in an examination or any questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written test. Only participants in the examination may request the questions and answers for a grade in an examination or any questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written test. Only participants in the examination may request the questions and answers for a grade in an examination or any questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written test.

(q) 8.324: Temporary Special-Exam Examinations—Where, in the opinion of the personnel director, the public interest so requires, the personnel director may, without notice, call for a special examination to fill permanent, temporary or temporary-exam positions provided that such examination shall be conducted under the rules and regulations in effect at the time of the special examination.

(r) 8.325: Promotion of Employees on the Civil Service Commission—The provisions of this section as herein amended shall apply to all special examinations authorized in this section after its effective date.
more than the minimum passing mark established by the civil service commission for inclusion on the list of eligibles resulting from the original promotional examination, his name shall thereupon be entered on the eligible list resulting from the original promotional examination in accordance with the relative superiorities established by all the qualified participants in the original and subsequent promotional examinations. Such employees shall be eligible for appointment from such list of eligibles in accordance with civil service rules to any vacancy thereafter occurring, and subject to satisfactory completion of a probationary period as provided in section 8.340 of this charter for a period of four years from the date on which their name is entered on the eligible list and the employees procuring standing through examinations held subsequent to the original promotional examination.

If it is determined by the civil service commission that the name of such person would have been reached for permanent appointment from the list of eligibles established as a result of the original promotional examination during his term of military service had the name of such person appeared thereon, then such employee, upon appointment to a permanent position as herein provided, shall be granted seniority in such appointment from the date his name would have been reached had his name appeared thereon, but such seniority shall be used only for the purpose of determining salary increments and calculating city and county service credits in other promotional examinations held subsequent to the similar promotional examination herein authorized. For all purposes, seniority of service shall date from the date of appointment as a result of the similar promotional examination as herein authorized.

Such employees who qualify for appointment as a result of a similar promotional examination as herein provided, and who are appointed to permanent positions as herein provided, shall be permitted to participate in other promotional examinations for which they are otherwise eligible, while serving under the probationary appointment in the position to which appointed as a result of the similar promotional examination, provided that certification from lists of eligibles established from such other examinations shall not be made until the employee has satisfactorily completed the aforesaid probationary appointment.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules governing the administration of similar promotional examinations herein authorized, and appointments and other matters resulting therefrom.

8.329 Certification of Eligibles; Rule of Three

Whenever a position controlled by the civil service provisions of this charter is to be filled, the appointing officer shall make a requisition to the civil service commission for a person to fill it. Thereupon the commission shall certify to the appointing officer the names and addresses of the three persons standing highest on the list of eligibles for such position. In case the position is promatory, the commission shall certify the names of the three persons standing highest on such list. If there are fewer than three names upon the list of eligibles, certification as made, there shall be certified the number thereon.

The appointing officer shall fill the position by the appointment of one of the persons certified. The provisions of this section as herein amended at the election of November 2, 1976, shall be applicable only to lists of eligibles finally adopted by the civil service commission pursuant to the provisions of Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324, and 8.330 of this charter on or after the effective date of this amendment. In making such certification, six shall be disregarded except when a statute, a rule of the commission or the appointing officer specifies otherwise.

From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the commission shall determine whether the position is: (a) in character, temporary, seasonal or permanent, and shall notify the candidate in accordance therewith, or end that the candidate may have knowledge of the type of employment. The commission shall provide for such waiver of temporary or seasonal employment as it may deem just to candidates.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this or any other provision of the charter, an employee who has been certified to a deputized eligible list to a non-permanent position in a civil service classification shall be entitled to appointment to a permanent position within that same classification before the commission certifies to the appointing officer the names and addresses of persons standing higher on the list of eligibles who are not then current employees, such a satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the commission. The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to requirements for permanent positions filled from and after January 1, 1980.

8.330 Duration of Lists of Eligibles

The civil service commission may remove all names from the list of eligibles after they have remained thereon for more than two years and all names thereon shall be removed at the expiration of four years. The commission may, however, provide in the examination announcement that the list of eligibles so secured thereon shall be automatically expire at a date not less than two or more than four years after the adoption of such list.

8.331 Limited Tenure Appointments

When in time of war declared by the Congress of the United States eligibles are not available for appointment from registers established through the regular examination procedure as provided under Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof, the civil service commission may qualify applicants for wartime appointments to positions through informal and non-competitive tests. Such tests and appointments resulting therefrom shall be governed solely by the provisions of this section and by rule of the civil service commission adopted pursuant thereto and the tests shall be adequate in the judgment of the civil service commission. The civil service commission may authorize such applicants to perform the duties of the positions to be filled pending creation of lists of eligibles through the regular examination procedure as provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof. Appointments made under the provisions of this section shall be designated "warrant appointments" and may continue only until such lists are established through the regular examination procedure provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof but in no event to exceed six months beyond the cessation of hostilities. Limited tenure appointments may be terminated by the appointing officer at any time for lack of work or funds. Limited tenure appointments may be terminated by the appointing officer for good cause at any time with the approval of the civil service commission without reference to the procedures governing removals set forth in Section 8.424 hereof. Persons serving under limited tenure appointments in this section provided shall by reason of such service acquire no right or preference to permanent civil service status as defined elsewhere in this charter or by rule of the civil service commission which is conferred on persons completing probationary appointments made from lists of eligibles through the regular examination procedures provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 of this charter. Service after January 1, 1951 under limited tenure appointment, by platform employees of the municipal railway, shall not be included in the calculation of service of such employees for the purpose of determining assignments of runs when such assignments are made on the basis of seniority of service.

The provisions of this section do not apply to civil service appointments in the absence of civil service eligibles as provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 of this charter and shall not be authorized if applicants qualified for limited tenure appointments are available. The civil service commission shall make every effort consistent with current conditions to maintain adequate registers of eligibles in each of the classifications through the regular examination procedure provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules to carry out the provisions of this section and to govern the administration of limited tenure appointments.

8.332 Temporary and Emergency Appointments

When no list of eligibles exists or no eligible is available on an existing list for a position in the classification controlled by the appointing officer, and immediate service in the position is required, the appointing officer and another list exists which is deemed by the civil service commission to be suitable to provide temporarily the service desired, the commission shall certify for civil service temporary appointment an eligible from such list; if no such other list is deemed by the civil service commission to exist, the commission pursuant to its rules may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment thereto for a period not exceeding one hundred and thirty working days. Non-civil service or emergency appointments extended beyond ninety days must be approved by the civil service commission. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such one hundred and thirty working days at the time a civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in section 8.329 of the charter.

If a list of eligibles exists for the position requiring immediate service and the appointing officer the time an eligible from such list is certified and reports for duty as provided in section 8.329 of the charter, the commission may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment thereto for a period not exceeding thirty working days. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such thirty working days at the time a civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in section 8.329 of this charter.

No person shall be compensated under any non-civil service or emergency appointment thereto in excess of one hundred and thirty working days in any fiscal or calendar year, and no claim or warrant therefor shall be approved, allowed or paid for any compensation in excess of one hundred and thirty working days in any fiscal or calendar year.

If no eligibles are available for appointment to a permanent position in the class requested by the appointing officer, the commission shall immediately hold an examination and establish an eligible list for such position. If the annual appropriation is insufficient to meet the cost of said examination, it shall report to the mayor the estimated cost thereof, and the
governmental jurisdictions and private employment for like work and like service, based upon job classifications as provided in section 3661.3662 of this charter and shall make its findings, based on facts and data collected, as to what are the generally prevailing basic pay rates for each benchmark class of employment solely in the manner hereinafter provided. A benchmark class is defined as a "key class" within an occupational grouping selected as the class for which a representative sample of data will be collected. Basic pay rate data for public and private employment shall be collected solely from the Bay Area counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, and Santa Clara counties; and, as evident, however, that for any benchmark class of employment for which the civil service commission personnel director determines there is insufficient data from Bay Area public jurisdictions the civil service commission personnel director shall survey major public agencies in the state employing such class, major public agencies to be defined as those employing more than 3,000 persons.

The civil service commission personnel director shall collect basic pay rate data for like work and like service from Bay Area public jurisdictions as follows:

(a) The counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara.

(b) The ten most populous cities in these five Bay Area counties based on the latest federal decennial census.

(c) Agencies of the state and federal governments and from school districts and other special districts in the six Bay Area counties as determined by the civil service commission personnel director. The civil service commission personnel director shall collect private basic pay rate data for like work and like service from Bay Area salary and wage surveys of private employers in the city and county of San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. The data collected shall be limited to basic rates of pay and salaries actually paid by public and private employers for like work and like service.

The term "prevailing rates of wages" for employees governed by charters section 8401 and this section shall be defined as the rate ranges developed from the weighted average of the midpoint of the basic pay rates, excluding fringe benefits, for surveyed public employment and the median of the pay rates for private employment to be determined as follows:

1. Multiply the private and the midpoints from public employment data base by the number of employees in the given classification from each data base;
2. Add the products of (1);
3. Divide the sum by (2) the total number of employees surveyed for that classification;

4. Adjust the figure by 10 percent to establish the maximum of the range and reduce this figure by 10 percent to establish the minimum.

When fixing rates of compensation the board of supervisors shall fix basic pay rates as close as reasonably possible to prevailing rates, provided, however, that the board of supervisors shall not set the maximum basic rate for any class in excess of the maximum prevailing rate for that class; provided further, however, that no employee shall have his basic pay rate reduced to conform to prevailing rates except as provided for in section 8406. For those classifications of employment in which the practice is customary, the schedules of compensation shall provide for minimum basic rates, maximum basic rates, and maximum salary steps and for a method of advancing the salaries of employees from minimum to intermediate to maximum with due regard for seniority of service.

The "basic pay rate" as used in this section is hereby defined as applying only to the basic rate of wages, with included range scales, and does not include any other benefits of employment or working condition benefits.

It is the declared intent of the qualified electors of the city and county that neither the board of supervisors nor the mayor have any inherent power to grant any benefits of employment except those enumerated already provided for in the charter and. Any additional, deletion or modification of benefits of employment enumerated in the charter shall be submitted, as a charter amendment, to the qualified electors of the city and county. The qualified electors may provide that the establishment or the rescission of any benefit of employment are sometimes referred to as "fringe benefits" of employment and the qualified electors expressly reserve the right to either grant or deny such benefits except those conditions of employment commonly referred to as "working conditions". Any reference to "working conditions" shall mean those compensations which must necessarily be provided in order for the employees to perform his job description duties efficiently and safely, and shall include but not be limited to such working conditions and benefits as are typically included in the administrative provisions of the salary standardization ordinance and the salary ordinance.

The board of supervisors may, in its discretion, may provide additional retirement benefits for employees covered under this section and section 8401 of this charter only in accordance with the following provisions:

(a) The civil service commission personnel director must determine, certify and recommend to the board of supervisors that the working condition benefit is equitable or necessary for the efficient and safe performance of the employee's duties as enumerated in his job description.

(b) The working condition benefit, as recommended by the civil service director, is substantially comparable for like work and like service to that provided for the job classification and is provided to not less than 50 percent of the employees of the class in the jurisdiction covered by the salary survey.

9.08 Initiative, Referendum, and Recall

(a) The registered voters shall have power to propose by petition, and to adopt or to reject at the polls, any ordinance, act or other measure which is within the power conferred upon the board of supervisors to enact, or any legislative act which is within the power conferred upon any other board, commission or officer to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinance, act, charter amendment or other measure may be so proposed by filing with the registrar a petition setting forth said measure in full, signed by registered voters of the city and county as many in number as the percentages hereinafter required of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor cast at the last preceding regular municipal election.

(b) Petition of any measure may be submitted to the electors in the manner provided for the submission of ordinances; and when approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting on said declaration, it shall thereupon be the duty of the board of supervisors to enact an ordinance or ordinances to carry such policies or principles into effect, subject to the referendum and recall provisions of this chapter.

Any ordinance which the supervisors are empowered to pass may be submitted to the electors by a majority of the board at a general election or at a special election called for the purpose, said election to be held not less than thirty days from the date of the call.

Any such ordinance may be proposed by one-third of the supervisors, or by the mayor, and when so proposed shall be submitted to the electors at the next succeeding general election. No ordinance passed by the supervisors granting any public utility franchise
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or privilege, shall go into effect until the expiration of sixty days from the date it becomes final. At the end of such sixty days such ordinance shall be in force and effect, unless within such period there shall be filed with the registrar a petition signed by registered voters equal in number to five percent of the entire vote cast for mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election, requesting that such ordinance be submitted to the electors. In case such petition is filed, such ordinance shall not go into effect until approved by a majority of the voters voting thereon at a general or special election.

If, before the time any other ordinance involving legislative matters becomes effective, there shall be filed with the board of supervisors a petition signed by qualified electors of the city and county equal in number to at least ten percent of the entire vote cast for all candidates for mayor at the last preceding general municipal election at which a mayor was elected, protesting against the passage of such ordinance the same shall be suspended from going into operation, and it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to reconsider such ordinance, and if the same be not entirely repealed, said board shall submit the ordinance to the vote of said electors either at the next general municipal election or at a special election to be called for that purpose, and such ordinance shall not go into effect or become operative until and until a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon shall vote in favor thereof. The provisions of section 9.109 and 9.110 of the charter shall apply to and govern the verification and certification of such petition.

Annual budget and appropriation ordinances, supplemental appropriation ordinances, the annual salary ordinance, or ordinances amending the same, the ordinances levying taxes, any ordinance appropriating money from the emergency reserve fund, ordinances authorizing the city attorney to compromise litigation, and ordinances necessary to enable the mayor to carry out any of the powers vested in him in the case of public emergency as defined in section 3.100 of the charter, ordinances enacted pursuant to section 8.410 of the charter, as well as ordinances relative to purely administrative matters, shall not be subject to referendum.

Any elective official, the chief administrative officer, the controller or any member of the board of education or public utilities commission may be recalled by the electors. The procedure to effect such recall shall be as follows: A petition demanding the recall from office of the person sought to be recalled shall be filed with the registrar. Said petition shall contain a statement of the grounds on which the recall is sought. Any insufficiency of form or substance in such statement shall in no way affect the validity of the election and proceedings held thereunder. No recall petition shall be filed against any officer until he has held his office for at least six months.

(b) In the event the representative of the board of supervisors mayor and the representatives of recognized employee organizations do not reach an agreement through the meet-and-confer process on matters contained in the annual salary standardization ordinance by March 15 of any year, the mayor shall recommend and the board shall adopt or reject a schedule of compensation which reflects current prevailing rates for the classifications covered by Section 8.410 of this charter. The last good faith offer presented by the mayor or his or her representative shall be submitted. In any year when an agreement on matters contained in the salary standardization ordinance has not been achieved, the civil service commission personnel director, upon receipt of a written demand from a recognized employee organization made to the mayor and the personnel director shall prepare, prior to April 1, a schedule of compensation and administrative provisions which reflect additional rates that would be payable, and working conditions, based upon the last demands made by the recognized employee organization(s) which participated in the meet-and-confer process.

Said schedule shall be transmitted to the registrar of voters for submission to the electors of the city and county at a general election or a special election called for the purpose, and said special election shall be held no less than sixty (60) days from the date of the call. No such schedule shall be withdrawn after it has been received by the registrar of voters. At said election, the ballot shall contain the following two alternatives:

1. Approval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.
2. Disapproval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

If a majority of the valid votes cast in the election favor paying the additional rates set forth in the schedule of compensation based upon the last demands of the recognized employee organizations which engaged in the meet-and-confer process, it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to amend the salary standardization ordinance to reflect said increased
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TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION E

NOTE: All sections are new.

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

Section 1. This ordinance may be called the "City College Public Lands Preservation Ordinance."

Section 2. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall disapprove or deny, WITH NO EXEMPTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS, any building permit application for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, which consist of Assessor's Block 3189, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

Section 3. The term "building permit" encompasses building permits, site permits and any other permits for the performance of construction work.

Section 4. No member of the California State Legislature shall appear before any City and County board, department or commission as a compensated advocate representing a private interest.

Section 5. In the financing of city and county campaigns: (a) No person other than a candidate shall make, and no campaign treasurer shall solicit or accept, any contribution which will cause the total amount contributed by such person with respect to a single election in support of or opposition to such candidate, including contributions to political committees supporting or opposing such candidate, to exceed $500.00. (b) If any person is found guilty of violating the terms of this section, each campaign treasurer who received part or all of the contribution or contributions which constitute the violation shall pay promptly, from available campaign funds, if any, the amount received from such person in excess of the amount permitted located across Phelan Avenue from the presently occupied campus of City College and consisting of Assessor's Block 3189, Lot 1, as presently constituted, between June 3, 1966 and June 3, 1989.

Section 3. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall revoke or rescind, WITH NO EXEMPTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS, any building permit application previously granted for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, which consist of Assessor's Block 3189, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

Section 4. The term "building permit" includes building permits, site permits and any other permits for the performance of construction work.

Section 5. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of the ordinance shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. No provision of this ordinance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent implementation of the policy stated above.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION F

NOTE: All sections are new.

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

Section 1. The People of the City and County of San Francisco do desire and are entitled to a local government whose officers do not engage in, assist or promote compensated advocacy on behalf of private interests before City and County commissions and boards while also serving as City and County officers.

Section 2. No officer of the City and County may, during the term of office, engage in compensated advocacy before any City and County board or commission, or any member of the board or commission or its staff, in order to represent any private interest, for which representation the officer receives, directly or indirectly, any compensation, reward or gift.

Section 3. Officers of the City and County shall not discuss matters pending before their commission or department with other City and County officers or state legislators when those other officers or state legislators are acting as compensated advocates for a private interest.

Section 4. No member of the California State Legislature shall appear before any City and County board, department or commission as a compensated advocate representing a private interest.

Section 5. In the financing of city and county campaigns: (a) No person other than a candidate shall make, and no campaign treasurer shall solicit or accept, any contribution which will cause the total amount contributed by such person with respect to a single election in support of or opposition to such candidate, including contributions to political committees supporting or opposing such candidate, to exceed $500.00. (b) If any person is found guilty of violating the terms of this section, each campaign treasurer who received part or all of the contribution or contributions which constitute the violation shall pay promptly, from available campaign funds, if any, the amount received from such person in excess of the amount permitted...
rates and the same shall be in lieu of said annual compensation, and notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, said rates shall become effective and be payable as if adopted prior to April 1, of any year.

The provisions of sections 3.100 and 3.100-1, relating to the emergency powers of the mayor, shall not be applicable to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

11.185 Effective Date of Amendments
The effective date of the amendments, additions and deletions to the civil service provisions of the charter shall be ninety (90) days after the acceptance and filing thereof with the Secretary of State.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION G

We the people of San Francisco declare this to be our policy:
1) IT IS IMPROPER TO PROFIT FROM OR PROVIDE SUPPORT TO THE RACIST POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SYSTEM IN SOUTH AFRICA, KNOWN AS APARTHEID.

Therefore it is necessary to sever commercial ties to South Africa, until people of all races obtain equal rights in that country, including equal voting rights.
2) COMPANIES HAVING SUBSTANTIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH APARTHEID MUST BE CONSIDERED IRRESPONSIBLE.

(a) The Board of Supervisors must determine which companies doing or seeking business with the City have the greatest ties to Apartheid. Companies that have a significant involvement in profiting from or maintaining the Apartheid system, may, on that basis, be deemed "irresponsible bidders."

In purchasing goods and services and awarding other contracts, the city must give priority to avoiding such companies; the degree of the preference must be in proportion to the company's complicity with Apartheid, according to the following criteria:
— how much business the company does in or with South Africa;
— how much the company profits from that business;
— how much support the company provides the Apartheid government in taxes, loans, payments or other funding;
— the nature of the company's South Africa business;
— the degree of the company's cooperation with South African political censorship or secrecy agreements;
— the degree to which the company provides the South African government with the technology, materials and other means to maintain and enforce Apartheid.

(b) City funds must not be deposited or invested with any bank or other company which does business in or with, or makes loans to, South Africa.
(c) If any exception to the above policies is found to be necessary or appropriate, the responsible official must promptly and publicly report it to the Board of Supervisors, clearly describing the exception and the reasons for it.
(d) The term "city" includes all agencies, departments, officials, employees, units and subunits of the city and county of San Francisco, and all funds administered by or on behalf of the city or county.
(2) WE CALL ON ALL OTHER PUBLIC BODIES AND PRIVATE OR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS TO ADOPT SIMILAR POLICIES.
(4) WE CALL A GENERAL PUBLIC BOYCOTT, FOCUSING ON THOSE COMPANIES HAVING THE GREATEST TIES TO APARTHEID.

The Board of Supervisors must determine and announce which company or companies are the worst offenders within each major industry, so that the public can focus its boycott on those companies.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION H

SUMMARY: THIS INITIATIVE STATES THAT THE AIDS EPIDEMIC IS A MAJOR PUBLIC HEALTH PROBLEM OF CONCERN TO EVERYONE, REQUIRING INCREASED SUPPORT FOR RELATED MEDICAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION. IT CALLS FOR A COUNCIL FOR AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION OR SIMILAR UNITED EFFORT TO STOP AIDS.

We the people of San Francisco hereby adopt the following policy:
The AIDS epidemic has rapidly become a major public health problem, costly both in human lives and in general community resources.
The first steps in dealing with such a crisis are:
— the scientific research needed to discover and understand the nature, causes, co-factors, prevention, diagnosis and treatment of the disease, and
— the education of the public about the lessons of the epidemic.

A proper program of research and education pays for itself in the long run;
Prompt action is urgent, because of the rapidly growing number of persons affected, increasing not only the suffering but also the difficulty of eradicating the disease;
The leadership and support of such an effort is everyone's responsibility;
While San Francisco's role in the overall effort against AIDS has been viewed as a positive example to other areas, the continued rapid increase in the spread of the disease means that we cannot afford to rest on our laurels or leave further responsibility to others.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:
We call on all appropriate government bodies as well as medical, professional, charitable and community organizations and concerned individuals to join together in an all-out effort to stop AIDS;
We call for support to an organized united effort along the lines of an AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION COUNCIL, including, in some form:
— A COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, to provide informed evaluations as to priorities among research projects and proposals, recommending those which are most cost-effective and most likely to produce early results useful in the prevention or treatment of the disease, to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts or neglect of promising approaches, and to provide the council with complete and up-to-date information regarding comparative results of experimental treatments, prevention programs and other existing research;
— A COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, to inform the public regarding prevention and other research findings, and to inform relevant government officials and the general public, concerning the factual basis for a re-ordering of current public funding priorities toward an increased war against disease, including research and education against AIDS and related conditions;
— A FUND-RAISING COMMITTEE, to solicit donations, lobby for grants, organize benefits and other fund-raising projects spreading the financial burden by appealing to many sources;
We ask the council and committees to be responsive and accessible to public input, to include representation of all interested groups, to consider all viewpoints, and to be capable of prompt action;
We ask appropriate city officials to determine whether a suitable form of such a council already exists; if it does, we wish the city to support it actively; if not, we wish the city to seek to encourage its formation by such means as may appear proper.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION I

SUMMARY: This initiative asks "Shall we tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?" The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated portion of Route 480 known as the Embarcadero Freeway. This initiative declaration of policy will give the voters the opportunity to establish the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco regarding the proposed teardown of the Embarcadero Freeway.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION J

Shall the City replace a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if such replacement would open up the Waterfront to its citizens, improve the tax base, and create a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic?
Candidates

FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER
JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: The Bill of Rights guarantees that every person accused of a crime shall have the effective assistance of counsel. Whether an individual is rich or poor, that person is entitled to a competent and dedicated attorney.
In San Francisco it is the duty of the Public Defender to uphold this sacred right. In every case, we provide the client with the best defense under the law.
In the last 7 years, my outstanding staff has done this work with the highest degree of professionalism. In the next 4 years, that same strong, professional, independent and ethical representation will continue.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John D. Bardis, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Henry E. Bernan, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Sala Burton, 8 Slout Blvd., Representative In Congress, 5th District
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1085 14th St., Clerk
Linda C. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Artist/Community Organizer
Brian Getz, 55 22nd Ave., Attorney
Michael Hemmessey, 261 Anderson, Sheriff of San Francisco
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., International Vice President, ILGWU
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for Children & Youth
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070 26th Ave., Executive Assistant to Sala Burton M.C.
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scene Way, Attorney
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Community Health Director
Linda Ann Post, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative
Jim Rivaldo, 430 Steiner St., Political Consultant
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Member, SF Community College District Governing Board
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel W. Walker, 562 Campbell Ave., President — Local 250-A Transport Workers Union of America
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hililriss Ave., Minister
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor
C. R. Zanca, 1965 Pacific Ave., Auto Repair Proprietor

FOR ASSESSOR
SAM DUCA

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I was elected your Assessor in 1978 and re-elected in 1982. My years in the Assessor’s Office were spent in a professional appraisal capacity personnel and administration. I have two university degrees, the coveted MAI designation, and am the recipient of a special Congressional Advisory Board award from the United States Congress. I have served in an advisory capacity, both nationally and internationally, in property tax administration and will continue to serve the taxpayers of the City and County of San Francisco in dealing with Article XIIIa of the State Constitution. My community involvement includes participation in cultural, civic business organizations.

Sam Duca

The sponsors for Sam Duca are:
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
Eugene E. Friend, 2990 Lake St., Investor
Nancy Pelosi, 40 Presidio Ter., Housewife and volunteer in politics
Walter H. Shorenstein, 740 El Camino del Mar, Chairman, Milton Meyer & Co.
Stanley Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Emma W. Louie, 1257 Jackson St., Housewife
Alfred S. Wilsey, 2590 Jackson St., Chr. of Exec. Comm. of Diversified Holding Co.
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hinkley Way, Physicist
Gerson Bakar, 2310 Hyde St., Investor
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management
Jane McKeeakle Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired
Joseph C. Oreno, Sr., 866 Faxon Ave., Publicity Dept. — S.F. Giants
James A. Scatena, 101 St. Elmo Way, Chairman of the Board, Scatena York Co.
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher
Frances May McAfee, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Recreation & Park Commissioner
Frederick F. Campagnoli, 2609 Larkin St., Attorney
Betty Brooks, 1738 26th St., Field Representative
Jess Tenuel Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Businessman
Cyril J. Magnin, 594 California St., Merchant
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John H. Swanson, 145 Lake Merced Hill South, Bowling Alley Owner
Frances G. Goldman, 745 El Camino Del Mar, Child Guidance
Irina M. Bernardo, 2132 34th Ave., Housewife
Leo J. Murphy, 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Charles M. Cunningham, 475 Connecticut St., Self Employed
Lawrence V. Eppineate, 815 Fell St., Conf. Secretary
Mary M. O’Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Volunteer & Homemaker
Elizabeth R. Duca, 16 Wawona St., Homemaker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Application for Absentee Ballot is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

Name _________________________________
Residence Address _________________________________
Mailing Address _________________________________
Signature _________________________________

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

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

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

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

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

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

The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The active members of the Committee are Dick Roberson (Chair), Suzanne Guyette, Mary Ann Aronson, Mary Martin and Tom Owen.
EXPLANATION OF YOUR SAMPLE BALLOT

At primary elections there aren’t enough voting machines to assign a separate machine to each party at each precinct; therefore, some of the machines will have to handle more than one party.

In each precinct we have assigned one or two voting machines to handle the ballots of the nonpartisan voters and the voters belonging to the American Independent Party, the Peace and Freedom Party and the Libertarian Party.

Since all four types of voters will be using the same machine (but with different ballots) it is possible that some confusion might result, so it is important that you study these pages carefully.

If you are in doubt as to what party you are affiliated with, check the address label on the back cover of this pamphlet. Your party affiliation appears above your name and address. Nonpartisan voters (those who have no party) are indicated on the address label as “D-S”; this stands for “Decline to State”.

Here is what you can expect when you go to your polling place on June 3:

**NONPARTISAN VOTERS:** You will get a BROWN ballot card. Go into the appropriately marked booth. Inside the booth you will vote on only the brown pages. There are four brown pages numbered 6, 7, 8 and 9.

**PEACE & FREEDOM VOTERS:** You will get a YELLOW ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the yellow pages and the brown pages.

**AMERICAN INDEPENDENT VOTERS:** You will get a BLUE ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the blue pages and the brown pages.

**LIBERTARIAN VOTERS:** You will be given RED ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the red pages and brown pages.

In other words, everyone votes on the brown pages of the voting machine and, in addition, members of the three smaller parties also vote on the color-coded page(s) that match the color of the ballot card that they are given.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>Gary V. Miller</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>James C. “Jim” Griffin</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>Theresa “Tena” Dietrich</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>Nicholas W. Kudronzeff</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Merton D. Short</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>Gary R. Odom</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: This page will be blue)

If you are affiliated with the American Independent Party,

This will be the first page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>UNITED STATES SENATOR</th>
<th>UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE</th>
<th>STATE SENATOR</th>
<th>MEMBER OF THE STATE ASSEMBLY</th>
<th>MEMBER, COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now continue voting on the brown pages numbered 6, 7, 8, & 9.
Continúe votando en las páginas de color café, numeradas 6, 7, 8, & 9.
請在棕色紙第 6, 7, 8 及 9 頁上繼續投票。

**(NOTE: THIS PAGE WILL BE BLUE)**

If you are affiliated with the AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY,

This will be the second page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the pages numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 to vote for nonpartisan offices and propositions. On your voting machine those pages will be colored brown.
If you are affiliated with the LIBERTARIAN PARTY,

This will be the first page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the next page.
# Libertarian Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Political Affiliation</th>
<th>Vote Instruction</th>
<th>Vote Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delegate to State Convention</td>
<td>Samuel K. Grove</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegate to State Committee</td>
<td>Joseph Fuhrig</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Now continue voting on the brown pages numbered 6, 7, 8, & 9.**
Continúa votando en las páginas de color cafre, numeradas 6, 7, 8, & 9.

(Note: This page will be red)

If you are affiliated with the Libertarian Party,

This will be the second page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the pages numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 to vote for nonpartisan offices and propositions. On your voting machine those pages will be colored brown.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>159</th>
<th>160</th>
<th>161</th>
<th>164</th>
<th>165</th>
<th>168</th>
<th>169</th>
<th>172</th>
<th>173</th>
<th>176</th>
<th>177</th>
<th>178</th>
<th>181</th>
<th>182</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>MARIA ELIZABETH MUNOZ</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educator/Profesora</td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHERYL ZUUR</td>
<td>Vote for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labor/Latino Activist/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activista Laboral Latina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>candidate whose name does</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not appear on the ballot,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>please refer to the posted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>instructions. Do not vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for more candidates than</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>CLYDE KUHN</td>
<td>Vote for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Instructor/Instructor de Colegio Universitario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>candidate whose name does</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not appear on the ballot,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>please refer to the posted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>instructions. Do not vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for more candidates than</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>GLORIA GARCIA</td>
<td>Vote for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worker/Trabajadora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>candidate whose name does</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not appear on the ballot,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>please refer to the posted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>instructions. Do not vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for more candidates than</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>JOHN HAAG</td>
<td>Vote for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peace/Political Activist /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activista Político</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacificista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>candidate whose name does</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not appear on the ballot,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>please refer to the posted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>instructions. Do not vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for more candidates than</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>MAUREEN SMITH</td>
<td>Vote for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Union/Community Organizer /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizadora Sindical y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comunitaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>candidate whose name does</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not appear on the ballot,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>please refer to the posted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>instructions. Do not vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for more candidates than</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>DOV WISNER</td>
<td>Vote for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worker/Trabajador</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>candidate whose name does</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not appear on the ballot,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>please refer to the posted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>instructions. Do not vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for more candidates than</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: This page will be yellow)

If you are affiliated with the PEACE & FREEDOM PARTY,

This will be the first page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the next page.)
PEACE & FREEDOM PARTY

(MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTAL DE IGUALAMIENTO) 州平頭局委員
Member, State Board of Equalization

ROBERT LOVATO
Medical Relief Coordinator / Coordinador de Auxilios Médicos

185

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

186

(SENADOR DE ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國參議員
United States Senator

PAUL KANGAS
Socialist Organizer / Organizador Socialista

189

LENNI BRENNER
Author / Autor

190

(REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國衆議員
United States Representative

THEODORE "TED" ZUUR
Worker / Trabajador

193

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

194

(SENADOR ESTAL) 州參議員
State Senator

No candidate has filed / No se ha presentado ningún candidato

197

(MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL) 州衆議員
Member of the State Assembly

MARGARET "MEG" WEBER
Child Care Teacher / Maestra de Guardería Infantil

200

JOYCE SCHON
Clerk / Oficinista

201

(MIEMBRO, COMITE CENTRAL DEL CONDADO) 縣中央委員
Member, County Central Committee

CHERYL HOPE ZUUR
Labor / Latina Activist / Activista Laboral Latina

204

MARK AIRGOOD

205

DOV WISNER
Worker / Socialista Organizer / Trabajador / Organizador Socialista

206

MARGARET "MEG" WEBER
Worker / Socialista Organizer / Trabajadora / Organizadora Socialista

207

JOYCE SCHON
Clerk / Oficinista

208

NOW CONTINUE VOTING ON THE BROWN PAGES NUMBERED 6, 7, 8, & 9. CONTINUE VOTANDO EN LAS PÁGINAS DE COLOR CAFE, NUMERADAS 6, 7, 8, & 9.

(NOTE: THIS PAGE WILL BE YELLOW)

If you are affiliated with the

PEACE & FREEDOM PARTY,

This will be the second page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the pages numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 to vote for nonpartisan offices and propositions. On your voting machine those pages will be colored brown.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:

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

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

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, mete la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

A 第一步
请双手持票向自动机将整张选票插入。

STEP 1

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.
Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con los dos cabecitas rojas.

B 第二步
请切面将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合于二红点之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL [STRAIGHT UP]. PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.
Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perforé con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

C 第三步
请把带印之选票针，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

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

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

D 第四步
投票选举之后，把选票取出，放入空封袋内，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格预备为投票人应用。

(Due to space limitations and requirements that the other sample ballot pages face each other, the voting instructions had to be placed in the middle of your sample ballot. When you go to the polls this page on your voting machine will be blank.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent Estatal de Instruccion Publica</td>
<td>DANIEL NUSBAUM</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Project Advisor</td>
<td>JEANNE BAIRD</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>SAM DUCA</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En posesin del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En posesin del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $850,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>COMMUNITY PARKLANDS ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for acquiring, developing, improving, rehabilitating, or restoring urgently needed local and regional parks, beaches, recreational areas and facilities, and historical resources.</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>WATER CONSERVATION AND WATER QUALITY BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $150,000,000 to provide funds for water conservation, groundwater recharge and drainage water management, and clarifies language in the Clean Water Bond Law of 1984.</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>DEPOSIT OF PUBLIC MONEYS IN CREDIT UNIONS. Authorizes Legislature to provide for deposit of public moneys in any credit union. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect. Legislation already approved implementing measure could result in greater interest income to state and local governments.</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. Provides exception to property tax limit when acquisition or improvement of real property approved by two-thirds of voters. Fiscal Impact: By itself, measure has no fiscal effect. No increase can occur in local property tax rate unless bond issue is approved by two-thirds vote. State costs for tax relief programs could increase. State income tax revenues could decline as taxpayers deduct greater amounts for property tax payments.</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>ALLOCATION OF VEHICLE LICENSE FEE TAXES TO COUNTIES AND CITIES. Requires allocation of Vehicle License Fee taxes to local governments. Fiscal Impact: Measure would have no direct fiscal effect. Prevents Legislature from changing the law to take vehicle license fees away from counties and cities. Measure would not prevent state reducing other forms of aid to local governments or changing existing formula for dividing vehicle license fee revenues between counties and cities.</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>LEGISLATORS’ AND JUDGES’ RETIREMENT SYSTEMS. Limits retirement allowances for persons entering Legislators’ and Judges’ Retirement Systems after January 1, 1987. Fiscal Impact: Minor savings to state in future years if rate of inflation exceeds increase in salaries paid to current officeholders.</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1986. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de setas y casas para los veteranos de California.

ACTA DE TERRENOS DE PARQUES DE LA COMUNIDAD DE 1986. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición, mejoramiento, rehabilitación o la restauración únicamente de parques, playas, lagos e instalaciones de recreación, y los recursos históricos locales y regionales.

LEY DE BONOS PARA LA CONSERVACIÓN DE AGUA Y CONTROL DE LA CALIDAD DEL AGUA DE 1986. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la conservación del agua, reabastecimiento de agua subterránea, manejo apropiado del agua de desecho, y clarificación del lenguaje en la Ley de Bonos para Agua Limpia de 1984.

DEPÓSITO DE Fondos PÚBLICOS EN COOPERATIVAS DE CRÉDITO. Autoriza a la Legislatura para que disponga el depósito de fondos públicos en cualquier cooperativa de crédito. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. La legislatura ya ha aprobado que pone en efecto la medida podría resultar en mayor ingreso de intereses para los gobiernos locales.

Fijación de Impuestos a la Propiedad: Disponen exenciones a los límites de impuestos a la propiedad en el caso de adquisición o mejoramiento de la propiedad inmueble. No se aplican por $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de parques, playas, lagos e instalaciones de recreación, y los recursos históricos locales y regionales.

Asignación de Impuestos por Pagos de Licencias de Vehículos a los Condado y Ciudades. Requiere la asignación a los gobiernos locales de los impuestos reclamados en pagos por Licencia de Vehículos. Impacto Fiscal: La medida no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo. Implica que la Legislatura puede cambiar la ley para tomar los fondos provenientes de licencias de vehículos de las ciudades y condados. La medida no evitará que el estado pueda reducir otras formas de asistencia a los gobiernos locales o que pueda cambiar la fórmula actual de dividir los royalties provenientes del pago por licencia de vehículos entre los condados y ciudades.

SISTEMAS DE JUBILACIÓN DE LOS LEGISLADORES Y JUECES. Limita las pensiones de jubilación para aquellos personas que se auffles al Sistema de Jubilación de los Legisladores y Jueces después del 1 de enero de 1987. Impacto Fiscal: Algunas medidas para el sistema de jubilación alcanzaría el aumento en el salarios que se pagan a los que actualmente ocupan cargos.
**MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE NO.</th>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>NONPARTISAN OFFICES. Prohibits a political party or party central commit- tee from endorsing, supporting, or opposing a candidate for nonpartisan office. Fiscal Impact: No direct state or local government fiscal impact.</td>
<td>YES 262</td>
<td>NO 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. DISASTERS. Base-year value of property damaged or destroyed by disaster transferable to comparable replacement property in same county. Fiscal Impact: Local property tax revenues would decrease by an unknown amount. County assessor and tax collectors would have nonsignificant higher administrative costs. State would replace revenues lost by school and community college districts. State income tax revenues could increase due to lower property tax deductions on replacement properties. These state costs and revenues cannot be estimated.</td>
<td>YES 266</td>
<td>NO 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>MULTIPLE DEFENDANTS TORT DAMAGE LIABILITY. Plaintiff's non-economic damage recovery limited to defendant's liability based on defendant's percentage of fault. Fiscal Impact: Substantial savings to state and local governments. Savings could be several millions of dollars in a year, varying significantly from year to year.</td>
<td>YES 270</td>
<td>NO 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>COUNTY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county correctional facilities and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of four hundred ninety-five million dollars ($495,000,000).</td>
<td>YES 273</td>
<td>NO 274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSITION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgements against the City?</td>
<td>YES 278</td>
<td>NO 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?</td>
<td>YES 281</td>
<td>NO 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>PROPOSITION C HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THE BALLOT BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CARGOS NO PARTIDARIOS.</strong> Prohibe a un partido político a un</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comité central de un partido político patrocinar, apoyar u oponerse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a un candidato a un cargo no partidario. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impacto fiscal directo a los gobiernos estatal o locales.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>262 SI 赞成</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>263 NO 反對</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **IMPUTOS A LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE DESABASTECIDA.** El valor en |
| año base de propiedad inmueble dañada o destruida por un desastre |
| puede ser transferido a propiedad inmueble de reemplazo comparable |
| en el mismo condado. Impacto Fiscal: Las recaudaciones de im-
| puestos locales a la propiedad demolidas se usando una cantidad |
| disminuida. Los benefactores de impuestos del condado |
| también ineficientes costos administrativos más altos. El esfuerzo |
| reemplazará los réditos que los distritos escolares y de colegios de |
| educación superior dejan de percibir. Los réditos del impuesto estatal |
| a la renta podrán aumentar debido a menores deducciones en el im-
| puesto a la propiedad en las propiedades de reemplazo. Estos costos |
| y réditos estatales no pueden ser calculados. |
| **266 SI 赞成** | 50 |
| **267 NO 反對** |

| **RESPONSABILIDAD CIVIL DE MULTIPLES PARTES DEMANDADAS EN |
| JUICIOS DE AGRARIOS INDEMNIZABLES.** Limita la indem-
| nización que puede recibir el demandante por daños no |
| económicos a la responsabilidad del demandado basándose en el |
| porcentaje de la culpabilidad del demandado. Impacto Fiscal: |
| Ahorros sustanciales para los gobiernos estatal y locales. Los |
| alquileres podrían ser algunos millones de dólares al año, que |
| variarían significativamente de año a año. |
| **273 SI 赞成** | 51 |
| **274 NO 反對** |

| **ACTA DE BONOS PARA DESEMBOLO DE CAPITAL PARA INSTALAC.
| CIÓN DE RUTAS ESCOLARES DE CONSTRUCCION DE 1988.** Estas actas |
| disponen la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelación, y |
| reemplazo de instalaciones escuela en los condados y la |
| ejecución del mantenimiento diferido en las mismas en conformi-
| dad con una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos novena y |
| cinco millones de dólares ($450,000,000). |
| **273 SI 赞成** | 52 |
| **274 NO 反對** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD &amp; CONTADO</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>278 SI 赞成</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>279 NO 反對</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **281 SI 赞成** | **B** |
| **282 NO 反對** |

<p>| OFICIALMENTE ELIMINADA | <strong>C</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**VOTER SELECTION CARD**

**PRIMARY ELECTION**

**JUNE 3, 1986**

**POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.**

Fill out this card and take it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR CANDIDATE SELECTION

*aumentará el acceso del público a la zona de los muelles y mejorará el tráfico*
**MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS**

**D** Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?  
**YES 288**  
**NO 289**

**E** Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?  
**YES 292**  
**NO 293**

**F** Shall the City prohibit campaign before any city commission, at candidate for municipal office?  

**G** Shall it be the policy of the people greatest ties with South Africa?  

**H** Shall it be the policy of the people and private organizations to station Council?  

**I** Shall it be the policy of the people Freeway?  

**J** Shall it be the policy of the people遢 evero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the mountains and improve traffic?  

---

**VOTER SELECTION CARD**

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>County Central Committee*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td>6.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>7.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td>8.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>9.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate</td>
<td>10.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td>*Refer to your sample ballot for the number of County Central Committee members to be elected. The number varies with each district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. Public Inst.</td>
<td>SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR PROPOSITIONS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSITIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

288 SI 贏成
289 NO 反對

"¿Debe el ayuntamiento transferir la administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil a un departamento de administración de personal que tenga poder para cambiar las normas del servicio civil que el presente consta en la Carta Constitucional?" 市政府是否將公務員事務部移交給市政委員會，建立一個有權改變現行職務規定的人事行政部門？

292 SI 贏成
293 NO 反對

"¿Debe el ayuntamiento negar o revocar cualquier permiso de construcción para edificar en la Ruta de Babcock en las Avenidas Ocean y Pfeil en los próximos tres años?" 市政府是否將issent 再度許可在未來三年內在 拉寶克路及海洋大道和菲爾大道所指定的地區興建建築？

296 SI 贏成
297 NO 反對

"¿Debe el ayuntamiento prohibir la defensa remunerada efectuada por empleados de la ciudad y legisladores estatales ante cualquier comisión de la ciudad, y limitar la cantidad con la que una persona puede contribuir para un candidato a una oficina municipal en $500?" 市政府是否禁止市議員及州議員為ciudad的法律委員會的委員進行付費辯護，並規定每人對市議員的候選人的捐款的上限不得超過五百元？

300 SI 贏成
301 NO 反對

"¿Debe el ayuntamiento retirar las empresas que tengan mayor vinculación con la segregación racial auditricio?" 市政府是否應收回與種族歧視有關的企業？

303 SI 贏成
304 NO 反對

"¿Debe el ayuntamiento aprobar a todos los organismos apropiados, públicos y privados, para establecer y mantener un Consejo para la Investigación y Educación sobre SIDA (A.I.D.S.)?" 市政府是否將批准各個組織，包括公部門及私人機構，支持一個對HIV教育及研究的委員會？

307 SI 贏成
308 NO 反對

"¿Debe el ayuntamiento aprobar la ampliación del Autopista Embacadero?" 市政府是否將批准伊巴卡託級公路的擴張？

310 SI 贏成
311 NO 反對

"¿Debe el ayuntamiento aprobar la ampliación de la Autopista de la Embacadero, si esto aumentara el acceso del público a la zona de los muelles y mejore el tráfico?" 假如伊巴卡託級公路擴張的一部 分會有助於增加民眾到寧靜地區的通勤時間及改進交通情況，盡量人民是否會贊同？
Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

**BALLOT**—An official list of candidates and propositions.

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

**VOTE BY MAIL**—See Absentee Ballot, above.

**POLLING PLACE**—The place where you go to vote.

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

**MEASURE**—Another name for proposition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**PERMIT (noun)**—A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building. Proposition E concerns the issuance of a permit.

**COMPENSATED ADVOCACY**—Compensated means being paid for doing something; Advocacy means speaking or writing on behalf of someone else. Proposition F concerns the issue of compensated advocacy.

**RISK MANAGEMENT**—This field covers two areas: (1) deciding on when it is better to buy insurance and when it is better to be self insured or uninsured, then shopping for the insurance; (2) identifying hazardous conditions on one's property and seeing that they are corrected so that liability and damage claims will be avoided. Proposition A concerns risk management.

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

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

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

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

PROPOSITION A

Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgments against the City?

YES 278  NO 279

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Consultants hired by the Chief Administrative Officer are available to City departments that have questions about "risk management", such as how to keep damage claims to a minimum and how to find the best insurance rates. In some cases, the departments use these consultants. In other cases, the departments make their own decisions. When damage claims are filed, some are handled by the City Attorney's Office and some are handled by City departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would amend the City Charter to create an Office of Risk Management, under the Chief Administrative Officer. The office would set risk management guidelines for all City departments, boards and commissions. Proposition A would also establish a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration in the City Attorney's Office. The bureau would be responsible for investigating, evaluating and processing all damage claims made against the City, except those claims made against the Public Utilities Commission and the Police Department. The bureau would also have the power to investigate potential suits against the City and to make settlements within dollar limits to be set by ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer and a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want damage claims and risk management decisions to continue to be handled the way they are now.

Controller's Statement on "A"

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not affect the cost of government. However as a result of its potential future application and the exemption of certain employees from the civil service provisions of the Charter, costs may be affected in an amount presently indeterminate."

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On March 10 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted "No."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON A

Last fiscal year, over 6,400 claims and law suits were filed against the City, costing us more than $10 million in settlements. I believe that it is time to change the way we handle our claims, secure insurance, prevent risks and settle legitimate claims against the City.

Last summer, we appointed a task force of citizens, under San Francisco Bar President Jerry Falk, to make recommendations on how to streamline our procedures and save money at the same time. The present system is very slow, costly, and inefficient.

Currently, all claims are investigated by the department involved. The City Attorney cannot act on any claim until the department is ready. This results in delay and duplication of effort and increased costs. A centralized and accountable Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney would be more efficient, cost-effective, and professional. It would enable the City to settle many claims quickly, before litigation is begun, saving the City the costs of defending itself in court and lowering the average cost of settling a case.

This can be accomplished without creating new jobs by simply moving into one office the city positions presently scattered throughout the government.

Vote “Yes” on A. Reduce the cost of City government.

Adoption of this measure would also formally establish responsibility for Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer, where it has been unofficially since 1978. With this strengthened authority, the Risk Management Office would be responsible for the gathering of claims data on a City-wide basis, the creation of incentives for both reducing the possibility for injuries and damage and the number of claims for each department, the coordination of insurance purchasing and specific suggestions to avoid and reduce risk.

This amendment is presented with the recommendation of the Mayor’s Task Force on Claims and Judgments, the Chief Administrative Officer, City Attorney, the President of the San Francisco Bar Association, and the President of the Lawyers’ Club of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Each year the City spends almost $10 million to settle damage claims. It is estimated that the overall costs to the City for all risk-related activities exceeds $125 million a year. It is time for action to be taken to reduce these huge expenditures. This charter amendment is designed to do just that.

Claims Investigation and Adjustment

Right now, the City claims investigation process is decentralized and largely unorganized. Each department investigates its own claims. Investigators may or may not be specially trained for their duties. There is no uniformity of investigation procedure or claims reporting. In only a few departments do investigators contact injured parties within days of an accident in order to settle the claim quickly and economically.

This amendment will create a claims investigation and adjustment bureau in the Office of the City Attorney. Claims investigation and adjustment activities will be centralized, economized and made much more efficient. The new bureau will be able to respond immediately to accidents and claims, providing quick compensation to deserving persons while at the same time producing a prompt, professional investigation. This reform is greatly needed.

Risk Management

Presently, there is no overall plan for the management of the City’s risk exposure: insurance purchasing, avoidance of industrial accidents, gathering data on accident patterns, etc. Again, risk management as a function is fragmented among the various City departments. As a consequence, departments cannot develop the necessary expertise to manage themselves to reduce risk-related costs.

This measure will establish a risk manager under the Chief Administrative Officer. For the first time, overall City planning will be possible in order to control risk. Departments will be told what activities are producing injuries or damage and advised on corrective measures. Private industry has been utilizing risk managers of this type for years. It is time that the City did the same.

This amendment will reduce the cost of government and insure a more efficient delivery of City services to all San Franciscans. We urge you to give it your unqualified support.

Board of Supervisors

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This charter amendment was proposed by a citizens’ task force appointed by Mayor Feinstein. Its mission was to propose ways of reducing the number and financial costs of claims and lawsuits against the City.

The amendment has two principal features. The first is to centralize within the City Attorney’s office the investigation of claims filed against city departments. This will allow for improved training and supervision of the investigators, who presently are scattered throughout city government. The result will be more efficient, cost-effective and professional investigation of claims. By improving the quality of claims investigation, the City can identify those claims which have merit and attempt to reach early — and less costly — settlements. Meritless claims will be denied with greater confidence that if suit is filed it can be defended successfully.

The second major feature of the amendment will establish a Risk Management office under the Chief Administrative Officer. Risk management is a concept widely used in private business. Risk managers are professionals skilled in reducing the overall cost of claims. The Risk Manager would be responsible for coordinating the City’s insurance program, data collection, and correcting problems within the City which lead to claims. The Risk Manager would review those claims which have been filed against the City. Where it appears that an unsafe condition or practice has led to a claim, the Risk Manager would suggest to the affected department that corrective measures be taken. Reports to the Mayor and to the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors of the recommended corrections and the actions taken would ensure that the various departments will be responsive.

The City cannot eliminate claims and lawsuits against it. But it can limit its exposure by managing the claims process more effectively. This measure will reduce injuries and reduce claims, and that is good for everyone.

Jerome B. Falk, Jr.
Chair, Mayor’s Task Force on Claims and Judgments Against the City

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, May 31, 1986

12 Noon State Senate, Assembly, Congress and State Propositions
1:00 Proposition A — Risk Management & Claims
1:15 Proposition B — Purchaser & Contracts
1:30 Proposition D — Civil Service
2:15 Proposition E — Balboa Reservoir
2:30 Proposition F — Compensated Advocacy
3:00 Proposition G — Apartheid
3:20 Proposition H — AIDS
3:30 Propositions I, J — Embarcadero Freeway
3:50 Statewide Candidates

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

PROPOSITION B

Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?

YES 281

NO 282

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchaser must get the approval of the Chief Administrative Officer before signing certain contracts for more than $15,000. Only the voters may change that dollar limit. The Purchaser must personally sign every contract that comes through his office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would raise the limit on contracts requiring the Chief Administrative Officer's approval to $50,000. It would also allow the Board of Supervisors to change that limit by ordinance. Proposition B would also permit the Purchaser to name certain people in his office to sign contracts on his behalf.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer's approval only on contracts for more than $50,000. You also want the Purchaser to be able to name certain people in his office to be able to sign contracts on his behalf.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to require the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer's approval on contracts for more than $15,000. You also want him to sign all contracts himself.

Controller's Statement on "B"

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On March 3 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON B!

The City's Charter requires that a permanent, non-elected City official, the Chief Administrative Officer, review all purchases and contracts above $15,000. Of course, CAO approval of major contracts is very important. But, due to inflation, the number of contracts that have to go to the CAO for approval is always increasing. Today there are too many documents requiring CAO approval. This slows down the purchasing process, occupies staff time—and ultimately costs the City money. Proposition B will raise the CAO approval level to $50,000, and help the City to improve the efficiency of its purchasing operations.

The City's budget includes more than $250 million for purchases on tens of thousands of contracts. At the current $15,000 review limit, the CAO must approve thousands of documents every year—a costly, time-consuming process. In the long run the City loses money because of the inordinate length of time required to complete all the paperwork.

An adjustment must be made to remove the smaller contracts from this cumbersome process. Review and approval of contracts under $50,000 should be under the responsibility of the City Purchaser, a highly trained and experienced professional, who reports directly to the CAO. By changing the present $15,000 to $50,000, it will be possible for the CAO to give each document that comes to him the attention it requires. And, by placing its orders and paying its bills faster, both the City and businesses will benefit—especially small business and those owned by minorities and women.

Proposition B will allow future adjustments to the limit to be made by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility will ensure the City's ability to adjust to inflation and changes in the market.

This amendment comes to you with the recommendation of auditors, controllers, bankers, and others who exercise top fiduciary responsibility within their own organizations.

VOTE YES ON B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will make essential changes to update the purchasing and payment procedures under the Chief Administrative Officer. These measures are necessary and desirable because they will save the City money by significantly increasing our management efficiency.

Right now, the City loses because it takes too long for contracts to be reviewed and payments okayed, which means that early payment incentives go unutilized. The CAO has to approve every contract greater than $15,000—and with City purchases last year over $250 million, the paperwork logjam is vast and overwhelming.

An increase in the review limit from $15,000 to $50,000 will make an adequate adjustment for inflation—$50,000 now is only about $15,000 in 1967 dollars. Proposition B will also enable the City Purchaser, who reports to the CAO, to maximize potential savings through early payments by designating appropriate personnel to approve contracts up to $50,000. These “Good Business” amendments are consistent with private sector practices and should be incorporated by the CAO in the City’s best interests.

Finally, Proposition B will give the City the ability to respond quickly to changes in the market place by allowing changes in the CAO review limit by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility is necessary to ensure that in the future we will not lose money because of institutional rigidity. Control is maintained with the necessity of Board action and Mayoral approval to adjust the review limit, and this same feature will allow for change when desired.

Vote yes on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

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

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the civil service system of the City of San Francisco. The structure of the civil service system and certain rules governing its operation are written into the Charter and can only be changed by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would make major changes. A Department of Personnel Administration would run the Civil Service system and would be able to change rules with Commission approval. Major features of Proposition D are described below. The complete charter amendment is printed in this voters' handbook.

Department of Personnel Administration

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Certain civil service rules governing the general operation of the system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs, are written into the Charter and carried out by the Civil Service Commission. Only the voters can change these rules.

THE PROPOSAL: A department of Personnel Administration would be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. A Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor would run the Department. Certain rules governing examination, selection and appointment would be taken out of the Charter. The Personnel Director would be able to change these rules with the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

Civil Service Commission

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the general operation of the civil system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs. The Commission also hears and decides appeals on civil service matters.

THE PROPOSAL: The Civil Service Commission would no longer be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. The Commission could investigate the operation of the system, approve rule changes proposed by the Personnel Director, and hear and decide appeals only on claims of job discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest.

Employee Relations

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors appoints an Employee Relations Director to negotiate contracts with City employees; the Board approves all contracts.

THE PROPOSAL: The Mayor or his or her agent would negotiate with City employees; the Board of Supervisors would still approve all contracts.

What your vote means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing civil service system.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE
Controller's Statement on "D"

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

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not directly affect the cost of government, as it removes many civil service policy setting functions from the Charter and an independent Civil Service Commission and transfers responsibility for personnel matters, including labor negotiations, to the Mayor.

"As a product of its inherent flexibility and possible future application, costs could be affected or savings realized in amounts presently indeterminate but probably substantial."

Civil Service

How "D" Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative Charter amendment rewriting the civil service provisions of the Charter had qualified for the June ballot.

Robert Bradford, Jonathan Bulkley, Lee Munsen and Mary Hilton, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 36,049 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 25,027 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

Polls close at 8:00 p.m.

Text of Proposed Initiative Charter Amendment

PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by struck-through type.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisanship, political, social, or other considerations. Consistent with the City's and County's affirmative action goals, no applicant or employee shall be selected, appointed, reduced in rank, removed or in any way favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, union activities, political affiliation or sexual orientation.

(b) The purpose of the civil service system is to obtain for the city and county the best qualified persons to fill city and county positions in a timely and economical manner, using professional, fair and equitable personnel selection and personnel management practices with consideration of the following merit principles:

1. Recruit, selecting, and advancing employees on the basis of their ability, knowledge, skills and performance relative to the work to be performed.

2. Establishing equitable and adequate compensation, as provided elsewhere in this charter.

3. Training employees, as needed, to promote productivity and high quality performance and to facilitate career development.

4. Retaining employees during good service and separating employees for good cause.

5. Assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration, with proper regard for their privacy and constitutional rights; and assuring equal employment opportunity, based on the person's ability to do the job.

6. Assuring that employees are protected against coercion for political purposes and are prohibited from using their official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the outcome of an election or a nomination for office.

(c) This charter does not limit the power of departments, agencies, or other subdivisions of the city and county in their exercise of management prerogatives including but not limited to:

1. Directing employees in the performance of their duties;

2. Hiring, promoting, transferring and assigning employees from those qualified;

3. Classifying positions in accordance with Section 3.663 (b);

4. Dismissing employees;

5. Laying off employees because of lack of work, lack of funds or other reasonable cause; and

6. Determining the mission of its departments and divisions, and its budget, organization, the number of its employees, and the numbers, types, classifications and grades of positions or employees assigned to an organization unit, work project, shift or tour of duty, and the methods and technology of performing its work.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisanship, political, social, or other considerations. No person shall in any way be favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, age, religion, national origin or other non-merit factors.

(b) The purpose of the civil service system is to obtain for the city and county the best qualified persons to fill city and county positions in a timely and economical manner, using professional, fair and equitable personnel selection and personnel management practices with consideration of the following merit principles:

1. Recruit, selecting, and advancing employees on the basis of their ability, knowledge, skills and performance relative to the work to be performed.

2. Establishing equitable and adequate compensation, as provided elsewhere in this charter.

3. Training employees, as needed, to promote productivity and high quality performance and to facilitate career development.

4. Retaining employees during good service and separating employees for good cause.

5. Assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration, with proper regard for their privacy and constitutional rights; and assuring equal employment opportunity, based on the person's ability to do the job.

6. Assuring that employees are protected against coercion for political purposes and are prohibited from using their official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the outcome of an election or a nomination for office.

(c) This charter does not limit the power of departments, agencies, or other subdivisions of the city and county in their exercise of management prerogatives including but not limited to:

1. Directing employees in the performance of their duties;

2. Hiring, promoting, transferring and assigning employees from those qualified;

3. Classifying positions in accordance with Section 3.663 (b);

4. Dismissing employees;

5. Laying off employees because of lack of work, lack of funds or other reasonable cause; and

6. Determining the mission of its departments and divisions, and its budget, organization, the number of its employees, and the numbers, types, classifications and grades of positions or employees assigned to an organization unit, work project, shift or tour of duty, and the methods and technology of performing its work.

There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county shall have the general powers and duties set forth in Section 3.661.

The civil service commission shall consist of five members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and this charter section as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed. Provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the respective terms of the commissioners who shall hold office on the effective date of this section as amended shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date. Thereupon, the mayor shall appoint...
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Vote YES and join 34,000 San Franciscans who signed petitions to get this crucial reform on the ballot. "D" clears the way to modernize Civil Service so that it is fair and efficient. The present system is a 50-year conglomeration of rules that tie the City’s hands —

— A protest by one applicant can hold up hiring for an entire job classification for months — even years.
— Often tests cannot be given frequently enough to maintain current tests of qualified employees. This leads to delays and temporary appointments that make hiring top candidates all but impossible.
— Appointments to jobs are restricted to the top three names on a list even though more than three people have the same score!
— Many provisions are out of date. Some deal with hiring during the Korean War. Others limit our ability to carry out affirmative action.

"D" would remove archaic rules from the Charter so they could be changed as the times require — subject to meet and confer and public hearings. Job tests could be expedited; hiring and promotions speeded up; opportunities opened to women and minorities.

Specifically, Proposition D:

1) Creates a Department of Personnel Administration at no additional cost. Like other U.S. cities, day-to-day administration would be the responsibility of a director, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Supervisors.
2) Makes the Civil Service Commission the oversight body to set policy and hear appeals. Rulings would have to be within 60 days, eliminating endless delays.
3) Moves the office of labor relations from the Supervisors to the Mayor, who must make the tough-minded decisions to balance the budget. Never again could the Board give labor $27 million for “comparable worth.”

This reform is the product of years of work with SPUR, League of Women Voters, Chamber of Commerce. Members of the Board of Supervisors could have put the reform on the ballot last year but bowed to some labor leaders, and 34,000 San Franciscans had to do the job for them.

Proposition D will enable City government to work better for you. Vote YES.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON ‘D’

Proposition D is a complex proposition with a simple goal: remove the archaic restrictions on the hiring, promotion, or firing of city employees and bring San Francisco’s personnel system into the modern age.

Archaic is the only way to describe a system that keeps equally qualified people from competing for a job, and that takes months — sometimes years — to fill vacancies.

For example, if 50 people score equally high on a competitive examination, shouldn’t they all have a chance for any job for which they are eligible? Not under the current system, which requires complicated tie-breaking rules not at all related to a person’s qualifications or abilities.

Or what about being able to hire the best person available for a given job? Currently, eligibility lists are frozen for two years and every person on each list, including the lowest-scoring, must be offered a job before the highest-scoring person on a more recent list. Private businesses couldn’t function saddled with such absurdities.

Proposition D cuts through the red tape. It creates a modern personnel department, with a director responsible for carrying out rules to ensure fairness and efficiency. Accountable to the Mayor, the director would be selected from a list provided by the Civil Service Commission, and subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.

The Civil Service Commission remains an independent body, with the right to approve new personnel rules and hold hearings on abuses. Also under ‘D’, negotiations with employee unions would be under the Mayor, subject to approval by the Supervisors, providing checks and balances in balancing our budget.

With greater accountability and continued checks and balances, Proposition D will open the way to more efficient government in our City.

Bill Maher, Supervisor
Louise Renne, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON ‘D’

Proposition D is a necessary reform to the City’s Civil System. As the City’s Chief Administrative Officer for almost ten years, I have found that quality employee hiring is difficult and the process causes long delays.

The current system is:

• inflexible. The City cannot hire and promote the most qualified persons.
• inefficiently administered by a commission. Other large
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The hiring practices outlined in San Francisco City Charter have been virtually unchanged since 1931, a severe handicap in running a modern city. Proposition D is designed to streamline the charter and ensure that the rights of present city employees and candidates for city jobs are protected, while improving the hiring process itself. The initiative also builds management accountability in the city system.

Proposition D Is More Fair, More Efficient, More Economical

The day-to-day personnel functions, including hiring, will be consolidated under a Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. Decisions of the Director of Personnel on examination content and administration are final, unless a decision is stayed during the appeal process by a unanimous vote of the Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D will make it easier to modernize the many archaic Civil Service rules and procedures now included in the Charter, while maintaining a strong and independent Civil Service Commission to safeguard the merit system and protect the rights of city employees. Many detailed rules will come out of the Charter and will become personnel regulations. These regulations can then be modernized, but only through a process which includes public hearings and meet and confer sessions with the union involved. In addition, the Civil Service Commission must approve any changes or new regulations governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfer, resignation and terminations.

Proposition D Will Improve Performance And Public Confidence

The openness and fairness of the proposition will benefit everyone. Well-qualified job candidates will have a better chance of being hired, and well-qualified job holders will have a better chance of being promoted. This means generally better job performance in all departments, resulting in higher employee morale and more public confidence in city government.

Submitted by
Louis Hop Lee, President
Civil Service Commission
Lee Munson, Member Civil Service Commission and
Treasurer, San Franciscans for Fair and Efficient Government
VOTE YES ON D

Cities can survive only with strong management. The greatest budgetary restraint must be exercised to assure that full value is received for each tax dollar spent.

With firm limits on what it can spend and faced with a possible loss of Federal funds next year, the City must be managed with the greatest possible efficiency.

Essential to greater efficiency is the need for Civil Service reform. As members of City Commissions, we constantly confront the torturous delays and confused rules that gridlock the present system. The present system simply can’t respond to the City’s personnel needs.

Qualified applicants become frustrated and seek employment elsewhere. Promotions are blocked. Morale suffers. Temporaries fill in; overtime mounts. The ability to plan is crippled; management is weakened.

Proposition D would put the system on a business-like basis. A personnel department would handle day-to-day administration. The Civil Service Commission would be the watchdog to assure the integrity of the merit system.

This streamlined system would replace what is now inflexible and cumbersome. Testing could be accelerated; hiring made more efficient and promotions made on time. The result would be greater efficiency and elimination of costly waste.

Vote Yes on D.

Jerry E. Berg, President, Board of Permit Appeals
Henry Berman, President, Fire Commission
Mo Berstein, President, Airports Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Hector Chinchilla, Rent Board
Rev. Harry Chuck, Housing Authority
Dr. Arthur Coleman, President, Port Commission
Owen Davis, Police Commission
J. Edward Fleishoff, Airports Commission
H. Welton Flynn, President, Public Utilities Commission
James Foster, Health Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation & Park Commission
James Fussell, President, Housing Authority
Anne Halsted, Port Commission
Tommy Harris, Recreation & Park Commission
Tom Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Walter Jebe, Public Library Commission
Jeffrey Lee, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Philip Lee, President, Health Commission
Bruce W. Lillenthal, Small Business Advisory Commission
Jacqueline Nemorovski, President, Arts Commission
Toby Rosenblatt, President, Planning Commission
Dr. David Saucedo, President, Police Commission
Joan San Jule, Housing Authority
John Patrick Short, President, Parking Authority
Marjorie C. Stern, President, Public Library Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D contains civil service reform measures urged by the League of Women Voters since 1969.

Proposition D will:
— Modernize the City’s outdated personnel system by creating a Director of Personnel, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors
— Preserve the principles of merit through policies set by the Civil Service Commission
— Create a more responsive Civil Service system at no additional cost to the taxpayer

EFFICIENCY AND FLEXIBILITY

Proposition D transfers authority for day-to-day management of the City’s personnel system from the Civil Service Commission to the Director of Personnel. This will:
— Prevent hiring delays
— Ensure only the most qualified individuals are hired and promoted
— Provide City managers with more administrative flexibility

FAIRNESS FOR EMPLOYEES

Proposition D will:
— Safeguard the rights of City workers
— Protect gains made in hiring women and minorities
— Retain the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit appeals board
— Retain the ability of the City’s unions to negotiate working conditions
— Create a system that can respond quickly and fairly to the needs of City workers

Proposition D will bring the Civil Service system into the 20th century by making the Mayor accountable for the management of a system employing more than 25,000 people. Hiring by merit is still guaranteed by the Charter. Please join us in voting for this Reform!

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
Esther Marks, Past President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote Yes on Proposition D the Civil Service Modernization Initiative.

Prevent abuse of a system that was intended to serve the public and protect against favoritism. Prevent situations like this: an employee failed to report to work for a week without explanation; he was telephoned, notified by certified mail and a message left under his door; he was terminated 13 days later; he did not appeal the termination and the civil service commission up-
held the termination. Two months later, the employee petitioned the commission for reinstatement. The employee got his job back, not because the process of termination was wrong but because the commission had a long standing objection to using “absent without leave” as a reason for firing.

The quality of public services is dependent upon the effectiveness of the staff who deliver them. The primary role of the civil service commission should be to facilitate recruitment and retention of the best available personnel. It must protect against favoritism and must assure that everyone has an equal and fair chance at employment.

The present system does not do that. We feel this initiative will make the system work better, for the managers, for the employees and for the public.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR

San Francisco government is huge, with a budget of more than $1 billion per year and 25,000 employees. It is expected to solve serious problems. This requires that the City have the ability to hire and promote talented people to do the job.

The present civil service system is so tied up in red tape that jobs remain vacant for six months to a year, and all too often someone who is not capable of doing a good job is hired. Your tax dollars are being wasted, and you are not receiving the quality of services you need and deserve.

Proposition D will modernize San Francisco’s civil service system. It separates the personnel department from the Civil Service Commission, and puts the department under the Mayor where it belongs. The Mayor is responsible for balancing the budget and delivering city services as efficiently as possible. She cannot do this unless she can find capable people to do the job. That is the task of the personnel department in any organization.

Proposition D will also insure that the independent Civil Service Commission has sufficient authority to require the personnel system to be fair in its treatment of City employees. The Commission will be able to issue subpoenas and require testimony of witnesses on investigations it conducts. Should it find that discrimination has occurred, it can issue orders that must be obeyed.

Most major American cities, and virtually all cities and counties in California, have the kind of civil service system that will be established by Proposition D. San Francisco’s present system is still mired in the past. It hobbles the ability of the City to deliver services and spend your tax dollars as efficiently as possible.

SPUR has not placed a statement in the Voter’s Handbook for any other issue over the past 15 years. We feel that Proposition D is so vital for San Francisco’s future that we are making this appeal for your support.

Vote “YES” on Proposition D.

SPUR—The San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR

Proposition D, the Civil Service Reform Initiative, will give San Francisco citizens the HIGH PERFORMANCE GOVERNMENT necessary to meet the many challenges of the future. Proposition D corrects the outdated and inflexible requirements originally written in San Francisco’s City Charter in 1931. It will eliminate the problems which prevent San Francisco’s personnel system from operating with efficiency the City’s voters and taxpayers deserve:

Proposition D insures City jobs will be filled from current lists of the most qualified employees.

Proposition D prevents ungrounded appeals from delaying for years the appointment or promotion of qualified employees.

Proposition D eliminates the repetitive tasks currently monopolizing the Civil Service Commission meetings and directs the Commission to serve as an appellate body to protect the City’s good employees.

Proposition D centralizes the day-to-day operation of the civil service system and makes the Director of Personnel responsible to the Mayor.

Proposition D simplifies the budgetary process by making the Mayor the City’s chief labor negotiator, responsible for setting working conditions within the City’s financial capacity.

Proposition D is the result of years of painstaking review by the most experienced, able and respected management experts in San Francisco. It is a plan intended to move City government out of the 1930s and equip San Francisco to enter the twenty-first century without being burdened by the red tape of the past.

After ten years of commitment to improving our City, the Mayor’s Fiscal Advisory Committee is convinced adoption of Proposition D is one of the most important issues facing the voters. CHANGE IS LONG OVERDUE. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by,
The Mayor’s Fiscal Advisory Committee

David Anischer
Jerome Anderson
Richard Blum
Charles Chapman
Arthur Cooke, Jr.
Benton Dial
James Edgar
Ruben Garcia

Robert Hayden
Walter Henderson
John Jacobs
Michael McGill
Ellen Newman
Roy Nordman
Frank Tatum

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PERSONNEL MANAGERS SAY YES ON PROPOSITION D

As the personnel managers for City Departments, we are charged with the responsibility of managing the City's personnel system. The activities include examinations, hiring, training, discipline, union-management relations, affirmative action and compensation. No one knows better than we the frustrations experienced in attempting to monitor an unbelievable sequence of overlapping bureaucratic activities in attempting to get the job done.

Proposition D will bring our personnel system into line with most other public personnel systems. The improved system will create the potential for being more responsive to the needs of operating departments. It will improve labor relations by transferring this function to the executive branch of government where it belongs.

Proposition D will streamline certain routine procedures resulting in a reduction of cost and time. Under the current system delays are experienced due to lengthy appeals during which time the departments' objectives are delayed.

Proposition D will create an atmosphere of increased accountability for department managers in the areas of affirmative action, discipline and job performance.

Proposition D has been endorsed by the San Francisco Council of Human Resource Managers, the association of over one hundred personnel managers in City government.

Proposition D strengthens merit system principles. Civil Service commissioners will have more time to enforce and protect these principles rather than being bogged down in the day-to-day activities of administration.

Proposition D will help bring about improved methods and practices in personnel administration and should result in a more competent and effective workforce which the citizens of San Francisco have a right to expect.

Alvin W. Schaaf
Personnel Director
Recreation and Park Department

Marcha Ramirez
Personnel Officer
San Francisco Port

Edward M. Gazzano
Personnel Director
Department of Health

James Horn
Senior Personnel Officer
Department of Social Services

James Ilnicki
Personnel Director
San Francisco International Airport

Andrea R. Gouraine
Manager, Bureau of Personnel & Training

Marti Naguchi
Senior Department Personnel Officer

Mary Smith
Senior Personnel Officer

Laguna Honda Hospital

Thelma Pennekamp
San Francisco General Hospital

John Burke
Controller's Office

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will assist the Department of Public Works by streamlining the Civil Service process.

- Under the current system, the duration of eligible lists from 2 to 4 years hampers the Department from hiring graduates of colleges and universities on an annual basis. Consequently, many excellent candidates are not entered into the Civil Service System. Passage of the proposition will improve the quality of the pool of applicants and thereby the quality of public service given by the Department.

- The establishment of a Personnel Director to administer the day-to-day tasks of the system will speed up the decision making process to the advantage of employees and management alike.

The proposition still calls for checks and balances in that the Commission will continue to hear appeals on discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest. The Commission will act as a watchdog while leaving the general administration to the Personnel Director.

The initiative will make for an improved system for employees, management and the citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Donald Birrer
Director of Public Works

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Passage of this amendment will update our civil service system. These changes will make it comparable to other merit system agencies. Some of these changes are

(A) removal of administrative details from the charter which inhibit timely and effective personnel actions.

The following subjects will be placed in personnel regulations:
- Protests of written questions and answers
- Protests of tentative employment lists
- Promotional examinations
- Examinations for employees on military leave
- Certification of eligibles — Rule of three
- Duration of employment lists
- Temporary employee appointments
- Allows continuous up-dating of employment lists.
- Allows equitable treatment of job candidates with same test score.

(D) realigns responsibilities: the Civil Service Commission dealing primarily with compliance and adjudication activities (continued)
while the Personnel Department administers the day-to-day operation of the merit system.

Equally important the amendment retains important merit system provisions dealing with:

- Employee salary setting procedures
- Positions subject to merit system examinations
- Public hearing and meet and confer requirements
- Penalties for examination fraud
- Seniority, meritorious service and applicable educational credits for promotional examinations in the Police/Fire De-

PARTMENTS

- Termination of unsatisfactory employees
- Disciplinary suspensions
- Conflict of interest
- Creation of positions

Proposition "D" merits a 'YES' vote.

John J. Walsh
General Manager Personnel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Initiative, is a long-overdue reform to streamline antiquated hiring practices in San Francisco's fifty-year-old charter. Proposition D will ensure that the best and brightest job candidates are chosen to serve our city, thus promoting excellence in job performance and helping to eliminate incompetence. This initiative builds management accountability in the city system, while giving the Civil Service Commission the independence to protect the rights of women and minorities.

A Better, More Efficient System at Less Cost

Proposition D consolidates personnel functions, including hiring, under a new Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. The Director has final authority over content of examinations given city job applicants, so more flexibility is possible in finding truly qualified candidates.

Proposition D redefines the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit systems appeals board and policy-setting body. The merit principles are spelled out in the Proposition. This allows the Commission to protect the rights of women and minorities at no cost to the public.

More Fair to Everyone

Proposition D greatly improves the city charter. Well-qualified job candidates have a better chance to be hired and well-qualified job holders have a better chance to be promoted. The public is rewarded with the better job performance, efficiency and friendliness one expects from good government employees. All of these improvements are at no additional cost to the taxpayer.

Submitted by
James W. Haas

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service System, as presently constituted, (vintage 1932!), is uncivil, and there is nothing "systematic" about it! It's pure, unadulterated municipal lunacy and chaos! Remarkably, BOTH Management and Labor despise it. It certainly is NOT producing the best qualified persons to fill City jobs!

Let's follow Mayor Feinstein's recommendations. If this operation doesn't dramatically improve, there are always FUTURE ELECTIONS where additional, more Draconian changes can be considered by the voters.

As matters now stand, it is far better to light a candle than just sit and curse the darkness! Any changes will be an improvement! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

For more than a half-century, San Francisco Mayors have abided by the employee examination, hiring and promotion policies administered by a strong and independent Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D is a deceptive and dangerous scheme that would give future Mayors and top-level bureaucrats the power to ignore competence and reward political loyalty.

Proposition D would take key Civil Service employment rules out of the City Charter and make them subject to wheeling and dealing by City Hall politicians.

There's an old saying -- "if it ain't broke, don't fix it." Civil Service has worked well for more than 50 years. Proposition D is unnecessary, ineffective and even counter-productive.

It's not just deceptive, it's dangerous.

Joseph L. Alioto
Former Mayor of San Francisco

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

Time and time again, different groups have put various propositions on the ballot to weaken our Civil Service System and reintroduce political patronage into City employment practices. And every time the voters have wisely rejected these schemes, no matter how cleverly they have been disguised. Proposition D is just another power grab by bureaucrats at the top in City Hall.

We’ve said NO! loud and clear in the past. Let’s say NO one more time.

Submitted by:
TAXPAYERS FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT
Thomas Scanlon
City Treasurer, Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “D”!!!
During the eight years while a member of the Board of Supervisors, I fought hard to reform the Civil Service Commission and to bring working conditions and city workers’ pay equitable to both workers and taxpayers. I fought to insure an independent Civil Service Commission that would remain just that—independent and free from political influence and political patronage of particularly the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

I am truly saddened by the Mayor’s insistence in bringing this disastrous Proposition “D” before the voters. Some of the Supervisors rejected this misguided measure for what it is; an unwise consolidation of authority to hire, fire and promote city workers by the Mayor and newly created personnel officer.

My efforts to bring pay equity to both taxpayers and city workers were continually squashed by then Supervisor Feinstein and Supervisor Molinari. Finally, in 1975, shortly after a disastrous city strike, I was able to place on the ballot, for voter approval, a measure that almost eliminates the power of the Mayor and Supervisors to manipulate the pay of city workers. This measure was overwhelmingly passed by the voters that year and we have not had any labor unrest since that date.

Vote No on “D”!
“D” stands for disaster. It will undo many of these reforms. Also, right now, the City is almost broke, thanks to the manipulation of Mayor Feinstein and her chief ally Supervisor Molinari.

If “D” passes the cost of operating our city government will increase in the next 24 months by not less than $60,000,000. Contrary to the provisions of Proposition 13, property taxes would be increased, thus forcing up rents.

Vote No on “D”.
Don’t weaken our Civil Service Commission, whereby least deserving city employees could be promoted because of connection or clout.

Vote No on “D”.
We now almost have more problems than we can handle. We don’t want our city turned into another Chicago, wherefor for nearly half a century a corrupt political system flourished under Mayor Richard Daley.

John Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We join San Franciscans for Fair Employment in opposing the Civil Service Initiative, Proposition D.

This measure will severely hamper the well-being of the San Francisco Fire and Police Departments. These departments are two of the finest in the Country and have consistently protected life and property in a professional manner. They must continue that tradition with a civil service system based on MERIT and not political patronage.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.
Andrew C. Casper
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired
Keith F. Calden
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired
William F. Murray
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired
Thomas J. Cahill
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired
Donald M. Svat
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Our present Civil Service system was designed to keep corruption out of government. It has generally served that purpose well. This proposition would dismantle that system and in my opinion open the doors to nepotism, favoritism, patronage and corruption. Better a city government that is bureaucratic than one that is corrupt. Vote NO on D.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

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

Proposition D is an attack on the merit system and an attempt to return patronage to the Mayor's office by eliminating the authority of the Civil Service Commission and its built in checks and balances.

The present Civil Service system is not perfect, but corrections can be made within the Charter without destroying a system that has worked for over 50 years and has been free from fraud and corruption.

This proposition will do nothing to improve the caliber of police performance and could have the opposite effect.

I urge you to vote NO on PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by
The San Francisco Police Supervisors and Investigators Association

Don Goad, Captain SFPD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D could be a dangerous first step toward weakening the independent, impartial administration of our City government.

Proposition D would transfer power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor. The Director's decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline and certification would be final. The Commission would have no right to hear examinations or disciplinary appeals.

With the transfer of duties and responsibilities from the Commission to the Mayor's appointed Personnel Director, the Mayor would have control over personnel functions. Currently, commissioners have independent status and can be dismissed for cause. The Personnel Director could be dismissed at will.

The Merit System could be replaced by a patronage system. Proposition D could open the door to rules permitting the Personnel Director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his or her position on the list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Proposition D is NOT a reform package. The checks and balances for efficient City government would be lopsided, with too much power in the hands of unknown future Mayors.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
John L. Molinari, President
Harry G. Brit
Richard Honigso
Willie B. Kennedy
Wendy Neldor
Nancy Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Beware of PROPOSITION D!

Powerful special interest groups are attempting to remove key City employees from the independent and impartial Civil Service system in the name of "reform".

They want instead to make these employees answerable directly to future Mayors and politically-appointed Personnel Directors and department heads.

PROPOSITION D got on the ballot because the Chamber of Commerce and such companies as Pacific Bell and PG&E paid a professional southern California campaign firm, $70,000 to collect signatures.

They're trying to destroy the merit system and replace it with an old-fashioned patronage system.

Department heads will be able to ignore examination scores and reward loyalty rather than competence in promotions and hiring.

Don't let the Chamber of Commerce, big business and their allies in the City bureaucracy dictate who's hired, fired and promoted among public employees.

PROPOSITION D is not just deceptive, it's dangerous!
Vote NO on PROPOSITION D!

Libby Dereheim
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Ron Huberman
Vice-Chairman, Democratic Central Committee
Jim Wadell
Democratic Central Committee
Roberto Esteves
President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Rick Pacurur
President, Harvey Milk Lesbian Gay Democratic Club
Walter L. Johnson
Exec. Secty., S. F. Labor Council
Michael Bernick
Sal Roselli
John Melring
Nancy Walker
Harry Brit
Carole Migden
Jack Morrison
Linda Post
Deborah Stein
Pat Norman
Gwen Craig
Louise Minnick
Agar Jachi
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D places too much power in the hands of ONE. Proposition D will provide for a personnel director to be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. The Mayor now appoints five members of the Civil Service Commission who also serve at her pleasure.

You work for years to climb the civil service ladder and then somebody comes along with an idea to cut you off at the pockets.

Proposition D will lock in all the employees employed in the Mayor's office and will control the appointments of any new staff by the next Mayor elect in 1987 and years thereafter.

Like controlling your estate from the grave.

Vote NO on D.

Marguerite Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service Merit System has served our City well, giving San Franciscans an equal opportunity. It has helped us obtain employment and earn promotions based on objective examinations.

The Civil Service Merit system replaced the old patronage system that rewarded political loyalty more than competence.

Now the supporters of PROPOSITION D want to create a new Personnel Director, accountable only to the Mayor, and give department heads the absolute power to decide who works for the City and who gets promoted.

If PROPOSITION D passes, equal opportunity would give way to opportunity based on membership in the bureaucratic "establishment".

Keep our Civil Service Merit System strong and free from the political abuses of the past.

Vote NO on D!

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly
Ben Tom
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
JoAnne Miller
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
A. Richard Cerbulo
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Sodonia Wilson
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, President
S. F. Community College Governing Board
Julie Tang
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Alan S. Wong
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Henry Der
Albert Chang
Rudy Muruc
Robert "Bob" Morales
Yori Wada

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Can you imagine studying for a civil service examination, being rated at the top of the eligible list and never receiving the promotion? That's exactly what Proposition "D" will do should the electorate adopt this amendment.

The civil service merit system has defects, but to totally eliminate the system and replace it with a patronage system where promotions are based on who you know, rather than what you know is scandalous.

Civil service was put into place to prevent scandal and the "favor seeking" individual from getting a paid position because he/she happened to support the right elected official.

Proposition "D" will allow one person, chosen by the Mayor, to decide who will be promoted, hired and fired. This is awesome power for one single individual to have at any level of government.

Our current Mayor may choose a fair person for this position, but will future Mayors be as careful? As each new Mayor assumes office, the civil service system will again change. The potential to favor one individual or group over others is great.

Proposition "D" has a great potential to diminish the quality of services we now provide to our citizens, as the future of how people are hired and promoted in the San Francisco Police Department is completely unknown.

It's true our promotional system is fraught with delays and delays frustrate us all, but Proposition "D" is not the answer. Proposition "D" will only add to our existing problems. Several years ago, our citizens elected a Charter Commission to streamline city government and make civil service work more efficiently. The voters eventually rejected those proposals. The checks and balances that make our government stable were no longer present. It simply went too far.

Proposition "D" goes even further. It brings about a system of patronage and should be defeated lest we want to engage in "free-wheeling and dealing" of civil service jobs and promotions.

We urge a strong No vote against Proposition "D"!

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry, President
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The purpose of the Civil Service Commission is to ensure that the merit system would be the only criteria in any examination process.

If Proposition D passes, all authority concerning examinations would be taken from the Civil Service Commission and given to a Personnel Director, who is appointed by the Mayor. This Personnel Director would have the authority to hire and fire at his discretion, with no appeal available. This proposition is contrary to everything the Fire Department and all City employees have strived for over the years.

The Civil Service Commission in its present form was instituted to prevent any possibility of a patronage system, where one person has complete control.

This proposition would do nothing to improve your Fire Department. If you are satisfied with the work and make up of the San Francisco Fire Department in its present form, “Vote No On Proposition D”. You will be doing a service for the San Francisco Fire Department, and the people of San Francisco.

Submitted by the San Francisco Fire Chiefs’ Association
John Flaherty, Battalion Chief SFFD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is bad government and bad politics, changing our independent civil service system into a system dominated by the Mayor:

..By shortening the six year terms of Civil Service Commission to conform to the Mayor’s four year term of office.

..By transferring most of the Commission’s powers to a Personnel Director who serves solely at the Mayor’s pleasure.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D fails to offer enough new and improved procedures to cure the current defects in the civil service system. Charter sections and civil service rules are repealed without specific known replacements.

Proposition D transfers power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created personnel director appointed by, and to serve at the pleasure of, the Mayor. The director’s decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline, and certification would be final. The commission would have no right to hear examination or disciplinary appeals.

There are hidden costs with Proposition D because the new Personnel Administration Department will employ a personnel director, and other employees “as may be necessary to carry out (its) functions and duties.”

The Merit System could be replaced by an old style Patronage System. Proposition D could open the door to rules which permit the personnel director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his/her position on the civil service testing list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Police and Fire Commissions would lose functions as a result of the personnel director’s new power. The director’s unlawful employment discrimination policy would be binding upon department administrators. The director’s procedure for employee dispute resolution must be used by all department heads and appointing officers.

Proposition D is not the answer. The checks and balances for efficient city government would be lopsided.

I urge a no vote on Proposition D.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, 17th Assembly District
Sala Burton
Congresswoman
Art Agnos
16th Assembly District
Million Marks
State Senator

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

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

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years? YES 292 NO 293

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission declared Balboa Reservoir South (located across Phelan Avenue from San Francisco City College) surplus in 1984 and made the site available for low, moderate and market rate housing. In July 1985, a City-community advisory committee chose a developer to build 203 single-family homes on the 13 acre site. Construction has not yet begun.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would prohibit granting new building permits and would revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site (Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1) between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit granting any new building permits and you want to revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to allow building permits to be granted for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

Controller's Statement on "E"

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

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

How "E" Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for a three-year ban on development of the Balboa Reservoir site had qualified for the June ballot.

Sidney Kass and Jesse David Wall, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 12,430 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 10,012 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 77
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Having been responsible for providing leadership at City College from 1947 to 1977, we cannot stand by and see this site converted to housing. We must speak out. Such a move would preclude forever the logical and much needed campus expansion to what was once our West Campus. We left that site reluctantly to make way for water storage. If it is no longer required for that purpose, let us return it to City College.

Thousands of San Franciscans — high school graduates, dropouts, veterans, re-entering women — representing all of the city’s diverse ethnic groups, have been prepared for transfer to four-year colleges, profitable careers, and have had their lives enriched at the City College of San Francisco. Without City College’s open door and easy access, many would have been deprived of these opportunities.

Its 56 acre campus originally housed 3,000 students. Now it serves over 23,000. This campus, compared to other community colleges, can be best described as cramped, inadequate, and second rate. The condition of the campus is to be contrasted with the excellence of its programs — which are recognized as among the best in the nation.

Lou Batmale
Chancellor 1970-1977
Louis G. Conlan
President 1947-1970

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION ‘E’

We question:
1. Why no EIR was required when the proposed development could have a substantial impact.
2. Whether the future needs of City College for classrooms, housing, and parking have been considered.
3. What the impact on taxpayers is with below market land sale and construction financing by bonds.

This moratorium will permit adequate study of these issues. Vote YES on Proposition ‘E’.

Bruce Bonacker, President
Board of Directors, Glen Park Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don’t let a developer make a mint on land across from the most overcrowded college in the Bay Area! Parking is already an impossibility for residents near City College...adding 200 homes to this land would make the situation much worse.

It’s simple: a college which can’t find room for more students at a time when more people are returning to education doesn’t serve the community.

This land is being sold at much less than its true value. The development wouldn’t do much to ease the City’s housing crunch, but it would undercut the future of City College and the peace of mind of the neighborhood.

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

You’d probably be upset. We certainly are. Please help us protect our neighborhood. Please vote YES on proposition E.

Westwood Park Residents:
Edna Tucker
Minnie Dorwin
Eugene Eden
Donna Nicoletti
Robert Armstrong
Pauline Armstrong
Joel Martinez
Richard & Lisa Patterson
David Bean
H. Bozzone
William Burke
Richard Robel
Clyde Theriot
Danae Manus
Esma Manus

Sunnyside Residents:
Ellen Wall
Melissa Vohunad
David Wall
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let the greedy developers take this potentially picturesque open space. A yes vote means you want more time to consider its future use. All we ask is time to think and plan.

John Barbagelata
Former member, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Suppose there was a publicly owned open space across the street from the main U.C. Berkeley Campus. Can you imagine for one moment that it would be passed into private ownership? Vote Yes on E for Equality and Excellence in Education.

City College Students:
William Lew, Student
Tim McGuire, Student Council Member
Joseph Goldstein, Student Council Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

In 1952, the "Experts" said we needed reservoirs. They felt so strongly that they condemned the City College West Campus, destroyed the buildings, and constructed the reservoirs—all at taxpayer's expense.

Now, in 1986 with more demand for water, the "Experts" say the reservoir is no longer needed. What is the concerned taxpayer to believe?
When in doubt, the city should hold on to the expensive things already paid for.

Stop the reservoir giveaway. Vote YES on E.

Taxpayers for Preserving the Reservoir.
Richard Patterson
Dorice Murphy
Lucille Carson
Daniel Gutiérrez
Franz Wine
Bernhard Scholand
Ruth Hanson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This is a Planning issue
We have been accused of trying to stop housing for poor people. Not true. In the first place, the price levels are certainly middle income and above, but our main objection is that this badly done plan is damaging to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as to the over-crowded community college across the street.

WHAT WE WANT
Even our critics point out that we originally SUGGESTED housing for that site, but they don't talk about what else we suggested. We want two levels of parking under a City College Library, Bookstore, and Auditorium, with housing on top. Furthermore, let the housing be TRULY affordable—for students and seniors. We are trying to stop the bureaucrats' subsidized middle income housing project because it makes our dream impossible.
We ask for three years to give the neighborhood and the college a chance to produce a better plan.
SNAP (Sensible Neighborhood Planning Committee)

Helen Crizer, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council, representing 17 neighborhood associations in the area of the surplus reservoir property in question has voted to endorse the three-year stop of private construction on the old West Campus of City College.

Dr. Louis Batmale, Chancellor of City College from 1970-1977, has persuaded us that City College needs the lands.

Juanita Raven, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Be a sport.

Give City College a vote of support.

City has 23,000 students and badly needs a library. The only place to put it is in the reservoir site. City College has walked closely with San Francisco for five decades. The reservoir site has always been understood to be reserved for City College.

Until now when someone wants it for housing. Housing is important, but it can be anywhere in town. But a City College library can only be located at the College.

Vote yes to support a book—and a reader.

Reading, studying, writing and research make up our town also.

It is hard to understand criticism of City for wanting to keep this area for a library. Sure, housing sites are at a premium—but even more so a library site for City which is one of the largest schools in the Nation.

Some people blast City for wanting a library because of the need for housing. Housing is needed. But some of those very same people want a big battleship stationed here that will bring in 15,000 new family members.

The Educational and cultural growth of San Francisco mandates living space for the City College library.

If this measure gets a no vote, it means there will be no site for a Library. This is the last chance. Vote YES to help out a book—and a reader.

State financing, when approved, will construct this building. It is the top building priority at City College.

A YES vote here means there will be time to think about the use of the site. During that three year period, cooler heads may realize this is the only site for a Library. If the housing goes in there will be no library there.

Vote yes for a book, for a good school and a better City.

John Riordan, Board of Governors
San Francisco Community College District.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Sunnyside Neighborhood Association is not against housing, but we are trying to stop a hasty and short-sighted plan. We are asking for this moratorium to get time for a better plan that will answer a variety of needs and benefit the entire city as well as our community.

This is a planning issue.

The release of the reservoir property as surplus by the water department came as a surprise to our neighborhood. The June 1984 “Residence Element” of the city’s Master Plan did not even list the land as surplus. By 1985 major decisions were being made for use of the land without adequate neighborhood input.

There were some meetings attended by a few people carefully selected for their zealous pro-housing views or potential financial gain. The resulting plan has gone out of control. Now it benefits only the developer and the lucky few who will get houses on free land.

Proposition E is not an attack on housing.

Please help us save our neighborhood against poor planning by voting YES on Proposition E.

Joe Mahoney, President
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Mirafloma Improvement Club urges a YES vote on Proposition E.

Frank Mastro, President
Arnell Rodrigues

Maggie Kroll
Dorothy Evers

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION E

All the talk in the world can’t change the fact that City College has fewer acres of land relative to its student population than any college in the Bay Area.

Enrollment at City College is INCREASING, as is the enrollment of the San Francisco public schools from which City College draws most of its students. It is obvious that City College needs and deserves the reservoir land. The three year moratorium will gave time to produce a better plan which will have in-

put by faculty, students and alumni who know the college’s needs and want to support it.

Sid Kass
Susie Langdon Kass
Phil Kass
City College Student

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The homeowners of Westwood Park, a neighborhood adjacent to the Balboa Reservoir, support the ballot initiative calling for a 3 year development moratorium. We believe that the City and City College should take additional time to determine their needs and how they might be met by using the Reservoir. In the event that City College does not need this property, we support its development as open space or as single family detached housing.

Westwood Park Association
Don C. Swander
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Let’s not aggravate the traffic problem around City College before we first develop solutions for the existing problems.

A three-year moratorium only buys our neighborhood and elected officials time to find solutions; it doesn’t say no to housing. A YES vote is a vote for prudent development. A YES vote helps to preserve the family character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ken Hoegger
Realtor and community activist

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As representatives of the students of City College, we understand first-hand, the intense need to reserve a site for future school expansion.

Preservation of the Balboa Reservoir, a site directly adjacent to the campus, is particularly crucial. The facilities that CCSF requires, such as a library and an auditorium, are essential to the main structure of the campus. Unlike classrooms, it would be unreasonable to build an auditorium or a library on an off-campus site, since these facilities are integral to the main function of the school.

In short, opposition to the moratorium based on the notion that alternate sites could be secured, is misleading. Once a site near the college is taken, any hope of expansion would be eliminated.

Associated Student Council of City College
Jack Lee, Vice President of Associated Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Local 2121 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, representing City College faculty, urges a yes vote on Proposition E.

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

Yes on E for continued excellence in community college education.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is twice as crowded as any community college in northern California. It needs a much larger library, bookstore and auditorium, and more parking.

The college has always expected to use the empty SOUTH reservoir for educational needs. That land is finally surplus. Neither the college Governing Board nor the Chancellor attended the Mayor’s planning sessions for the property and the faculty was not informed. When the 12.3 acre site was offered to a developer for $36,900 for subsidized housing, the Chancellor said, “We are at a crossroad and the correct path is for the Board of Supervisors, with the Mayor’s support, to deed this surplus land to City College so that the college may continue to serve the city effectively for the next 50 years as it has for the past half-century.” The Mayor refused. Now only Board member John Riordan supports the correct path.

The Water Department says it may need the NORTH reservoir now used for student parking. If that crisis occurs, the Chancellor says, “We’ll deal with the situation then.” How, if the south reservoir is gone?

(continued)
When land is available other community colleges finance large projects through alliances with civic, athletic and cultural organizations, and through property sales. New methods for public funding are being developed.

The faculty would like three years of careful study to unravel misunderstandings and poor management, and to find the best way to be a good neighbor.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College needs land now for desperately needed facilities, one of which is a library. City College has an enrollment of 23,000 students but our library has seating for 450. There are other possible locations for new housing, but City College can’t be moved. Give us an opportunity to plan a development for the community and the college.

Annie M. Young
City College Library Faculty and Staff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty and staff members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco’s community college for our students’ needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Virgie Appling
Bill Carpenter
Matthew Castaneda
Hortensia Chang

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco’s community college for our students’ needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Darlene Allato
Mary Allen
Mary Amaker
Tom Angeloff
Robert Balistreri
Don Bateni
Diana Bernstein
Joe Berry
Anna Bratton
Thomas Brendel
James Bristol
Richard Brongel
Lawrence Broussal
Philip Brown
Barbara Cabral
John Caillen
John Carlu
Frank Cerrato
Rosemary Clark
Perry Close
Kart Connon
Walter Cribbs
George Crippen
Patricia Davis
Guy DePrimo
Edward Diener
Sharon Edwards
Larry Ernst
Mary Erwin
Kurt Fong
William Funke
Terry Greenfield
Robert Griffin
Michael Guthrie
Mary Hanna
Yen Hau Ho
Peter Hoch
Ronald Hochhede
Myrna Holden
Katherine Hendiun
Michael Hubert
Edward Hunt
Frank Ingersoll
Elaine Johnson
Wendy Kaufman
Jo Kennedy
Mercedes Kow
Roland Kock
Don LaFerter
James Lollar
Steve Levinson
Mary Light
Gary Ling
Amelia Lippa
Dave Labbert
Leon Levy
Dawnane Macalou
Marion McManus
Patricia Madigan
Michael Malachowski
Mary Mari
Maria Mariani
Sylvia Marshall
Valerie Mckean
Jose Mejia
Margit Michelmayr
Deanne Milan
Cindy Moody
Thomas Munro
David Myhr
Deborah Nagle
Glenn Nance
Herbert Naylor
William Nett
Dennis Pietkowski
Francine Podenski
Theresa Poydeuss
Solomon Bajou
Mary Randell
Faribor Sayeh
Marvin Schimmer
Fred Schneider
Earl Sleder
Andy Seal
Ken Shen
Robert Struckman
MoStuart Tom
Edward Taylor
Pierc Thiry
Barbara Thomas
Clare Thompson
Wille Thompson
Mary Thurber
Robert Tricaro
James Trulman
Joanne Tumminia
George VonBoetzky
Cherie Wetteh
Austin White
Joan Wilson
Rosalie Wolf
Christina Yee
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Water Department has begun a resource study of water use, due for completion in two or three years. The study may well indicate that one or both reservoirs will be needed. The American Water Works Association states that reservoirs should be used in pairs. This is particularly important because it is the only reservoir at an elevation of 305 feet.

The Mayor twisted the arm of the Water Department to declare one of these reservoirs surplus before the water resource study is completed. Don't let her get away with this kind of political manipulation.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Kurt Common
Ken Crizer
Ed Dierau
Herb Naylor
CCSF Engineering Professors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The South Balboa Basin has been unused since college leased buildings, including a large auditorium, were torn down on that site thirty years ago. We hope that three years of thorough planning would explore the possibility of returning a part of that property to the college for the development of a multi-purpose medium-sized auditorium which could be shared with community groups.

Joseph Alessi
Mary Argenti
Neyda Azvedo
John Bischoff

Robert Bezaia
Mack Crooks
Bob Davis
Helen Dilworth
Franz Enciso
Richard Esterman
Richard Fenner
Lawrence Ferrara
Ted Fleming
Peggy Goham
William Grothkopf
David Hardiman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition E. This moratorium is necessary because there are too many worthy uses for this land to make a hasty and potentially very costly decision. Only through careful planning can the limited land available for development be best used.

Nicos Alexander
Paul Hewitt

Jerome Hylken
Robert Kooar
Jamek Kurck
Dack Lee
Chelelu Liu
William Maynez
Annette Rappleyea
Oleg Reutti
David Wall
City College Physics Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, as Physical Education Instructors, have always been committed to a diversified program for our students and community. The reservoir space is a natural land resource for a Multi Educational and Cultural Center.

Your YES vote on E will allow us the freedom to explore ways that this property could most constructively benefit all.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, full-time faculty of the Computer and Information Science Department of City College, urge a YES vote to postpone the decision until additional planning and surveys can be conducted. The current proposal would negatively impact the College's enrollment.

Nicolae Constantinescu
Robert Decker
Brad Duggar
Tanaka Hagiwara
JoyAnn Hahn
Daniel Hayes

Gail Barton
Curtis Decker
Brad Duggar
Tanaka Hagiwara
JoyAnn Hahn
Daniel Hayes

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

William Beaver
Ronald Cerruti, Chairman
Kirk Gibson
Howard Granger
Frank Holden
Michael Kelly

Lene Johnson
Grover Klemmer
Paula McCullum
Art Octavio
Louise Scourles

George Landi
Norbert Lautkey
Charles Mettler
Charles Miller
Marilyn Schnake

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

A YES vote on Proposition E helps STOP a scheme to GIVE AWAY $12,300,000 worth of City land for $1,800,000 (or less) to a Redwood City real estate developer.

A YES vote will SAVE taxpayers $550,000 per year. The housing project will produce $240,000 in taxes, but supplying City services will cost $790,000 per year.

The Controller's cost estimate does NOT account for the $12,300,000 land value, since land sale below value is NOT technically a cost of government. The Controller also is NOT permitted to assume that the housing project will be constructed, since construction has NOT yet been ordered by the Board of Supervisors.

The plan does NOT restrict housing sales to moderate-income first-time buyers. The plan only restricts use of tax-subsidized funds. Any person favored by the developer or politicians can buy these dwellings and get the benefits of the public land giveaway.

The houses are made "affordable" by giving away the land far below market value, by City-backed low interest, and by cutting construction corners.

The real beneficiaries of the subsidized housing project are the financiers (NOT the project dwellers). Bondholders receive 9.6% average tax-free interest, which is equivalent to 24.6% taxable interest at 61% maximum tax. The developer and bond establishment receive $5,340,000; this is $26,300 (or 22.40%) for each $117,400 unit.

The City loses $51,700 worth of land GIVEN AWAY for each unit.

Vote YES on Proposition E for good fiscal management.

William Marquardt
Financial Analyst, SNaP
Helen Crizer, Treasurer, SNaP

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

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

Name of College | Number of students | Campus (acres) | Area/1000 students
--- | --- | --- | ---
City College of SF | 22,624 | 56 | 2.47
Laney College, Oakland | 9,805 | 59 | 6.02
Chabot College, Hayward | 18,000 | 147 | 8.17
Contra Costa College | 8,500 | 83 | 9.76
College of San Mateo | 13,820 | 153 | 11.07
College of Marin | 6,663 | 77 | 11.56

Given these facts, why does the Governing Board not try to get the old West Campus back? Why don't they support this moratorium to delay the land grab?

The Governing Board is under political pressure from City Hall. They have been threatened with the loss of the north reservoir parking lot and funding for special projects. Forgive them. Vote Yes on E.

Friends of City College
David Newton
Glen Simpson
Jack Baker
Thomas Velasquez
Tillie McCullough

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The student population at City College is increasing. This semester's enrollment is up 1,265 students over last semester.

The enrollment in the San Francisco public schools has been increasing by 1,218 per year for the last three years. City College draws most of its enrollment from public schools in San Francisco.

Obviously, City College will have a larger enrollment in the future years, and will be in desperate need of space if we do not give it back its old West Campus.

Please reserve this public land for the college.
Please vote YES on E.

Barbara Holman

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON E

In 1981, I launched a six-point program to expand San Francisco's housing supply and the voters had approved a City policy to add 20,000 new housing units within five years. This Proposition would destroy a major portion of the effort to build affordable, single-family housing in our city.

The Balboa Reservoir Site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now a site for development of 203 new single-family homes, most with three bedrooms and two baths. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed as other homes built under the City’s program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom could not afford homeownership. It is believed that these new homes will sell rapidly.

The Balboa Reservoir site is one of the few sites large enough to accommodate a substantial number of new homes. Please do not let a few people stop a major opportunity for new housing. Vote no on Prop. E.

Not only would Proposition E halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site, but the 9.8% fixed-rate, 30-year mortgage money set aside for the housing would also be lost.

Nothing constructive is accomplished by this measure—it does not provide additional land or facilities for City College. As a matter of fact, City College has neither plans nor money to use the property. Further, the Community College Board of Directors, the governing body for City College, has voted overwhelmingly to oppose the initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No on E.”

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the site of the unused Balboa Reservoir and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost.

These homes are desperately needed for San Franciscans who can't afford to buy in the city where the average house is selling for over $160,000. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

The homes would be built on land that belongs to the City. Over two years ago, it was declared surplus and available for housing. It is not part of City College, and City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

We urge you to vote no on Proposition E if you want more affordable housing for San Franciscans.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

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

The 203 affordable owner occupied single family units slated for the southern portion of Balboa Reservoir are part of the 1988 total. Our progress in addressing the City's housing shortage will be curtailed if this ill-advised initiative is approved. SUPPORT OWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Housing production is essential to check rising prices and to maintain our social, economic, and ethnic population diversity. AS A SAN FRANCISCO VOTER, YOU CAN BE PART OF OUR HOUSING PROGRESS BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Do not be misled. The Community College Governing Board opposes this initiative. The district does not have any future building plans for this housing site. WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT THE CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY HOUSING BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

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

Doris M. Ward, Member
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

A critical issue facing San Francisco today is the lack of housing middle class San Franciscans can afford.

That is why I have joined these neighborhood associations to support the Balboa Reservoir neighborhood housing proposal. Those participating in the development of the proposal includes:

OMI Community Association
Dorado Terrace Association
Outer Mission-Ingleside
Political Action Committee
Greater Ingleside Community
Mount Davidson Manor
Ocean Avenue Merchants Association
Ingleside Terrace Association
The San Francisco Open Space Committee
City College of San Francisco

From early in 1985 I worked closely with these neighborhood groups in the discussions between city government and community leaders concerning the development plans for this desperately needed new housing at the unused Balboa Reservoir site.

These are the reasons you should vote no on Proposition E:

1. The neighborhood housing proposal that this initiative seeks to stop is the result of months of hard work by the largest coalition of neighborhood associations ever to join together to plan a housing development in San Francisco.

2. The housing at the Balboa Reservoir site was designed with the involvement of the coalition of neighborhood associations to enhance the surrounding community.

3. The governing Board of the Community College District has made clear that they have no plans for the site and no ownership rights to it. City College does not oppose the construction of this development and opposes this initiative.

4. Self-proclaimed “Friends” of City College want to stop the proposal in order to preserve the site for future faculty parking. A clique of City College staffers involved in a neighborhood association pose as community opposition to this development even though a representative from this organization, the Sunnyvale Neighborhood Association, had helped plan and support the proposal.

5. By masquerading as concerned neighbors these self-appointed “friends” of City College hope to prevent the construction of 204 critically needed units of housing and pull off one of the biggest land grabs in San Francisco’s history.

Don’t be fooled. Vote no on Proposition E.

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Residence Element of the Comprehensive Plan of the City and County of San Francisco assesses the City’s housing needs and lays out specific steps to meet those needs. This document was adopted by the City Planning Commission in 1984 after extensive public review at neighborhood meetings and public hearings, and consideration of the detailed Environmental Impact Report.

The first objective of the Housing Element is “to provide new housing for all income groups” in locations appropriate for residential development. To meet this goal, development of housing is to be aggressively pursued and encouraged on surplus, underused and vacant public land.

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

If you want more affordable housing in San Francisco vote no on Proposition E.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Susan J. Bieman, City Planning Commissioner
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on E.

Proposition E deprives San Franciscans of one of their last real chances to become homeowners at an affordable price. At the South Balboa Reservoir we have City-owned land on which 203 units of three-bedroom, two-bath homes can be built at low prices which average San Franciscans can afford to pay. These homes need to be built now, not in three years. In three years the low interest rates on mortgages and the bond financing will be gone. Two hundred families will have lost the opportunity to become homeowners, and the City will have lost the opportunity to ease the tight market in rental housing.

Nor does this ill-conceived initiative help City College in any way. City College does not need this land. Speculation that the College may at some future date find a use for the land is not founded on fact. The College may never be able to build on the reservoir. Their enrollment has dropped by over 4000 students in the last few years.

This initiative is designed to confuse you. It will make our housing shortage worse for three long years. If you support affordable housing in our City, Vote NO on Proposition E.

—Bill Maher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Balboa Reservoir site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now planned for development of 203 new single family homes. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed — other homes built under this program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom would not otherwise be able to afford home ownership.

San Francisco has the most expensive housing in the nation where last year the average home sold for over $160,000. Housing is difficult to produce because the obstacles are great — little land on which to build, high construction costs and uncertain interest rates.

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost. The initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional land or facilities for City College. The Community College Board, the governing body of City College, in fact recently voted to oppose this initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No” on Propositon E.

—John L. Molinari

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

In 1980, the voters of the City and County of San Francisco approved a measure making it City policy to add 20,000 new units of housing within five years. In 1984 in an effort to satisfy this objective, the Board of Supervisors adopted a policy encouraging the expansion of the City’s housing supply. Making surplus City-owned land, such as the site at Balboa Reservoir, available for affordable housing was an important part of that policy. A proposal to build 203 homes on the unused Balboa Reservoir site was advanced to help implement the pro-housing policy.

Approval of Proposition E would HALT construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.

The Balboa Reservoir homes would be built on land currently belonging to the City and County of San Francisco. The property IS NOT part of the City College, and City College has neither plans or money to buy the property and convert it for City College use.

The only debatable issue is the future of affordable housing on the Balboa Reservoir site.

As we are all aware, San Francisco has the most expensive homes in the United States. The average cost of a home is $152,000. Not many can afford such prices. However, the housing proposed for the Balboa Reservoir will give many more citizens the opportunity to become homeowners. The homes to be built will be sold to first-time buyers at prices ranging from $83,000 to $145,000.

Other homes built in San Francisco under the direction of similar affordable housing programs have been snapped up quickly by San Franciscans. Without the program, most would not have been able to purchase the home and become homeowners.

Again, if you desire to preserve the construction of more affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site, vote “NO” on Proposition E.

—Willie B. Kennedy
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

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

When some vacant surplus City land (12 acres) finally becomes available for 203 additional new private homes there will always be some selfish individuals who are in favor of new housing "just so long as it is not built across the street from me!" This unused, vacant City reservoir land hasn't generated a dime of taxes for over thirty years! Let's add 203 NEW home-owner taxpayers to the City's rolls as quickly as possible.

Stop these self-serving no-growth obstructionists! Please vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Prop E would halt affordable housing construction at the Balboa Reservoir site. Many gay people need affordable housing, too, and we join with other community groups urging you to vote NO on Prop E.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Robert Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E, if approved, would block the construction of 203 badly needed single-family homes on the south portion of the Balboa Reservoir in San Francisco. Sixty percent of these homes would be available for purchase by moderate and middle income families at purchase prices between $80,000 and $120,000. They would be constructed on surplus public land and financed by the sale of mortgage revenue bonds to enable the developer to sell the homes at below market prices.

A neighborhood group headed by two city college faculty members is responsible for placing Proposition E on the ballot. The group contends that the land which is intended to be used for the project should be made available instead to City College for the construction of new teaching facilities even though enrollment at City College is declining and the City College Board has voted 6 to 1 to oppose the initiative.

Like many other areas of the country, San Francisco suffers from a shortage of housing. Purchase prices here are among the highest in the nation. The use of surplus public lands and revenue bond financing provide a means for making single family homes available to a broad spectrum of families at affordable prices.

The Balboa Reservoir project is supported by the leaders of 8 neighborhood groups in the area surrounding the location of the proposed project and by a majority of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, as well as by Mayor Dianne Feinstein. We urge you to encourage the construction of this type of housing in San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition E.

San Francisco Board of Realtors
William L. Jansen, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

SAVE OUR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS!
BERSAL HEIGHTS SAYS, "VOTE NO ON PROP EI!"

We are residents of Bernal Heights in San Francisco. We’ve worked hard to build affordable family and senior citizen homes in our neighborhood.

We need more affordable housing in our City to survive. The real issue in Prop E is affordable family housing—a “yes” vote prevents the construction of 203 family homes. That’s crazy! Join us in preserving what’s best in our City. Vote “no” on Prop E!

Sylvia M. Yue, Bernal Heights Community Foundation Board of Directors***
Frank Huchins, BHCF Board*
Mary Lou Beretta, BHCF Board*
Lela Havener, BHCF Board*
Elizabeth Egger, BHCF Board*
Sister Janet Simons, BHCF Board*
Stephen Antonaras, BHCF Board*
Lorenzo R. Dill, BHCF Board*
Barbara Bagot, BHCF Board*
Margaret C. Randolp, Northwest Bernal Block Club*
Maureen Lawler, NWBBC*
Tim Molinaro, BHCF Planning & Dev’t Committee*
Buck Bagot, BHCF P & D Committee*
**Organization for identification purposes only.
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Balboa Reservoir
Development Ban

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco Needs Affordable Housing — Vote No on Proposition E

Everyone agrees that San Francisco needs affordable housing. The questions are how and where that affordable housing can be built.

The Balboa Reservoir housing development, to be built on the site of a reservoir built thirty years ago and unused since that time, answers those important questions for more than 200 San Francisco first-time home-buying families by providing:

— 203 new affordable three-bedroom, single family homes
— 9.8% fixed-rate financing
— A mix of 30% low-income, 30% moderate-income and 40% market-rate first time buyers
— A convenient site that has been declared “surplus” by the City and “available for development of affordable housing”

The Balboa Reservoir housing development is a small but significant step in the effort to generate affordable housing in our City.

Thousands of San Franciscans from every community, neighborhood group and viewpoint agree that the Balboa Reservoir development is good for San Francisco. Virtually every elected official, including the Governing Board of City College also agree.

All these San Franciscans ask you to say “yes” to affordable housing and “NO” to Proposition E.

San Francisco Coalition for Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar, Executive Director

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The viable plan for affordable single family housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site is being threatened by Proposition E. If Proposition E passes, 203 single family homes will be lost to the citizenry of San Francisco at a time when they are greatly needed.

The facts about the proposed housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site argue strongly against Proposition E. All 203 homes will be for first time home buyers. One-third of the homes will be available to households earning $27,000. Another third of the homes will be available to households earning $36,000. Adequate parking will be provided within the development itself, thus answering any concerns that traffic in the area will be congested.

City College has no need or plan to use South Balboa Reservoir for its facilities. City College’s priority is to develop its existing campus. South Balboa Reservoir should therefore be used for one of the City’s greatest needs: increased and affordable housing which is available to lower and middle income families.

As homeowners who live in the vicinity of South Balboa Reservoir, we welcome its planned use for single family housing and feel it will become an integral and contributing part of the community. We therefore urge you to vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Submitted by:
Stephen Graham, Chairman of the Housing Sub-committee of the Citizen’s Committee for Community Development
Roderick A. McLeod, Vice-Chairman of the Citizen’s Committee on Community Development

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing is a group of neighbors which consists of many of the renters of Westwood Park and Sunnyside neighborhoods as well as owners and renters of Ingleside which are the closest neighbors to the Balboa Reservoir along with some of the students and teachers of City College.

We strongly support the Balboa Reservoir for housing. We believe that the Balboa Reservoir is an ideal spot for housing.

Our neighborhood wants homes in the South Balboa Reservoir:
Vote No On Prop. E.

Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughey
Submitted by Patricia Vaughey

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

As Merchants as well as residents of Ocean Avenue, Greater Ingleside and San Francisco, we support the Development of the Balboa Reservoir as housing.

A Traffic Survey has stated that there will be minimal impact on the existing patterns of traffic by this development.

Additional City College Parking is being considered on another location off 1-280 to keep the college congestion away from the neighborhood’s streets.

City College has 44 more acres in which to expand and existing buildings at City College have viable means to expand.
We believe that housing on the Balboa Reservoir is the most viable solution to develop a vacant piece of property that is directly adjacent to our stores on a Transpreferential Street. Affordable housing is in great need in San Francisco and is as much needed here as anywhere. We want to help provide this need. Vote No on Prop. E.

Ocean Avenue Merchants Assoc.
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughey
Submitted by Patricia Vaughey

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction on much-needed affordable, single-family housing at the long vacant south Balboa Reservoir site. This proposition would also block a major housing development that would bring jobs into an area of the city that has little industry or private business.

Sale prices for these units are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the San Francisco housing market, where the average home is selling for $160,000. Construction of these homes will help all young, first-time home buyers and will require only 5% down, instead of the 20% down payment on houses bought with conventional home mortgages.

This plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by nine nearby neighborhood organizations. If Proposition E is approved and this project is blocked, more young adults will purchase their first home in Vallejo or some other outlying area, further draining San Francisco of the young families that every growing community needs.

San Francisco residents will gain apprenticeships, jobs, contracts and subcontracts from this development.

This plan calls for 2 and 3 bedroom, family-sized houses, with space for another bedroom which can be finished when needed.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided — 2⅛ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Affordable Housing Alliance — Mitchell Omerberg, Director
Bay Area Urban League — Gregory Best, Field Representative
Bernal Heights Community Foundation — Andre Lentell Deye
Community Educational Services — Dorothy Chen, Executive Director
Japanese Community Youth Council St. Francis Square Apartments, Inc. — Sandra Mayor-Jenkins, Secretary
Minority Contractors Association of Northern California — James Haugebock, Secretary, Board of Directors
National Community Congress — Dr. Eddie C. Welbon
PARKMarket Residents Organization, Inc. — Ricardo A. Callejo, Esq.
Petrozo Hill Neighborhood House — Ethyl Maxwell
San Francisco Building Trades Council — Stan Smith
San Francisco Housing & Tenants Council — Joseph Lacey
San Francisco Tenants Union — Jim Faye
Res. Amos C. Brown — Local Pastor & Community Servant
Greg Day — Chairman, Citizens Committee on Community Development
Polly V. Marshall — Commissioner, San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
Regina A. Sneed
Jim Wachtel — San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Michael E. Willis, AIA — Planning Corporation
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Greater Ingleside Political Club — Frank Noto, Treasurer
Housing Conservation and Development Corporation — Lonnie Lawson, Board of Directors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

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

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Bayview Baptist Minister Fellowship — Rev. N. B. Mills, President
Bread of Life Missionary Baptist Church — Rev. S. A. Bailey
Cosmopolitan Baptist Church — Rev. A. Ray Gentle
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Raymond M. Howard Sr.
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Carole Nelson
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Cornelius P. O'Reilly
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Paul G. Thieß
Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee — Charles Gale, Chairman
St. Peters Housing Committee — Tessa Rouverol

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON’T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

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

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: With certain exceptions, City officers, including elected officials and commission members, may represent clients before City boards and commissions other than their own, and be paid for their services. State legislators may represent clients before City boards and commissions, and be paid for their services. Any person may contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would prohibit City officers from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay. This proposition would prohibit State legislators from appearing before City boards, commissions and departments on behalf of clients for pay. City officers would be prohibited from discussing with these officers and legislators matters that the City is deciding. Proposition F would also prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit City officers and State legislators from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to allow City officers and State legislators to represent clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to allow any person to contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

Controller's Statement on "F"

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

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 77

How "F" Got on Ballot

On February 26 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for limitations on compensated advocacy and campaign contributions had qualified for the June ballot.

Quentin Kopp, Marth Gillham and Cheryl Arenson, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 9,400 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,986 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The purpose of Proposition F is to cut campaign contributions by large contributors (and thus reduce campaign spending) and eliminate undue influence by officeholders retained as paid lobbyists for projects requiring City approval. Let’s take a minute to analyze the untrue arguments against Proposition F.

- The opponents claim that Proposition F will force half the City’s Commissioners to resign. In fact, Proposition F does not force any Commissioners to resign. It simply says they can’t be a paid lobbyist and a City Commissioner at the same time. Does a commissioner value making money by lobbying more than public service?
- Some have also alleged that Proposition F will prevent duly-elected union leaders from serving as City Commissioners. No it won’t. Proposition F prohibits “compensated advocacy” — that means lobbyists hired by an organization, not members of the organization itself. Proposition F does not apply to salaried employees of labor unions, corporations, or non-profit agencies. Moreover, Section 8.105 of the Charter precludes it specifically from applying to any member serving as a representative of any profession, trade, business, union or association on any board or commission which requires membership of representatives of specific professions, trades, businesses, unions or associations.
- Another untrue argument against Proposition F is that it prohibits City officials only from discussing pending issues with other City officials or State Legislators who are also acting as paid lobbyists in a matter and doesn’t stop those officeholding lobbyists from writing City officials about their clients’ objectives. That’s not so. Proposition F applies to all such lobbying, written or oral. (The dictionary defines “discuss” as “to examine by means of speech or writing.”)

End government decision-making by “insiders” and reduce the influence of money on local campaigns.

VOTE YES ON F.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
San Franciscans for Good Government

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

In all our years of observing San Francisco City government, we have found one maxim to be true time after time: a good idea gets copied, especially among politicians.

For no sooner did Quentin Kopp promise to bring Proposition F to the voters than did Mayor Feinstein come up with an informal, administrative version of her own. Fine, you say (and the Mayor says), then why vote Yes on Proposition F?

(1) The Mayor’s remedy of asking City Commissioners who also act as lobbyists before City agencies to resign is nothing more than a hand slap, and is good only as long as she is mayor. It’s not binding on future mayors and could be changed without any vote of the Board of Supervisors, let alone the people of San Francisco. Proposition F prohibits this kind of conflict-of-interest, and it will be the law, no matter who is mayor.

(2) The Mayor’s action did nothing to state legislators who can also act as lobbyists before City Boards and Commissions, nor did her action stop the law or business partners of City Commissioners from picking up the slack in big-money lobbying. Proposition F will stop these practices in their tracks.

(3) What about the other half of Proposition F, which reduced the campaign contribution limit to $500 so that all San Franciscans can enjoy equal access to City officials, not just the ones with the big bucks? The Mayor can’t do anything about this, and she hasn’t. Only a Yes vote on Proposition F will reduce the weight of big money and ensure our full voice in City elections and City government.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. If it’s important enough for the Mayor to copy part of it administratively, it’s important enough to do the job right and make it a law.

John J. Barbogolata
Harry Aeo
June Cahn
Dorothy Partridge

Robert Arenson
Rudolph Lohneis
Janet Wentworth

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The worst and most persistent problem in American politics is that politicians and political races can be “bought”. Reducing the size of campaign contributions will be a step forward in reducing the role of money in elections. Vote yes for more honest government.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

RESTORE to the people their rightful and equal power as individual voters by reducing the monetary clout and influence of private interests who make the laws and the policies as City officials and Commissioners or State legislators.

TELL the special interests that their money and influence can no longer interfere with representative government.

TELL the special interests that the voters will no longer tolerate the influence-buying which comes with large campaign contributions.

TELL the special interests that this measure will encourage highly talented citizens to serve San Francisco honestly and responsibly.

VOTE YES ON F.

Cheryl Arenson
Anne Renfrew
David Pacheco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

“Government of the people, by the people, and for the people.”

These noble words from Abraham Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address, cast in bronze at the entrance to City Hall, seem to have escaped the attention of some City officials who pass by them every day. For in San Francisco City government, Lincoln’s simple formula for representative government would read quite differently: “Government of the powerful, by the lobbyists, and for the wealthy.”

Government of, by, and for the privileged few is bad government. Government of, by, and for all the people is good government. It’s as simple as that—as simple as Lincoln first put it.

Proposition F, the Good Government Initiative, will help San Franciscans maintain control of their government and will prevent undue influence by City officeholders.

To reduce undue influence, Proposition F outlaws the practice of City Commissioners and State Legislators representing special interests for pay before City Commissions and Boards. City Commissions should render their decisions deliberately and impartially, not be swayed by the political clout of the lobbyists appearing before them, or by any political favors those lobbyist/politicians might promise. “I’ll scratch your back if you scratch my back” bargains do not belong in government. And until such backroom bargains are made illegal, City government will not belong to the rest of us either.

Proposition F also reduces the maximum amount that anyone can give to a local candidate from $1,000 to $500. If large contributors and other special interests can’t give as much money, they can’t buy as much influence with elected officials. And the lower the contribution limit, the less campaign spending and the more City government will be responsive to all San Franciscans.

You can “buy back” City government from the privileged and powerful with the most precious of all political commodities: your vote.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Mary Lohneis
Peter Fatooh
Judith Thorson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F, an initiative of the people, is needed to protect the voters and the integrity of the legislative process from being corrupted by the power of money and influence. It prevents City officials and State Legislators from lobbying the City on behalf of high-powered special interests. It also lowers the campaign contribution limit from $1,000 to $500, thus reducing the influence of those same special interests over our elections and elected officials.

The bogus argument that the Mayor won’t be able to find qualified people to serve on City commissions if Proposition F is adopted ignores the plain fact that there are 700,000 people in San Francisco, a pool of civic-minded citizens more than large enough to accommodate the 250 commission appointments available in our City government. For example, there are plenty of architects to fill the one architectural appointment on the Art Commission, just as there are plenty of non-lobbyist business people and lawyers available to serve on other commissions.

Thousands of San Franciscans, not just the “insiders”, are ready, willing, and able to serve the public.

Proposition F deserves your vote. Restore integrity to City government. Restore the confidence of the citizens of San Francisco in that government. Let’s have no more Wilkes Bashford situations.

VOTE YES ON F.

Oscar Surro
Martha Gillham
Marguerite Warren

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE "NO" ON F

This proposition disguises itself as "good government" but, in reality, would drive good people out of government. It is so crudely drawn — so sweeping in its implications — that it would bar from government almost anyone with even a remote business or community tie to government.

It would purge from City commissions anyone who "directly or indirectly" receives compensation from any "interests" with an issue before any City agency. Effectively, this could discriminate against employees from community and neighborhood groups, civil rights organizations, non-profit corporations, labor unions, merchant and business groups, as well as architects, lawyers and other professionals.

Actually, there currently are no commissioners who represent any clients before any City agency. All who are appointed in my administration sign a statement saying they will not advocate for any paying client before any official body of the City while they are commissioners. This proposition simply is not necessary.

Proposition F also would lower the limit for any individual campaign contribution from $1000 to $500. Although this sounds good, it would permit a wealthy person with various businesses and numerous family members to contribute many thousands of dollars through different sources. This would encourage "hidden" contributions. We must strive for disclosure of contributions, not a system which drives contributions underground. Candidates must be able to raise funds enough to put their message before the voters. Reducing the contribution limit can be a tactic to discourage persons from challenging incumbents.

Vote no on Proposition F.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition F purports to achieve a noble objective: The removal of "influence peddling" from City Hall. In fact, Proposition F is so poorly-crafted, it may have exactly the opposite effect on City government. It is not a "good government" initiative. It is bad legislation.

Proposition F provides no definitions and no standards for the public to judge whether City officials comply with its restrictions. Its uncertainties will be chaotic and lead to endless, needless lawsuits.

A measure similar to Proposition F was rejected by the Board of Supervisors because no public hearings were ever held on the legislation. If the public had had a chance to comment on this initiative, it might not have the critical shortcomings, deficiencies and uncertainties that now warrant its rejection by responsible San Franciscans.

In the coming months, the Board will review good government measures that are comprehensible, effective and, most important, certain. Proposition F is a misguided disaster.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

This should properly have been titled the "SINK WILLIE BROWN ORDINANCE"! The "meat of the coconuts" is in Section 4.

Supervisor Kopp's intentions are good, however this sloppily drafted and incomprehensible measure succeeds in "burning down the barn" to eliminate a couple of rats!

Under this proposal, to avoid any potential INDIRECT conflict of interest, (which is undefined!), one would have to be a destitute, unemployed welfare recipient to qualify for service on any City Board or Commission! The Mayor has already solved this "hired advocacy" problem with the "conflict of interest" affidavits she demands IN ADVANCE from any prospective appointee.

Quentin's proposed $500.00 campaign contribution limit is an "inside joke" and he, of all people, knows it! It merely obliges a heavy contributor to have his wife, children, business associates, or friends send in SEPARATE $500.00 checks if he wants to contribute more than $500.00 to a politician's campaign.

These proposals require additional City employees for enforcement and wind up doing far more harm than good. Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

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

Union members and labor officials have legitimate reasons for meeting with City officers. It is unfair and wrong to lump them in the same category as special interest lobbyists, yet that's exactly what Proposition F does. Working people deserve representation on City boards and commissions. VOTE NO!

Walter Johnson
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council
LeRoy King
James Elliot
Keith Eckman
Reeva Olson

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

If you want to ban business owners and executives from serving on City boards and commissions, then vote for Proposition F.

If you think board members of non-profit corporations and employees of community agencies have nothing to contribute to City government, then vote for Proposition F.

If you believe union members and labor officials should not have a voice at City Hall, then vote for Proposition F.

But if you share our belief that these individuals have legitimate concerns and expertise that is valuable in running major City departments, then join us in voting NO on Proposition F.

Proposition F is a simplistic, sloppily-drafted, meat-axe approach to a problem already resolved by Mayor Feinstein's ban on commissioners lobbying on behalf of private clients.

Proposition F is not good government and it is not reform. Proposition F is bad legislation. VOTE NO.

Hon. Amy Meyer
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Walter Jebe
Hon. Bruce Lilienthal
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Jean Kortum
Hon. Thomas Horn
Hon. Henry Berman
Hon. Robert McCarthy
Hon. Richard Guggenheimer
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Hon. Patrick McGrew
Hon. Kirk Miller
Hon. Melvin Lee
Hon. Jerry Berg
Hon. Bonnie Gibson
Hon. Mary Noel Pepys
Hon. Mark Buell
Hon. Tim Carrico
Hon. Jo Hanson
Hon. Kevin Malone
John Sanger
Tom Moore

Hon. Douglas Engemann
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Eugene Friend
Hon. Phyllis Lyon

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

We're sympathetic to the need for political reform. But it's a complicated problem, and Proposition F just isn't the way to go.

Frankly, we can't tell who is and isn't affected by this measure. While a handful of people sometimes might abuse their positions, that's no reason to question the integrity of so many solid citizens who give tirelessly to public service. Proposition F is simply the wrong approach. Please join us in voting NO.

William E. McDonnell
Frances May McAteer
N. A. Sapunar
Caroline and Michael Figoni

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Concerned about elected officials spending $400,000 to run for supervisor and $1 million on a mayor's race? Then vote NO on Proposition F.

That's right. NO.

Proposition F isn't going to do anything about campaign spending. Prop F simply limits the size of contributions, reducing the current limit from $1,000 to $500. Supervisors can and will continue spending outrageous sums on their re-election campaigns. With Proposition F they'll just spend twice as much time raising money from twice as many sources, and that makes special interests even more powerful. They can always find ways around campaign limits.

We need campaign spending reform, but Proposition F doesn't provide it. Please join us in voting No on F.

District 8 Democratic Club
Stephen L. Tuber
Ruth Gravantis
Alan Raznick
Miriam Blaustein

Linda Chapman
Dale Carlson
James Firth
Debra Barnes
Lew Serbin
Debra Stein
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

When campaign contributions are limited, political freedom suffers. Your right to free speech includes not only your right to express your views, but also your right to support as much as you want, any candidate who speaks for you.

Minority viewpoints depend heavily on the contribution of a few dedicated supporters to get your message out. To limit your financial support of your beliefs is to silence your political voice.

Only incumbents, who have many opportunities for free media exposure benefit from this assault on free speech. The dangers of a campaign contribution limit far outweigh any possible benefit from this proposition. Defeat Proposition F!

San Francisco Libertarian Party Michael R. Fowler, Secretary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

You may think Prop F only applies to big-time lawyers and a few legislators who represent developers. Think again!

Prop F would prohibit many community leaders from public service. If it passes, board members and employees of community and charitable organizations could be banned from serving on City boards and commissions.

We appreciate the public need for a government free of “influencing peddling.” But restrictions on “compensated advocacy” ought to be clearly and carefully crafted to protect the voices of community leaders who argue on behalf of the public interest, not private special interests.

Vote No.

Hon. Juanita Del Carlo Mission Hiring Hall

Bob Ross Publisher, Bay Area Reporter

Hon. Jeffrey Ken Mori Japanese Community Youth Council, Inc.
Bill O'Callahan American Red Cross
Hon. George Sunic Horizons Unlimited
Hon. Jean Rita Aiviar Mission Education Project
Hon. Greg Day Polk Street Town Hall
Hon. Naomi Gray Hon. James Roter
Carol Weng Marlena Marseille
Lee Woods Jo Daly
Dennis Collins Hon. H. Welton Flynn
(Organizations listed only for purposes of identification.)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will have no effect on developers’ lawyers.
None.
It won’t make any difference to state legislators either.
Don’t kid yourself. This is not “reform” and it isn’t “good government.” Proposition F will allow the special interests and influence peddlers to continue exercising influence over our elected officials. It has so many loopholes, lobbying will actively continue, untouched, in the back rooms of City Hall.

And developers will always find ways around campaign contribution limits. As Common Cause has noted, Prop F simply makes tracing their dollars more difficult for the public.

Real reform would directly attack the source of huge contributions—the developers and other special interests that employ the lobbyists to peddle their influence.

VOTE NO.

Sue Hestor Calvin Welch David Looman Michiel Mason
Rich Waller
Susaun Klugerman
Rene Cazenave
Margie O’Driscoll

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON’T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

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

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?

YES 300

NO 301

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has adopted an ordinance prohibiting the City, with certain exceptions, from purchasing goods or services from companies doing business with South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a declaration of policy that says the City must try to avoid doing business with companies that significantly profit from or help maintain the Apartheid system in South Africa. It calls on other public bodies and private groups to adopt similar policies. It directs the Board of Supervisors to identify the companies which have the greatest ties to Apartheid so that the public can also boycott those companies.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to avoid doing business with companies that help maintain Apartheid, and you want a public boycott of those companies.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to adopt this policy.

Controller's Statement on "G"

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

"The proposed Declaration of Policy be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

Polls Close at 8:00 P.M.

How "G" Got on Ballot

On November 6, 1985 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for the City to boycott businesses with significant ties to South Africa had qualified for the June ballot.

Arlo Hale Smith, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,546 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on October 11.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,941 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters:

It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This measure calls for a public boycott of companies that aid apartheid.

Any claim of "conflict" between Proposition G and existing anti-apartheid legislation is imaginary: It is the legislative intent of supporters of this measure that it can be construed as a directive for making existing law tougher.

Personal attacks have no legitimate place in a ballot measure campaign. As proponent of this measure, I repudiate all such tactics.

Vote NO on apartheid. Vote YES on Propositon G.

Arlo Hale Smith

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Boycotts are grassroots politics. They've helped the farmworkers, they've helped win integration, and they can help end the legal racism called "Apartheid".

A Gallup poll found 77% of South Africa's black majority favoring international economic boycotts to force the Apartheid regime to accept reform peacefully.

After the Boycott Initiative made the ballot, the San Francisco Supervisors unanimously passed a similar city purchasing policy. The issue that remains is whether to call on the general public to join in, boycotting companies identified by the Supervisors as the worst offenders in each industry.

The companies that would be targeted consider profits to be the "bottom line". Economic pressure is all they understand.

The AFL-CIO, NAACP, and NOW have called a boycott of Shell Oil because of its profiteering from South Africa's oppressive economic conditions. Proposition G supports that and would put the same pressure on other industries as well.

This proposition is supported by the elected county central committee of the Democratic Party, the Peace-and-Freedom Party and the Humanist Party, and by leading attorneys, such as Terry Francois, Terence Hallinan, Tony Serra, Lewis Hope Lee, Marc Van Der Hout, Abby Ginsberg and Terence Redmond.

If South Africa were a democracy, its majority would long ago have voted to end Apartheid. We need to vote Yes — because they can't.

Atty. Arlo Hale Smith, Democratic Party County Central Committee
Paul Kangas, Peace and Freedom Party
Lois Salisbury, Public Advocates*
Dr. Kevin Danaher, Food First*
Jesse James, Mission Rebels
Terry Collins, Community Activist
Stony Gebert, Election Action
Robert McCall, Hotel & Restaurant Employees
Executive Board Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Attorneys speak out against Apartheid:

South African police can arrest anyone without charge. They can hold you incommunicado — no contacts with family, lawyers or press.

They regularly censor news, books, music. They have banned Christmas caroling, funerals and other peaceful gatherings. Groups which criticize the government are forbidden to hold meetings.

Blacks are subject to legal segregation; their property and employment rights are greatly restricted; often, they are simply murdered.

As attorneys, we help people who have legal rights that are being violated. But what can we do for those who have no legal rights?

Boycotts and other economic sanctions are the only way to make the Apartheid government accept reform peacefully.

In the Court of World Public Opinion, Apartheid has been convicted of crimes against humanity. By imposing a sentence of economic isolation, we can end Apartheid.

Vote Yes — take a stand for justice.

Terence Hallinan
Arlo Hale Smith
Terry Francois
Karen Anderson Ryer
Robert R. Bryan

Ann Menasche
Rachel Ginsburg
Loo Pouri
Gabriel Gesmer
Ora Prouchovnick

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
South Africa Boycott

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is a moderate, responsible but effective proposal to bring economic pressure on the South African government to establish constitutional rights for all of its citizens.

Vote Yes.

Terence Faulkner, Republican
Mike Garza, Republican

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

All decent Americans abhor apartheid. However, boycotting U.S. investment in South Africa is counterproductive; it only penalizes the actual victims of apartheid.

U.S. international firms have acted as progressive agents for change through the Sullivan principles. Their investments have improved the social and economic condition of the labor force. It is improper to penalize their positive contributions.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

We are individuals and organizations working actively to end the racist system of apartheid in South Africa. And we are voting NO on Proposition G.

Why?

(1) Because Proposition G will weaken San Francisco's present divestment law. This law requires companies doing business with the city to sign affidavits that they will make no new contracts with South Africa.

Proposition G has no such provision.

(2) Proposition G provides no mechanism or funding to carry out its declared purpose of "boycotting" South Africa.

Proposition G will not stop South African products from entering the Port of San Francisco.

Vote against this useless, confusing, and deceptive initiative.

Preserve the stronger divestment law San Francisco already has. Vote NO on Proposition G!

Yvonne Golden
Geraldine Johnson
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
AFT 2121 Anti-Apartheid Committee
Artists Against Apartheid
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition of Black Trade Unions
Coalition of Conscience
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club Executive Committee
ILWU 10 and SEIU 250 Southern Africa Liberation Support Committees
National Conference of Black Lawyers
San Francisco Anti-Apartheid Committee
Southern Africa Freedom Committee/All Peoples Congress

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $30 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1983 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!
AIDS Research

PROPOSITION H

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council? YES 303 NO 304

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Several city and private agencies conduct various programs related to AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a declaration of policy that says San Francisco should support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council, consisting of a Committee on Education and a Fund-Raising Committee. The Research Committee would make recommendations on the most useful AIDS research projects and try to prevent duplication of efforts. The Education Committee would inform the public about the latest research and about ways to prevent AIDS. The Fund-Raising Committee would seek donations and grants for AIDS research and education projects.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

Controller’s Statement on "H"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

“The proposed Declaration of Policy for an AIDS research and education council and the formation of advisory committees of civic leaders would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, additional expenditure of public funds for AIDS research may result, the amount of which cannot be determined.”

How “H” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for AIDS research had qualified for the June ballot.

Stony Gebert, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 10,540 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on December 6, 1985.

A check of each signature on the petition showed that 7,564 of the signatures were valid. This is more than 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We need a council to expose and address major AIDS issues without the impasse of present medical/political bias.

As taxpayers, we are subsidizing a treadmill of continual AIDS casualties. There are major oversights where AIDS is concerned. Only recently was it learned that CDC statistics suggest 79% of early AIDS cases appear drug-related. We hear AIDS is 100% fatal. Perhaps that is because death may also be drug-related in the way of immuno-suppressive antibiotic and radiation overloads to already compromised immunity systems. Prevailing medicine is both tunnel-visioned and high-profit motivated. Also well-funded. This solution may be part of the problem. Some physicians are beginning to feel where AIDS is concerned many current practices are ethically, medically bankrupt.

Remissions occur. Largely through immunity-enhancing, holistic medicine. Significantly, only 1% of AIDS cases occur among people at risk in the Asian community. Perhaps this is due to less drug abuse or use of an unfunded, ignored resource: herbology as part of diet. More options: homeopathy, acupuncture, etc.

If, as anticipated, upwards of 40% of those testing positive come down with AIDS, we may become overburdened. To ignore all of the above becomes part of the problem. Vote Yes on Proposition H.

Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Rich McKirkeby, Former Orderly, Marketing Associate, Pacific Bell
Joseph P. Clady, AIDS Hospice, Shanti Counselor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There is great need for research and education about AIDS and related conditions.

John Lorenzini, President, People With AIDS Alliance
Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Jan Beck, Steven Russell, Eugene Evins, ARC/AIDS Vigil

We need to attack the disease, not its victims.
Knowledge is the only vaccine available today.
Vote Yes.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There are many possible treatments for AIDS and related conditions which are not being examined by the federal government, especially therapies based on natural substances and processes.

Vote Yes for an AIDS Research Council open to all viewpoints.

Scott Gregory, M.D.
Paul Kangas

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A tape recording (Talking Book) of the San Francisco Voter Information pamphlet is available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name___________________________________________________________

Address______________________________________________________ Apt. # ______

Telephone No. (required)________________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): ____________________________

Second choice locations (if any)____________________________________

Signature_______________________________________________________
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PROPOSITION I
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway? YES 307 NO 308

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the Freeway with a surface roadway.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City’s policy to remain as it is, and you want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to change the City’s policy, and you do not want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a policy statement asking whether or not the Embarcadero Freeway should be torn down.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway demolished, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by at least $10.2 million in local funds. Potential private sector financing and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “I” Got on Ballot

On March 3 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy placing the question of demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway before the voters had qualified for the June ballot.

Richard Hongisto, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 11,119 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,720 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land now under the Broadway ramps is put back on the tax rolls, with low-rise buildings limited by restrictive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when united with Proposition J, recognizes these facts:

1) The Embarcadero Freeway is what is left of a never-completed elevated freeway that would have ringed the City through North Beach and Marina neighborhoods to the Golden Gate Bridge.
2) Today this massive freeway, which separates us from our waterfront, would never be built.
3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.
4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf will be preserved.
5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked for this new system.
6) Only that portion of the Embarcadero Freeway east and north of the Main and Beale Street ramps — basically the portion directly on the waterfront — will be removed to make way for the new system. The removal cost, approximately $10 million to be paid for with privately-generated new revenues, is a relatively small part of the overall new system.

As for Proposition I, vote "YES, let's tear down the Embarcadero Freeway." Then turn to Proposition J and support the plan for a beautiful waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Removing the Embarcadero Freeway will allow San Francisco to:

• Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero.
• Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway.
• Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula.
• Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero.
• Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.
• Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won't benefit San Francisco. Don't let outsiders determine our future. Vote YES on I.

Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Hon. Jack Wohley
Hon. Roger Boyer
A. Lee Knigh
Robert Bradford
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Donald A. Crosby
Rai. Y. Okamoto
Robert Meyers
Ralph Hunsdorfer
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Douglas G. Wright
Anita Sanchez
Chuck Forester
Fritz Arko
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berruer
H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones
Randall Rossi
Karl Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
Jon Tischell
Jane Winslow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK — VOTE YES ON I

This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY — VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds — without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city's fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT — VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree — it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled. Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

— LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan revisors includes removal of order to make way for green which is already earmarked for open space. waterfront, would never be built.

3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.

4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf will be preserved.

5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked

FROM:

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION? (¿FIRMÓ SU APLICACIÓN?)

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON I

This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY—VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds—without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city's fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.
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If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT — VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree — it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

Hon. Doris W. Kahn
Monica H. Halloran
Lisa Klairemont
Jeffrey Heller
Nancy Katz
Robert Katz
Bob Isaacson
John Behanna
City Lights Books, Inc.
Kenneth R. Leach

Alan Lubliner
Norman Rolfe
Jerry Hartono
Gregory E. Jones
Marc Kasky
James W. Haas
Richard Reinhardt
Mrs. Bland Platt
Donald Black
David M. Hartley

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to 157 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown, Fisherman's Wharf and the financial district would be reduced.

Travel within the city would be slowed down at all hours. Vote no to the destruction of the freeway.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
• Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
• Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
• If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
  — By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections — an increase of 76%.
  — Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
  — MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
  — Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Judith Tornese

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Tear it down? The concept is preposterous! There are 70,000 cars a day whizzing by on this high speed downtown elevated waterfront freeway! Where will they all go?

Aside from the outrageous demolition costs involved, (some engineers estimate $40,000,000 of taxpayer money!), eyeball observation, logic, and just plain "common sense" dictates that ground level "total gridlock" will result if this expensive freeway is now destroyed.

Nostalgic individuals must realize that the times have changed! We can't bring the Bay back up to Montgomery Street! On behalf of San Francisco's overburdened taxpayers, we urge a NO vote!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled.
Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should not conduct foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

— LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic? YES 310 NO 311

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a policy statement that says that the City would replace the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt a policy statement which says that the Embarcadero Freeway would be torn down if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt a policy statement to replace the Embarcadero Freeway under these conditions.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway replaced with a tree-lined six lane boulevard and other traffic and transit improvements, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by approximately $27.5 million. This includes a one-time freeway demolition cost of $10.2 million plus $17.3 million required to match potential federally-funded transit improvements. Potential financing by the State and private sector and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “J” Got on Ballot

On March 5 a declaration of policy regarding the future of the Embarcadero Freeway was delivered to the Registrar from the Mayor and several supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows the Mayor or four or more supervisors to submit a declaration of policy to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

In addition to Mayor Feinstein, the March 5 document was signed by Supervisors Mahon, Renne, Silver, Walker, Molinari, Kennedy and Nelder.

POLLS ARE OPEN
FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans now have a chance to remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with an at-grade, six-lane parkway, which will open our waterfront and restore views blocked for years by this large freeway.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for traffic and transit improvements:
- New, shorter freeway ramps connecting directly with The Embarcadero;
- A tree-lined, at-grade, 6-lane Embarcadero Boulevard, with a new waterfront Muni line, a jogging and bicycle path from Fisherman’s Wharf to Mission Bay;
- Extension of Muni Metro south to the Caltrain station at 4th and Townsend;
- New ramps connecting I-280 with The Embarcadero;
- Changes in traffic flow and improvements to existing freeway ramps.

Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman’s Wharf will be preserved and enhanced.

The Board of Supervisors has specified that the Embarcadero Freeway will be torn down only if preliminary engineering during the next two years confirms—as traffic and environmental studies already have—that removal of the freeway will not result in more problems than it solves.

San Francisco became eligible for $88 million in federal highway funds for this new system when the Supervisors approved the plan in 1980. The $10.2 million cost of freeway demolition itself can be paid from revenues from low-rise development of the parcels now under the Broadway ramps and the increased values of nearby properties. Strict waterfront zoning limits the size of any development.

Traffic and environmental studies by the California Department of Transportation since 1980 clearly indicate that the new waterfront transportation system will be vastly superior to the existing situation, and that traffic congestion levels will not be notably different with the elevated structure removed.

Vote Yes on J and let’s remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with a parkway and transit system—once again let us see our waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J gives the voters a chance to be heard on an important and timely issue. This issue is the replacement of a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway as one element of a comprehensive package of transportation improvements in the Waterfront area.

Last fall, the Board of Supervisors adopted a further study a set of traffic and transit improvements for the Waterfront. These improvements include:
- a new landscaped surface-level boulevard
- replacement of the Clay/Washington and Broadway on and off ramps with new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom
- removal of the unused stub of I-280 and construction of new ramps connecting the new waterfront boulevard to Route 280
- a new light rail transit line linking Fort Mason with the Caltrain Depot
- extension of the Muni Metro to the train depot, improving the Peninsula Commute Service

A YES vote on Proposition J does not allocate funds for these projects. It does allow for further design and engineering studies, including cost analysis, assessment of impacts on traffic, and other matters. The studies will then be presented to the Supervisors so that they can make an informed decision on the plan. If the studies prove positive, San Francisco will be able to transform its Waterfront for the benefit of all.

Proposition J will insure that the City will not proceed with the removal of any of the Freeway until all the studies are completed and all potential consequences are assessed. This is the responsible approach. Vote YES on J.

SPUR
League of Women Voters
Embarcadero Citizens Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SAN FRANCISCO’S NEIGHBORHOODS ASK YOU TO VOTE YES ON J.

REDUCE TRAFFIC CONGESTION — YES ON J!

Traffic backed up by the Embarcadero Roadway slows travel and creates congestion in North Beach and other nearby neighborhoods. J will speed traffic flow.

IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION — YES ON J!

Proposition J will provide regular streetcar service along the Embarcadero and extend Muni Metro service to the south, ultimately extending to Bayview-Hunters Point.

PROMOTE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY — YES ON J!

If Proposition J does not pass, San Francisco could lose $88 million in federal funds for traffic improvements.

(continued)
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RESTORE THE WATERFRONT — YES ON J!
San Francisco's waterfront could become a focal point for the city, graced by a grand promenade, instead of the dismal, deteriorating eyesore it is now.
San Francisco's neighborhoods join together to ask your support for an improved Embarcadero. We guarantee the freeway will not be removed unless it is replaced by facilities that will assure a smoother, more efficient traffic flow. YES ON J!

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Robert Bradford
Ruth Gravani
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Anita Sanchez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J
in new electric trolley an articulated bus service, and in BART and Golden Gate Transit, have saved downtown San Francisco from gridlock!

IF you are concerned about the future of transit in San Francisco, IF you are concerned about reducing needless auto congestion, THEN we urge you to join Mayor Feinstein and the majority of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in voting Yes on Proposition J.

Norman Rolfe
San Francisco Muni Coalition
California Transit League
Jack Wooley
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Regina Snead
Tony Kilroy
Hon. Jack Morrison
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Bay Area Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Hon. Amy Meyer, Recreation and Park Commissioner
Alan Lablinge

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J
A SOUND BUSINESS PROPOSAL — YES ON J!
Common sense and good business demand we make the most of our resources. San Francisco's waterfront is an economic and civic asset unrivaled anywhere — yet much of it is cut off by an ugly, noisy, elevated roadway. The traffic improvements called for by Proposition J will benefit workers, tourists, property owners, neighborhoods, .and business.
Traffic flow and transit will move quickly on a realigned, reorganized Embarcadero Roadway, allowing easier, more pleasant access to waterfront businesses.
An improved and beautified Embarcadero will create new commercial opportunities and increase the value of existing property and businesses.
New jobs and an expanded tax base will generate increased revenue for the city as several lots now covered by freeway ramps return to productive private ownership. Though limited to low rise development (40 to 65 feet), tax revenues from development will more than make up the city's share of the project.

Robert Meyers
Dennis J. Perez
Kenneth R. Lerch
M. Arthur Gensler, Jr., FAIA
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones

Randall Rossi
Karl A. Linbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
Jon Twichel
Pritz, Arko
Michael J. O'Shea

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J OFFERS RESIDENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO A ONCE IN A LIFETIME OPPORTUNITY TO RECAPTURE THEIR WATERFRONT.

Converting the Embarcadero into a tree-lined boulevard and building a new streetcar line will make the waterfront more pedestrian and transit oriented, that is, more people oriented.

A freeway structure that is a source of objectionable noise and casts a pall over a large part of the waterfront will be removed.

The waterfront will be opened up to sunlight and fresh air and made more inviting and cheerful to those who wish to walk on one of the world's outstanding waterfronts. Air pollution that is now retained by the existing elevated structure will be dissipated.

The transit orientation of the new waterfront will encourage energy conservation. Proposition J will:

— Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero
— Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway
— Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula
— Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero
— Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line
— Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won't benefit San Francisco. Don't let outsiders determine our future.

VOTE YES ON J FOR A BETTER SAN FRANCISCO.

Sierra Club
Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage
Willinda McCrea*
Bob Cramer*
Rebecca Evans*
Richard Livingston*
Marilyn Clements*
Jennie Lew*
Jeffrey Henne*
Jane Winslow*
Roger Boyer

A. Lee Knight
Hon. Toby Rosenthal
Patrick S. Hobin
Monica Halloran
Walter K. Morris
Lisa Klairmont
Jeffrey Heller
Bob Isaacson
George T. Rockrise, FAIA
Jon Twitchell
Marc Kasky

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J GIVES US A CHANCE TO CORRECT A COLOSSAL MISTAKE!

The Embarcadero Freeway should never have been built. The original plan was to build a freeway from bridge to bridge, destroying the Northern Waterfront, Fisherman's Wharf, Fort Mason, and Marina Green in the process. When the people of San Francisco saw what was happening, they stopped it in mid-air—literally.

Walk under it. Hear the noise. Feel the gloom. See how it cuts out light.

It's time to remove this mistake.

The new waterfront plan will give us a tree-lined boulevard, a new streetcar line, and a Muni Metro extension to the Southern Pacific/Caltrain depot. It will give us a transit and pedestrian oriented waterfront that will give us pride and pleasure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J!

San Francisco Tomorrow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, with a membership of 1700 working architects in San Francisco, urges a “YES” vote on Proposition J. In 1968 the citizens of San Francisco stopped highway planners from ringing our waterfront with freeways. Today voters have another opportunity to return the waterfront to our citizens. Removal of the Embarcadero Freeway is one part of a carefully researched transit plan for San Francisco. This proposition supplies an unique opportunity to carry out a broad range of transportation improvements that will have many positive effects on the City of San Francisco.

Removal of the freeway will:

1. Return the waterfront to the people by removing this barrier to access and view.
2. Facilitate needed MUNI improvements.
3. Encourage development of the Embarcadero as a grand civic boulevard unifying the City of San Francisco.

The members of the American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition I and “YES” on Proposition J.

Donald Kennedy, FAIA
President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J**

San Franciscans love Their City, the ambiance; the Bay, waterfront, the views, the healthy neighborhoods.

Freeway builders did their damnest to destroy the City and divde our neighborhoods.

Now we can remove that damned spot, the concrete dinosaur, the hideous barrier that destroys our scenic views, the fence that keeps us from the Bay, the concealer of the Ferry Building.

Correct a mistake.

**VOTE YES ON J.**

Miriam Blaustein
Charlene Clark
Marie Clesby
Zach Cowan
Dick Grossboll
Rick Hauptman

Tony Kilroy
Jean Koriun
Ira Korlander
Jack Morrison
Andy Nash
Norman Rolfe

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J**

NO ON PROPOSITION J.

"J" is for JOKE—a cruel joke on us. What will J really do? Add traffic to every street east of Gough. Delay the construction of waterfront streetcar service. Cost millions in local dollars needed to improve MUNI. Create a ground-level freeway on the waterfront as big as Van Ness, with more cars.

I'm a private citizen who's concerned about traffic and what it's doing to our City. If you are too, vote NO on Proposition J.

Steve Colman

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J**

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
- Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
- Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
- If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
- By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
  - Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
  - MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
  - Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Blair C. Pascoe

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

**Special Notice to Absentee Voters**

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION A

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by boldface type. 
3.202 Office of Risk Management

There is established under the chief administrative officer an office of risk management which shall review, analyze and report to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the finance committee of the board of supervisors the practices of the several departments, boards and commissions of the city and county regarding loss prevention and risk management, including the insurance requirements of the city and county. The office shall also establish and assist in the implementation of planning and operational guidelines regarding risk management and loss prevention for each department, board or commission. The chief administrative officer may appoint, at his or her pleasure, or contract with, a qualified individual or organization for the operation of the office. The department of general services shall provide office space for the operation of the office. The chief administrative officer may designate an individual or organization operating the office shall include relevant education, training and experience in insurance and risk management.

3.401 City Attorney

(a) The city attorney shall be an elective officer. He shall furnish an official bond in the sum of ten thousand dollars ($10,000). He shall appoint, and at his pleasure may remove, all assistants and employees of his office. He shall devote his entire time and attention to the duties of his office. He must, at the time of his election, be an elector of the city and county, qualified to practice in all the courts of the state, and he must have been so qualified for at least 10 years next preceding his election.

(b) The city attorney shall represent the city and county in all actions and proceedings in which it may be legally interested, or, for or against the city and county, or, any officer of the city and county in any action or proceeding, when directed so to do by the supervisors, except where a cause of action exists in favor of the city and county against said officer. Whenever any cause of action exists in favor of the city and county, the city attorney shall commence the same when within his knowledge or when directed so to do by the supervisors. He shall give his advice or opinion in writing to any officer, board or commission of the city and county when requested. Except as otherwise provided in this charter, he shall not settle or dismiss any litigation for or against the city and county, unless, upon his written recommendation, he is ordered so to do by ordinance.

(c) The city attorney shall prepare, or approve as to form, all transcripts before him are executed by the supervisors. He shall approve, by endorsement in writing, the form of all official or other bonds required by this charter or by ordinance before the same are submitted to the proper commission, board or office for final approval, and no such bonds shall be finally approved without such approval as to form by the city attorney. Except as otherwise provided in this charter, the city attorney shall prepare in writing the draft or form of all contracts before the same are executed on behalf of the city and county. He shall examine and approve the title of all real property to be acquired by the city and county.

(d) He shall keep on file in his office copies of all written communications and opinions, also all papers, briefs and transcripts used in matters wherein he appears; and books of record and registers of all actions or proceedings in his charge in which the city and county or any officer or board thereof, is a party or is interested.

(e) The duties of the city attorney in connection with the board of delinquent revenue collection shall be transferred to and performed by the attorney for said board who shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

(f) There is established in the office of the city attorney a bureau of claims investigation and administration which shall have the responsibility of investigating, evaluating and processing for the several boards, commissions and departments all claims for money or damages made upon the city and county pursuant to section 7.03 of this charter or the general law of the State of California. Claim investigation functions of the police department in existence on June 4, 1986, shall continue as an adjunct to the board established under this section. Claims functions of the public utilities commission shall remain under that commission unless transferred to the bureau of claims investigation and administration by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the bureau shall also have the power to investigate events and occurrences giving rise to potential civil liability against the city and county and adjust and settle demands, within dollar limits to be established by ordinance, prior to their presentation as claims. There shall be established by ordinance a revolving fund to satisfy such demands adjusted prior to their presentation as claims. The bureau shall be responsible for the investigation of all claims and the analysis of city policies and practices upon which the bureau shall report and advise the several departments.

The city attorney shall appoint a chief of the bureau who shall serve at his or her pleasure. The chief of the bureau may appoint, subject to confirmation by the city attorney, investigators who shall serve at the pleasure of the chief; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of chief claims investigator or any equivalent classification on the date of approval of this amendment by the electorate shall continue to have civil service status to said position under the civil service provisions of this charter.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by horizontal strikethrough.

7.100 Materials, Supplies and Equipment

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreements for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract. All purchases in excess of one thousand dollars ($1,000) shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases and a permanent record of all such quotations shall be kept. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifteen-thousand-dollars ($15,000): fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) for materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifteen-thousand-dollars ($15,000): fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of materials, supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two or more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned and may advertise for
bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall direct the rejection of all articles which may be below standards, specifications or samples furnished. He shall not approve any bill or voucher for articles not in conformity with specifications, or which are at variance with any contract.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall also have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops hereinafter maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for and in use in all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report the same to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.

7.103 Requisition, Contract and Payment

All purchase orders and contracts shall be based on written requisitions, or, for materials, or supplies in common use in the various departments, on the purchaser's records of average use by all departments. Purchase orders and contracts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) to fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) must be approved by the chief administrative officer. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall approve all bids and vouchers for materials, supplies, equipment, and contractual services before the controller shall draw and approve warrants therefor. All contracts for the purchase of materials, supplies and equipment shall be made after inviting sealed bids by publication. All sealed bids received shall be kept on file. When an award of contract is made, notice that the same has been made shall be given by one publication, and any interested person may examine the bids and records at the purchaser's office.

The purchaser of supplies shall be subject to rules and regulations, approved by the chief administrative officer and the controller, designate and authorize appropriate personnel within the purchasing department to exercise the purchaser's signature powers for purchase orders and contracts approved as provided in this charter.

7.200 Public Works and Purchasing Contracts

The construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements, and the purchasing of supplies, materials and equipment, when the expenditure involved in each case shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) to fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), shall be done by contract, except as otherwise provided by this charter. It shall constitute official misconduct to split or divide any public work or improvement or purchase into two or more units for the purpose of evading the contract provisions of this section. In an emergency, provided an actual emergency is declared by the board of supervisors to exist, and when authorized by resolution of said board, any public work or improvement may be executed in the most expeditious manner. Notwithstanding any other provision in this section or this charter, and upon the approval of the chief administrative officer declaring the work to be emergency in character, there may be expended by the department of public works the sum not to exceed five hundred dollars ($500) for new construction of any type in or upon unimproved or unaccepted streets.

Any public work or improvement estimated to cost less than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) to fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) may be performed under contract or written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county. Any public work or improvement executed by the city, other than routine repair work, shall be authorized by the chief administrative officer when the cost exceeds fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) to fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or by the heads of departments not under the chief administrative officer, only after detailed estimates have been prepared and submitted by the head of the department concerned. There shall be separate accounting for each work or improvement so executed, which accounting shall include all direct, indirect and supervisory elements of cost chargeable to such work or improvement, and each cost accounting shall be reported to the chief administrative officer, or to the mayor when such work shall have been performed by departments not under the chief administrative officer. All such accounts shall be reported to the controller. Any public work or improvement costing less than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) to fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) and not performed by the city or county labor, materials, and supplies shall be performed under contract, be covered by written order or agreement which shall be based on not less than three bids, notice of which shall be given by three days' posting. Records of such bids shall be kept by the department.

When the expenditure for any public work or improvement shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) to fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), the same shall be done by contract, except as otherwise provided in this charter. The head of the department in charge of or responsible for the work for which a contract is to be let, or the purchaser of supplies in the case of purchases of materials, supplies and equipment, shall let such contract to the lowest reliable and responsible bidder not less than ten days after advertising by not less than one publication for sealed proposals for such work, improvements or purchase contemplated. Each such advertisement shall contain the reservation of the right to reject any and all bids. The officer responsible for the awarding of any such contract shall require from all bidders information concerning their experience and financial qualifications, as provided by general law relative to such investigation authorized by departments of public works.

The purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer for bids in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) to fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or the department head concerned, with the approval of the board or commission to which he is responsible, may reject any and all bids and readvertise for bids. The department head or the purchaser of supplies, as the case may be, shall have power to sign such contract for the estimated expenditures thereunder not in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) to fifty thousand dollars ($50,000). Any contract involving the expenditure of more than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) to fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), if for the purchase of materials, supplies or equipment, shall require the joint approval of the department head and the chief administrative officer for amounts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) to fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), relative to departments under his jurisdiction, or by the department head and the approval by resolution of the board or commission concerned for departments not under the chief administrative officer.

The board of supervisors, by ordinance, shall establish procedures whereby appropriate city and county departments may file sealed bids for the execution of any work to be performed under contract. If such bid is the lowest, the contract shall be awarded to the department. Accurate unit costs shall be kept of all direct and indirect charges incurred by the department under any such contract, which unit costs shall be reported to and audited by the controller monthly and on the completion of the work.

In any case where the lowest gross price or unit cost bid is not accepted, and a contract is entered into with another bidder, written report shall be made to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the controller by the officer authorized to execute the contract, with the reasons for failure to accept such lowest bid.

If any provision of this section is in conflict with any provision of section 7.100 of the charter, the provision contained in section 7.100 shall govern and control.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.

7.201 Public Works Contract Procedure by Ordinance

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter and, in particular, the provisions of section 7.200, the board of supervisors shall by ordinance determine the monetary limits not to exceed fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), within which the construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements may be done by contract or by written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county, consistent, so far as reasonable limits, with the manner provided for in section 7.200 and section 7.100.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.
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point two commissioners to terms of one year each, one commissioner to a term of two years, one commissioner to a term of three years and one commissioner to a term of four years. The terms of the commissioners shall be for four years from the commencement thereof. Not less than one-four members of said commission shall be of the same sex, and one member shall have prior experience representing labor and one member shall have prior experience representing management.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration." A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of one hundred dollars ($100).

Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of considering and adopting examination questions shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the commission shall be open to the public and held at such time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission, after the regular daily working hours of 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Such persons or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before the appointments are taken in any case involving such person or persons.

In accordance with section 3.500, the commission shall have the power and it shall be its duty to appoint an executive assistant to be the administrative head of the affairs under its control who shall serve at its pleasure; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of assistant secretary to the civil service commission on the effective date of this section as amended shall continue to have civil service status in the position of executive assistant under the civil service provisions of this charter.

3.661 General Powers and Duties
(a) The civil service commission shall be the employment and personnel department of the city and county and shall determine appointments on the basis of merit and fitness, as shown by appropriate tests. The commission shall classify, and from time to time may reclassify, in accordance with duties and responsibilities of the employment and training and experience required, all places of employment in the departments and offices of the city and county not specifically exempted from civil-service provisions by this or any other act, without regard to whether or not such positions are filled under civil-service provisions.
(b) The commission shall have power to institute and prosecute legal proceedings for violations of any of the civil service provisions of this charter.
(c) The civil service commission may hear appeals from an action of the personnel director with respect to
1. Allegations of discrimination. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the civil service commission regarding allegations of discrimination shall be final and binding on all employees and shall be conclusive upon all persons to whom it may be directed.
2. Allegations of fraud and
3. Allegations of conflict of interest, pursuant to section 8.105.
(d) No action by the personnel director which is the subject of any appeal shall be stayed during the appeal proceeding except by the unanimous vote of the civil service commission.
(e) The commission shall receive the same compensation as is provided to the personnel director whose function is placed under the department of personnel administration with authority to act as the personnel administrator.

There is hereby established a department of personnel administration which shall consist of a personnel director and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the civil service commission before appointment to the department of personnel administration shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job function had not, by amendment to this charter, been placed under the personnel administration.

The department of personnel administration shall be the personnel department for the city and county and shall provide a means to recruit, select, certify, appoint, train, evaluate, promote career development, classify positions, administer salaries, administer employee discipline, discharge and other related personnel activities in order to maintain an effective and responsive work force.

3.662 Personnel Director
(a) A personnel director shall be appointed and serve at the pleasure of the mayor; provided, however, that the personnel director shall be selected from candidates nominated by an elected civil service commissioner and confirmed by vote of the board of supervisors. The nominee of the mayor may be appointed by the personnel director pending confirmation. The person so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of personnel director in the spirit of this proposal." The personnel director shall conduct appropriate examinations for employment, establish eligible lists based on the results and provide for certification of eligibles. The appointment of the personnel director on examination matters including,
but not limited to, announcements, minimum qualifications, classes of applicants, components, current statements, type, list length, duration and certification shall be final.

(e) The personnel director shall adopt personnel regulations, which, except as otherwise provided in this charter, shall govern both the administrative matters within the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration and the exercise of the authority vested in the section 8.200. In the section, including, but not limited to, recruitment; applications; examinations; eligibility; duration of eligible lists; certification of eligibles; permanent, temporary and provisional appointments; regular performance evaluations; promotions; transfers; resignations; layoff; and non-service causes due to lack of funds, reorganization, retrenchment or completion of work; and classification. No personnel regulations shall be adopted, amended or repealed without a prior public hearing at least two weeks public notice by the personnel director and after meeting and confer sessions with recognized employee organizations as required by state law. All civil service commission rules relevant to the foregoing as well as the provisions of former sections 8.322, 8.323, 8.326, 8.328, 8.329, 8.330, 8.331, 8.332 and 8.340 of this charter shall become personnel regulations on the effective date of the charter.

(d) The personnel director shall conduct the salary surveys for the civil service commission as set forth elsewhere in this charter.

(e) The personnel director by personnel regulations shall establish procedures to review and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the personnel director shall forthwith be enforced by every employee and officer, unless the decision is appealed to the civil service commission in accordance with personnel regulations.

(f) The personnel director shall investigate all employee complaints concerning job related conduct of City and County employees and shall provide for the resolution of employee disputes which shall be consistent with other provisions of this charter and shall be utilized by all department heads and appointing officers upon the expiration of the existing term of any otherwise binding agreements.

(j) Consistent with the foregoing and other applicable provisions of this charter, the personnel director shall delegate to the various appointing officers appropriate personnel responsibilities, including but not limited to appropriate disciplinary procedures, and consult with appointing officers with respect to personnel regulations affecting their operations.

(k) Personal services contracts shall be reviewed and approved by the personnel director in accordance with the provisions of appropriate personnel regulations. Personal services contracts reasonably expected to involve payment by the city and county of more than twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000) shall be reviewed and approved by the Commission. Failure of the Commission to act within thirty days of submission of the contract by the personnel director shall be deemed to constitute approval by the commission.

(b) The personnel director shall establish a system of classification and compensation for employees of section 8.200 shall govern whenever new classifications are created or existing positions are reclassified. The personnel director shall be the judge of such classification determinations.

(f) From the requisition of the appointing officer or other person the civil service commission shall determine whether a position within a classification is, "in character", temporary or permanent. Appointments may be made on a permanent, temporary or, where confirmation is required, a provisional basis.

(m) Excepting sections 8.300, 8.660, 8.661, 8.105, 8.107, 8.108, 8.670 and 8.671 and county service when the passing mark has been attained and may include evaluation of work performance and other credits. When an examination announcement is issued for a class on both a promotional and entrance basis, there shall be one resulting list of eligibles which shall include all successful candidates both promotional and entrance in order of relative performance.

—Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this or any other provision of the charter, an employee who has been certified from a regularly adopted eligible list to a non-permanent position in a civil service classification shall be permitted to participate in promotional examinations on the same basis as a person holding a permanent appointment to a position in that same classification, subject to a demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the civil service commission.

—The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to promotional examinations announced after its effective date.

8.328 Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave

—Employees under permanent civil service appointment who, because of absence on duly authorized military leave after June 27, 1950, did not participate in a promotional examination held after June 27, 1950; and during time of war as defined in section 8.324 of this charter, and in which examination the employee would have been otherwise eligible to compete had the war not intervened, and which examination is hereinafter referred to as the original promotional examination, shall after abridgment of military leave, have the same right to participate in a similar promotional examination. Provided, that persons and employees who were on entrance or promotional eligible lists, shall, for the purpose of this amendment, be deemed to be appointees in their classifications from the time their names were reached for permanent certification while in the military service.

—in order to qualify for participation in a similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section, such employee who desires to participate therein must make application in writing to the civil service commission within thirty days after the abridgment of his military leave, or within thirty days after the effective date of this amendment. Failure to file such written request to participate in a similar promotional examination as herein provided shall be deemed a waiver of all rights of the employee to participate in such similar promotional examination.

—the civil service commission shall arrange to hold such similar promotional examination at a reasonable time after employees eligible to request participation in any such similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section have indicated their desire to so participate, or have waived their right to participate, as herein provided.

—the civil service commission shall be the sole judge of the eligibility of employees for a similar promotional examination. If the employee obtains in the similar promotional examination a score ranking equal to or

mayor shall request and the supervisors shall make supplemental appropriation therefor in the manner provided herein for supplemental appropriations.

8.340 Dismissal During Probation Period
Any person appointed to a permanent position shall serve on a trial or probationary basis. The civil service commission personnel director shall by rule establish a probationary period of not less than six months' service and up to a maximum of twelve months' service for such classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed ranks of the police department, fire department, sheriff's department and San Francisco International Airport police force shall be for twelve months except that, with respect to members of the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve months' service from the day following completion of the prescribed department field training officer program, but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment; provided further that probationary members of the uniformed ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in section 8.345 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months' service to a maximum of twenty-four months may be established for executive and management classifications. At any time during the probationary period the appointing officer may terminate the appointment upon giving written notice of such termination to the employee and to the civil service commission specifying the reason for such termination. Exempt from the provisions of this section are the employees in the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments the civil service commission shall review the termination. The civil service commission shall by rule establish the procedures for such review. If the appointment resulted from an entrance examination the commission may declare such person dismissed or may return him to the list for another group of eligibles preferred for further appointment as the commission may deem just: if the appointment resulted from a promotional examination the employee shall have the right of appeal and hearing before the civil service commission. The commission shall render a decision within thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination. The decision of the commission may be appealed:

(a)  by the employee
(b)  by the appointing officer
(c)  by all persons declared to be ineligible by the commission.

8.345 Dismissal and Layoff
Employees shall be laid off in the following order:

(a)  by the employee
(b)  by the appointing officer
(c)  by the commission.

8.401 Definition of Generally Prevaling Rates of Wages
Notwithstanding any provision of section 8.401 or any provision of any other section of this chapter to the contrary, generally prevailing rates of salaries and wages for those employees covered by section 8.401 of this chapter shall be determined by the civil service commission as set forth below.

The civil service commission personnel director shall conduct a comprehensive investigation and survey of basic pay rates and wages and salaries in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment for like work and like service, based upon job classifications. The board of supervisors of the charter and shall make its findings, based on facts and data collected, as to what are the generally prevailing basic pay rates for each benchmark class of employment solely in the manner hereinafter provided. A benchmark class is defined as a "key class" within an occupational group selected as the class for which a representative shall be selected.

Basic pay rate data for public and private employment shall be collected solely from the Bay Area counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, San Francisco and Santa Clara; provided, however, that for any benchmark class of employees for which the civil service commission personnel director determines there is insufficient data from Bay Area public jurisdictions the commission personnel director shall survey major public agencies in the state employing such class, major public agencies to be defined as these employing more than 3,000 persons.

The commission personnel director shall collect basic pay rate data for like work and like service from Bay Area public jurisdictions as follows:

(a)  The counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara.
(b)  The ten most populous cities in these five Bay Area counties based on the latest federal decennial census.
(c)  Agencies of the state and federal governments and from school districts and other special districts in the six Bay Area counties as determined by the civil service commission personnel director. The commission personnel director shall collect private basic pay rate data from recognized governmental Bay Area salary and wage surveys of private employers in the city and county of San Francisco, San Mateo, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. The data collected shall be limited to basic rates of pay and salaries actually being paid by public and private employers for like work and like service.

The "prevaling rates of wages" for employers governed by charter section 8.401 and this section shall be defined as the rate ranges developed from the weighted average of the midpoint of the basic pay rates, excluding fringe benefits, for surveyed public employments and the median of the pay rates for private employment to be determined as follows:

1.  Multiply the product of the pay rates and the midpoints from public employment data base by the number of employees in the given classification from each data base;
2.  Add the products of (1);
3.  Divide the sum in (2) by the total number of employees surveyed for that classification; and
4.  Extend this figure by 10 percent to establish the maximum of the range and reduce this figure by 10 percent to establish the minimum.

When fixing rates of compensation the board of supervisors shall fix basic pay rates as close as reasonably possible to prevailing rates, provided, however, that the board of supervisors shall not set the maximum rate of pay for any class in excess of the maximum prevailing rate for that class; provided further, however, that no employee shall have his basic pay rate reduced to conform to prevailing rates except as provided for in section 8.406. For those classifications of employment in which the practice is customary, the schedules of compensation shall provide for minimum, intermediate, and maximum salary steps and for a method of advancing the salaries of employees from minimum to intermediate to maximum with due regard for seniority of service.

The "basic pay rate" as used in this section is hereby defined as applying only to the basic rate of wages, with included range scales, and does not include any other benefits of employment or working conditions.

It is the declared intent of the qualified electors of the city and county that neither the board of supervisors nor the mayor have any or no power to provide any benefits of employment except those enumerated already provided for in the charter and. Any addition, deletion or modification of benefits of employment enumerated in the charter shall be submitted, as a charter amendment, to the qualified electors of the city and county. The qualified electors expressly state that they understand that benefits of employment are sometimes referred to as "fringe benefits" of employment and the qualified electors expressly reserve the right to either grant or deny such benefits and to describe them as commonly referred to as "working conditions". Any reference to "working conditions" shall mean those compensations which must necessarily be provided in order for the employee to perform his job description duties efficiently and safely, and shall include but be limited to such working conditions and benefits as are typically included in the administrative provisions of the salary standardization ordinance and the salary ordinance.

The board of supervisors may, in its discretion, provide working conditions of benefit for employees covered under this section and section 8.401 of this charter only in accordance with the following provisions:

1.  (a)  The civil service commission personnel director must determine, certify and recommend to the board of supervisors the working conditions of benefit that is equitable and necessary for the efficient and safe performance of the employee's duties as enumerated in his job description.
(b)  The working conditions of benefit, as recommended by the civil service commission personnel director, is substantially comparable for like work and like service to that provided for the job classification and is provided to not less than 50 percent of the employees of the class in the jurisdiction covered by the salary survey.

9.108 Initiative, Referendum, and Recall

Any ordinance which the supervisors are empowered to pass may be submitted to the voters by a majority of the board at a general election or at a special election called for the purpose, said election to be held not less than thirty days from the date of the call. Any such ordinance may be proposed by one-third of the supervisors, or by the mayor, and when so proposed, be submitted to the voters at the next succeeding general election. No ordinance passed by the supervisors granting any public utility franchise
or privilege, shall go into effect until the expiration of sixty days from the date it becomes final. At the end of such sixty days such ordinance shall be in force and effect. If at the end of such sixty days there shall be filed with the registrar a petition signed by registered voters equal in number to five percent of the entire vote cast for mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election, requesting that such ordinance be submitted to the voters. In case such petition is filed, such ordinance shall not go into effect until approved by a majority of the voters voting thereon at a general or special election.

If, before the time any other ordinance involving legislative matters becomes effective, there shall be filed with the board of supervisors a petition signed by qualified electors of the city and county equal in number to at least ten per cent of the entire vote cast for all candidates for mayor at the last preceding general municipal election at which a mayor was elected, protesting against the passage of such ordinance the same shall be suspended from going into operation, and it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to reconsider such ordinance, and if the same be not entirely repealed, said board shall submit the ordinance to the vote of said electors either at the next general municipal election or at a special election to be called for that purpose, and such ordinance shall not go into effect or become operative unless and until a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon shall vote in favor thereof. The provisions of section 9.109 and 9.110 of the charter shall apply to and govern the verification and certification of such petition.

Annual budget and appropriation ordinances, supplemental appropriation ordinances, the annual salary ordinance, or ordinances amending the same, the ordinances levying taxes, any ordinance appropriating money from the emergency reserve fund, ordinances authorizing the city attorney to compromise litigation and ordinances necessary to enable the mayor to carry out any of the powers vested in him in the case of public emergency as defined in section 3.100 of the charter, ordinances enacted pursuant to section 8.410 of the charter, as well as ordinances relative to purely administrative matters, shall not be subject to referendum. Any elective official, the chief administrative officer, the controller or any member of the board of education or public utilities commission may be recalled by the electors. The procedure to effect such recall shall be as follows: A petition demanding the recall from office of the person sought to be recalled shall be filed with the registrar. Said petition shall contain a statement of the grounds on which the recall is sought. Any insufficiency of form or substance in such statement shall in no way affect the validity of the election and proceedings held thereunder. No recall petition shall be filed against any officer until he has held his office for at least six months.

If in the event the representative of the board of supervisors, mayor and the representatives of recognized employee organizations do not reach an agreement through the meet-and-confer process on matters contained in the annual salary standardization ordinance by March 15 of any year, the mayor shall recommend and the board shall adopt or reject a schedule of compensation which reflects current-prevailing rates for the classifications covered by Section 9.110 of the Charter. The last good faith offer presented by the mayor or his or her representative.

In any year when an agreement on matters contained in the salary standardization ordinance has not been achieved, the civil service commission personnel director, upon receipt of a written demand by the recognized employee organization made upon the mayor and the personnel director shall prepare, prior to April 1, a schedule of compensation and administrative provisions which reflect additional rates that would be payable, and working conditions, based upon the last demands made by the recognized employee organization(s) which participated in the meet-and-confer process.

Said schedule shall be transmitted to the registrar of voters for submission to the electors of the city and county at a general election or a special election called for the purpose, and said special election shall be held no less than sixty (60) days from the date of the call. No such schedule shall be withdrawn after it has been received by the registrar of voters. At said election, the ballot shall contain the following two alternatives:

1. Approval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.
2. Disapproval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

If a majority of the valid votes cast in the election favor paying the additional rates set forth in the schedule of compensation based upon the last demands of the recognized employee organizations which engaged in the meet-and-confer process, it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to amend the salary standardization ordinance to reflect said increased rates.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION E

NOTE: All sections are new.

Be it ordained by the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. This ordinance may be called the "City College Public Lands Preservation Ordinance."

Section 2. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall disapprove or deny, WITH NO EXCPTIONS OR EXCPTIONS, any building permit application for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, located across Phelan Avenue from the presently occupied campus of City College and consisting of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

Section 4. The term "building permit" includes building permits, site permits and any other permits for the performance of construction work.

Section 5. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of the ordinance shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. No provision of this ordinance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent implementation of the policy stated above.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION F

NOTE: All sections are new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The People of the City and County of San Francisco desire and are entitled to a local government whose officers do not engage in, assist or canvass competition or activity on behalf of private interests before City and County commissions and boards while also serving as City and County officers.

Section 2. No officer of the City and County may, during the term of office, engage in compensated advocacy before any City and County board or commission, or any member of the board or commission or its staff, in order to represent any private interest, for which representation the officer receives, directly or indirectly, any compensation, reward or gift.

Section 3. Officers of the City and County shall not discuss matters pending before their commission or department with other City and County officers or state legislators when those other

officers or state legislators are acting as compensated advocates for a private interest.

Section 4. No member of the California State Legislature shall appear before any City and County board, department or commission as a compensated advocate representing a private interest.

Section 5. In the financing of city and county campaigns: (a) No person other than a candidate shall make, and no campaign treasurer shall solicit or accept, any contribution which will cause the total amount contributed by such person with respect to a single election in support of or opposition to such candidate, including contributions to political committees supporting or opposing such candidate, to exceed $500.00. (b) If any person is found guilty of violating the terms of this section, each campaign treasurer who received part or all of the contribution or contributions which constitute the violation shall pay promptly, from available campaign funds, if any, the amount received from such person in excess of the amount permitted by this section to the City and County Treasurer for deposit in the General Fund of the City and County. (c) This section shall not apply to any in-kind contribution of television or radio airtime to any candidate or committee granted to said candidate or committee pursuant to the "Fairness Doctrine" articulated in Cullinan Broadcasting, 40 FCC 576 (1963).

Section 6. Any person violating the terms of this ordinance shall be subject to the penalties set forth in San Francisco Charter Section 1.805. Such penalties shall include, but not be limited to, removal from office.

Section 7. If any provision of this ordinance, or any of its application to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, it is the expressed intent of the people of the City and County of San Francisco that the remaining of the ordinance, or the application of such provision, or any other provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.
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rates and the same shall be in lieu of said annual compensation, and notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, said rates shall become effective and be payable as if adopted prior to April 1, of any year.

The provisions of sections 3,100 and 3,100-L, relating to the emergency powers of the mayor, shall not be applicable to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

11.105 Effective Date of Amendments
The effective date of the amendments, additions and deletions to the civil service provisions of the charter shall be ninety (90) days after the acceptance and filing thereof with the Secretary of State.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION G

We the people of San Francisco declare this to be our policy:
1) IT IS IMPROPER TO PROFIT FROM OR PROVIDE SUPPORT TO THE RACIST POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SYSTEM IN SOUTH AFRICA, KNOWN AS APARTHEID.
Therefore it is necessary to sever commercial ties to South Africa until people of all races obtain equal rights in that country, including equal voting rights.
2) COMPANIES HAVING SUBSTANTIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH APARTHEID MUST BE CONSIDERED IRRESPONSIBLE.
(a) The Board of Supervisors must determine which companies doing or seeking business with the City have the greatest ties to Apartheid. Companies that have a significant involvement in profiting from or maintaining the Apartheid system, may, on that basis, be deemed "irresponsible bidders."
In purchasing goods and services and awarding other contracts, the city must give priority to avoiding such companies; the degree of the preference must be in proportion to the company's complicity with Apartheid, according to the following criteria:
- how much business the company does in or with South Africa;
- how much the company profits from that business;
- how much support the company provides the Apartheid government in taxes, loans, payments or other funding;
- the nature of the company's South Africa business;
- the degree of the company's cooperation with South African political censorship or secrecy agreements;
(b) City funds must not be deposited or invested with any bank or other company which does business in or with, or makes loans to, South Africa.
(c) If any exception to the above policies is found to be necessary or appropriate, the responsible official must promptly and publicly report it to the Board of Supervisors, clearly describing the exception and the reasons for it.
(d) The term "city" includes all agencies, departments, officials, employees, units and subunits of the city and county of San Francisco, and all funds administered by or on behalf of the city or county.
(3) WE CALL ON ALL OTHER PUBLIC BODIES AND PRIVATE OR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS TO ADOPT SIMILAR POLICIES.
(4) WE CALL A GENERAL PUBLIC BOYCOTT, FOCUSING ON THOSE COMPANIES HAVING THE GREATEST TIES TO APARTHEID.
The Board of Supervisors must determine and announce which company or companies are the worst offenders within each major industry, so that the public can focus its boycott on those companies.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION H

SUMMARY: THIS INITIATIVE STATES THAT THE AIDS EPIDEMIC IS A MAJOR PUBLIC HEALTH PROBLEM OF CONCERN TO EVERYONE, REQUIRING INCREASED SUPPORT FOR RELATED MEDICAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION. IT CALLS FOR A COUNCIL FOR AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION OR SIMILAR UNITED EFFORT TO STOP AIDS.

We the people of San Francisco hereby adopt the following policy:
The AIDS epidemic has rapidly become a major public health problem, costly both in human lives and in general community resources;
The first steps in dealing with such a crisis are:
- the scientific research needed to discover and understand the nature, causes, co-factors, prevention, diagnosis and treatment of the disease, and
- the education of the public about the lessons of that research;
A proper program of research and education pays for itself in the long run;
Prompt action is urgent, because of the rapidly growing number of persons affected, increasing not only the suffering but also the difficulty of eradicating the disease;
The leadership and support of such an effort is everyone's responsibility;
While San Francisco's role in the overall effort against AIDS has been viewed as a positive example to other areas, the continued rapid increase in the spread of the disease means that we cannot afford to rest on our laurels or leave further responsibility to others;
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:
We call on all appropriate government bodies as well as medical, professional, charitable and community organizations and concerned individuals to join together in an all-out effort to stop AIDS;
We call for support to an organized united effort along the lines of an AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION COUNCIL, including, in some form:
- A COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, to provide informed evaluations as to priorities among research projects and proposals, recommending those which are most cost-effective and most likely to produce early results useful in the prevention or treatment of the disease, to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts or neglect of promising approaches, and to provide the council with complete and up-to-date information regarding comparative results of experimental treatments, prevention programs and other existing research;
- A COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, to inform the public regarding prevention and other research findings, and to inform relevant government officials and the general public, concerning the factual basis for a re-ordering of current public funding priorities toward an increased war against disease, including research and education against AIDS and related conditions;
- A FUND-RAISING COMMITTEE, to solicit donations, lobby for grants, organize benefits and other fund-raising projects spreading the financial burden by appealing to many sources;
We ask the council and committees to be responsive and accessible to public input, to include representation of all interested groups, to consider all viewpoints, and to be capable of prompt action;
We ask appropriate city officials to determine whether a suitable form of such a council already exists; if it does, we wish the city to support it actively; if not, we wish the city to seek to encourage its formation by such means as may appear proper.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION I

SUMMARY: This initiative asks "Shall we tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?" The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated portion of Route 480 known as the Embarcadero Freeway. This initiative declaration of policy will give the voters the opportunity to establish the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco regarding the proposed teardown of the Embarcadero Freeway.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION J

Shall the City replace a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if such replacement would open up the Waterfront to its citizens, improve the tax base, and create a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic?
Candidates

FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER
JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: The Bill of Rights guarantees that every person accused of a crime shall have the effective assistance of counsel. Whether an individual is rich or poor, that person is entitled to a competent and dedicated attorney.

In San Francisco it is the duty of the Public Defender to uphold this sacred right. In every case, we provide the client with the best defense under the law.

In the last 7 years, my outstanding staff has done this work with the highest degree of professionalism. In the next 4 years, that same strong, professional, independent and ethical representation will continue.

Jeff Brown

FOR ASSESSOR
SAM DUCA

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I was elected your Assessor in 1978 and re-elected in 1982. My years in the Assessor’s Office were spent in a professional appraisal capacity personnel and administration. I have two university degrees, the coveted MAI designation, and am the recipient of a special Congressional Advisory Board award from the United States Congress. I have served in an advisory capacity, both nationally and internationally, in property tax administration and will continue to serve the taxpayers of the City and County of San Francisco in dealing with Article XIII-A of the State Constitution. My community involvement includes participation in cultural, civic business organizations.

Sam Duca

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John D. Bardis, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Henry E. Berman, 843 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative In Congress, 5th District
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
George Christopher, 170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Clerk
Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Artist/Community Organizer
Brian Getz, 55 22nd Ave., Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson, Sheriff of San Francisco
Thomas E. Horn, 930 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Mantie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., International Vice President, ILGWU
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for Children & Youth
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070 26th Ave., Executive Assistant to Sala Burton M.C.
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Community Health Director
Linda Ann Post, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative
Jim Rivaldo, 430 Steiner St., Political Consultant
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Member, SF Community College District Governing Board
Yori Woda, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel W. Walker, 562 Campbell Ave., President — Local 250-A Transport Workers Union of America
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilaritas Ave., Minister
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor
C. R. Zanca, 1966 Pacific Ave., Auto Repair Proprietor

The sponsors for Sam Duca are:
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
Eugene L. Friend, 2910 Lake St., Investor
Nancy Pelosi, 40 Presidio Ter., Housewife and volunteer in politics
Walter H. Shorenstein, 740 El Camino del Mar., Chairman, Milton Meyer & Co.
Stanley Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Emma W. Louie, 1257 Jackson St., Housewife
Alfred S. Wilsey, 2590 Jackson St., Ch. of Exec. Comm. of Diversified Holding Co.
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hinckley Walk, Physician
Gerson Bakar, 2310 Hyde St., Investor
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management
Jane McCaskie Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired
Joseph C. Orenget, Sr., 866 Faxon Ave., Publicity Dept., — S.F. Giants
James A. Scatena, 101 St. Elmo Way, Chairman of the Board, Scatena York Co.
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher
Frances May McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Recreation & Park Commissioner
Frederick F. Campagnoli, 2609 Larkin St., Attorney
Betty Brooks, 1738 26th St., Field Representative
Jess Teruel Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Businessman
Cyril I. Mgnin, 994 California St., Merchant
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John H. Swanson, 145 Lake Merced Hill South, Bowling Alley Owner
Frances G. Goldman, 745 El Camino Del Mar, Child Guidance
Irina M. Bernardo, 2182 34th Ave., Housewife
Leo J. Murphy, 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Charles M. Cunningham, 475 Connecticut St., Self Employed
Lawrence V. Eppinette, 815 Fell St., Conf. Secretary
Mary M. O’Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Volunteer & Homemaker
Elizabeth R. Duca, 16 Wawona St., Homemaker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Application for Absentee Ballot

is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

Name ____________________________________________

Residence Address __________________________________

Mailing Address ____________________________________

Signature _________________________________________

If the person to whom this pamphlet is addressed no longer resides at this address, please draw a diagonal slash (/) through the address label and drop the pamphlet in the mailbox.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible. This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
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Would ban development of the Balboa Reservoir site (near Ocean & Phelan Avenues) for three years.
Analysis ......................................................... 36
Arguments ...................................................... 37-50
Legal Text ....................................................... 77

PROPOSITION F
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Would declare it to be City policy that businesses with ties to South Africa be boycotted.
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Would declare it to be City policy that an AIDS research council be established.
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CREDITS
The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The active members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Suzanne Goyette, Mary Ann Aronson, Mary Martin and Tom Owen.
EXPLANATION OF YOUR SAMPLE BALLOT

At primary elections there aren’t enough voting machines to assign a separate machine to each party at each precinct; therefore, some of the machines will have to handle more than one party.

In each precinct we have assigned one or two voting machines to handle the ballots of the nonpartisan voters and the voters belonging to the American Independent Party, the Peace and Freedom Party and the Libertarian Party.

Since all four types of voters will be using the same machine (but with different ballots) it is possible that some confusion might result, so it is important that you study these pages carefully.

If you are in doubt as to what party you are affiliated with, check the address label on the back cover of this pamphlet. Your party affiliation appears above your name and address. Nonpartisan voters (those who have no party) are indicated on the address label as “D-S”; this stands for “Decline to State”.

Here is what you can expect when you go to your polling place on June 3:

NONPARTISAN VOTERS: You will get a BROWN ballot card. Go into the appropriately marked booth. Inside the booth you will vote on only the brown pages. There are four brown pages numbered 6, 7, 8 and 9.

PEACE & FREEDOM VOTERS: You will get a YELLOW ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the yellow pages and the brown pages.

AMERICAN INDEPENDENT VOTERS: You will get a BLUE ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the blue pages and the brown pages.

LIBERTARIAN VOTERS: You will be given RED ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the red pages and brown pages.

In other words, everyone votes on the brown pages of the voting machine and, in addition, members of the three smaller parties also vote on the color-coded page(s) that match the color of the ballot card that they are given.
# AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>GARY V. MILLER</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>JAMES C. &quot;JIM&quot; GRIFFIN</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>THERESA &quot;TENA&quot; DIETRICH</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>MERTON D. SHORT</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>GARY R. ODOM</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: This page will be blue)

If you are affiliated with the American Independent Party,

This will be the first page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the next page.
AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY

(MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE IGUALAMIENTO) 州平權局委員 請選 1 人 Vote por Uno Vote for One

NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED 無候選人

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

30 ➞

(SENADOR DE ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國參議員 請選 1 人 Vote por Uno Vote for One

United States Senator

EDWARD B. "ED" VALLEN
Director, Patriotic Committee/Director del Comité Patriótico 美國委員會主任

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

33 ➞

(REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國衆議員 請選 1 人 Vote por Uno Vote for One

United States Representative

NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED 無候選人

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

38 ➞

(SENADOR ESTATAL) 州參議員 請選 1 人 Vote por Uno Vote for One

State Senator

No candidate has filed/No se ha presentado ningún candidato 無候選人
Write-in votes are permitted. Follow the posted instructions.

41 ➞

(MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL) 州衆議員 請選 1 人 Vote por Uno Vote for One

Member of the State Assembly

NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED 無候選人

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

45 ➞

(MIEMBRO, COMITE CENTRAL DEL CONDADO) 縣中央委員 請選最多 8 人 Vote por no más de 8

Member, County Central Committee 購票 for no more than 8

NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED 無候選人

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

49 ➞

Now continue voting on the brown pages numbered 6, 7, 8, & 9.
Continúe votando en las páginas de color café, numeradas 6, 7, 8, & 9.
請在棕色紙第 6、7、8 及 9 頁上繼續投票。

(NOTE: THIS PAGE WILL BE BLUE)

If you are affiliated with the
AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY,

This will be the second page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the pages numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 to vote for nonpartisan offices and propositions. On your voting machine those pages will be colored brown.
**LIBERTARIAN PARTY**

**GOBERNADOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG</td>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSOR DE ECONOMIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VICEGOBERNADOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NORMA JEAN ALMODOVAR</td>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autor/Autor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECRETARIO DE ESTADO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD WINGER</td>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Law Consultant/Consultor de Leyes Electorales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONTRALOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAROLYN TREYNOR</td>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administrator/Administrador de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TESORERO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAY CULLEN</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.P.A./Contador Público Certificado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROCURADOR GENERAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAROL L. NEWMAN</td>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney, Private Practice/Abogado, Despacho Propio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*(NOTE: THIS PAGE WILL BE RED)*

If you are affiliated with the LIBERTARIAN PARTY,

This will be the first page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED</th>
<th>BRECK MCKINLEY</th>
<th>SAMUEL K. GROVE</th>
<th>(SENADOR ESTATAL)</th>
<th>(SENADOR DE ESTADOS UNIDOS)</th>
<th>(MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>NO SE HA PRESENTADO NINGUN CANDIDATO</td>
<td>Financial Consultant / Consultor Financiero</td>
<td>Electronic Technician / Tecnico en Electronica</td>
<td>州参議員</td>
<td>美国参議員</td>
<td>州衆議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 3, 1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIBERTARIAN PARTY**

NOW CONTINUE VOTING ON THE BROWN PAGES NUMBERED 6, 7, 8, & 9.

**NOTE: THIS PAGE WILL BE RED**

If you are affiliated with the LIBERTARIAN PARTY,

This will be the second page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the pages numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 to vote for nonpartisan offices and propositions. On your voting machine those pages will be colored brown.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOBERNADOR (Governor)</td>
<td>CHERYL ZUUR Labor/Latino Activist/Activista Laboral Latina</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>must refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARIA ELIZABETH MUNOZ Educadora/Educadora</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>must refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICEGOBERNADOR (Lieutenant Governor)</td>
<td>CLYDE KUHN College Instructor/Instructor de Colegio Universitario</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>must refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECRETARIO DE ESTADO (Secretary of State)</td>
<td>GLORIA GARCIA Worker/Trabajadora</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>must refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRALOR (Controller)</td>
<td>JOHN HAAG Peace/Political Activist/Activista Politico Pacifista</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>must refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESORERO (Treasurer)</td>
<td>DOV WISNER Worker/Trabajador</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>must refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAUREEN SMITH Union/Community Organizer/Organizadora Sindical y Comunitaria</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>must refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCURADOR GENERAL (Attorney General)</td>
<td>ROBERT J. EVANS Lawyer/Abogado</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>must refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: This page will be yellow)

If you are affiliated with the PEACE & FREEDOM PARTY,

This will be the first page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Vote Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td>ROBERTO LOVATO</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>LENNI BRENNER</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>THEODORE &quot;TED&quot; ZUUR</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker/Trabajador</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Candidate has filed. No se ha presentado ningún candidato. Write-in votes are permitted. Follow the posted instructions.</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the State Assembly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED/NO SE HA PRESENTADO NINGUN CANDIDATO</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, County Central Committee</td>
<td>KIM BOERNER</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker/Socialist Organizer/Trabajador/Organizadora Socialista</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEODORE &quot;TED&quot; ZUUR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker—Socialist Activist/Trabajador/Activista Socialista</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL KANGAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist Organizer/Organizador Socialista</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now continue voting on the brown pages numbered 6, 7, 8, & 9.
Continue votando en las páginas de color café, numeradas 6, 7, 8, & 9.

(Note: This page will be yellow)
If you are affiliated with the PEACE & FREEDOM PARTY,

This will be the second page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the pages numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 to vote for nonpartisan offices and propositions. On your voting machine those pages will be colored brown.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

**SPECIAL NOTE:**
*IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.*

**STEP 1**

**Using both hands:**
**Insert the ballot card all the way into the Votomatic.**

*Nota: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de voto y obtenga otra.*

**STEP 2**

**Be sure the two slots in the stub of your card fit down over the two red pins.**

*Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabezitas rojas.*

**STEP 3**

**Hold punch vertical (straight up).**
**Punch straight down through the ballot card to indicate your choice. Do not use pen or pencil.**

*Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de voto y perfure con él la tarjeta de voto en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.*

**STEP 4**

**After voting, withdraw the ballot card and place it inside the envelope pocket, with the stub showing.**

*Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y péguela bajo el cierre del sobre.*

(\*Due to space limitations and requirements that the other sample ballot pages face each other, the voting instructions had to be placed in the middle of your sample ballot. When you go to the polls this page on your voting machine will be blank.\*)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</strong></td>
<td>DANIEL NUSBAUM Teacher Maestro</td>
<td>211 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEANNE BAIRD Educational Project Advisor Asesora para Proyectos Educativos</td>
<td>213 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BILL HONIG State Superintendent of Public Instruction Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública</td>
<td>215 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>217 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessor</strong></td>
<td>SAM DUCA Incumbent En posesin del Cargo 现任信税官</td>
<td>222 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>224 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Defender</strong></td>
<td>JEFF BROWN Incumbent En posesin del Cargo 现任公共辯護律師</td>
<td>229 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>231 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Vote Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $850,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td>YES 236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>COMMUNITY PARKLANDS ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for acquiring, developing, improving, rehabilitating, or restoring urgently needed local and regional parks, beaches, recreational areas and facilities, and historical resources.</td>
<td>YES 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>WATER CONSERVATION AND WATER QUALITY BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $150,000,000 to provide funds for water conservation, groundwater recharge and drainage water management, and clarifies language in the Clean Water Bond Law of 1984.</td>
<td>YES 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>DEPOSIT OF PUBLIC MONEYS IN CREDIT UNIONS. Authorizes Legislature to provide for deposit of public moneys in any credit union. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect. Legislation already approved implementing measure could result in greater interest income to state and local governments.</td>
<td>YES 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. Provides exception to property tax limit when acquisition or improvement of real property approved by two-thirds of voters. Fiscal Impact: By itself, measure has no fiscal effect. No increase can occur in local property tax rate unless bond issue is approved by two-thirds vote. State costs for tax relief programs could increase. State income tax revenues could decline as taxpayers deduct greater amounts for property tax payments.</td>
<td>YES 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>ALLOCATION OF VEHICLE LICENSE FEE TAXES TO COUNTIES AND CITIES. Requires allocation of Vehicle License Fee taxes to local governments. Fiscal Impact: Measure would have no direct fiscal effect. Prevents Legislature from changing the law to take vehicle license fees away from counties and cities. Measure would not prevent state reducing other forms of aid to local governments or changing existing formula for dividing vehicle license fee revenues between counties and cities.</td>
<td>YES 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>LEGISLATORS' AND JUDGES' RETIREMENT SYSTEMS. Limits retirement allowances for persons entering Legislators' and Judges' Retirement Systems after January 1, 1987. Fiscal Impact: Minor savings to state in future years if rate of inflation exceeds increase in salaries paid to current officeholders.</td>
<td>YES 258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1986. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $500,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en la compra de granjas y casas para los veteranos de California.

ACTA DE TERRENO DE PARQUES DE LA COMUNIDAD DE 1986. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición, desarrollo, mejora, rehabilitación o la restauración urgentemente necesitada por parques, playas, áreas de recreación y los recursos históricos locales y regionales.

LEY DE BONOS PARA LA CONSERVACIÓN DE AGUA Y CONTROL DE LA CALIDAD DEL AGUA DE 1986. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $150,000,000 para la conservación del agua, reabastecimiento de agua subterránea, manejo apropiado del agua de drenaje y clarificación del lenguaje en la Ley de Bonos para Agua Limpia de 1984.

DEPÓSITO DE FONDOS PÚBLICOS EN COOPERATIVAS DE CRÉDITO. Autoriza a la Legislatura para que disponga el depósito de fondos públicos en cualquier cooperativa de crédito.

FINACIÓ DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD: Dispone exenciones a los límites de impuestos a la propiedad en el caso de adquisición o mejoramiento de la propiedad inmobiliaria si es aprobada por dos tercios partes de los votantes. Impacto Fiscal: Por el acta, la medida no tiene ningún impacto fiscal. Ningún aumento en la tasa de los impuestos locales a la propiedad puede ocurrir a menos que una medida de bonos sea aprobada por los dos tercios partes de los votantes. Los costos asociados con programas de desgravación de impuestos podrían aumentar. Los recaudos de los impuestos están en la mente para disminuir a medida que los contribuyentes de impuestos descubran mayores saldos por el impuesto a la propiedad.

ASIGNACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS POR PAGOS DE LICENCIA DE VEHÍCULOS A LOS CONDADO Y CIUDADES. Requiere la asignación a los gobiernos locales de los impuestos recaudados en pagos de licencia de vehículos. Impacto Fiscal: La medida no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo, implica que la Legislatura puede cambiar la ley para tomar los fondos provenientes de licencias de vehículos de las ciudades y condados. La medida no evitará que el estado pueda reducir otras formas de asistencia a los gobiernos locales o que pueda cambiar la fórmula actual de dividir los recaudos provenientes del pago por licencia de vehículos entre los condados y ciudades.

SISTEMAS DE JUICIO DE LOS LEGISLADORES Y JUECES. Limita las penas de julgamiento para aquellos personas que se atienden al Sistema de Juzgamiento de los Legisladores y Jueces después del 5 de enero de 1997. Impacto Fiscal: Ahorros menores para el estado en futuro. Los futuros aumentos de inflación exceden el aumento en los salarios que se pagan a los que actualmente ocupan cargos.
### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

#### STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fiscal Impact</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>NONPARTISAN OFFICES. Prohibits a political party or party central committee from endorsing, supporting, or opposing a candidate for nonpartisan office. Fiscal Impact: No direct state or local government fiscal impact.</td>
<td>YES 262</td>
<td>NO 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. DISASTERS. Base-year value of property damaged or destroyed by disaster transferable to comparable replacement property in same county. Fiscal Impact: Local property tax revenues would decrease by an unknown amount. County assessor and tax collectors would have nonsignificant higher administrative costs. State would replace revenues lost by school and community college districts. State income tax revenues could increase due to lower property tax deductions on replacement properties. These state costs and revenues cannot be estimated.</td>
<td>YES 266</td>
<td>NO 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>MULTIPLE DEFENDANTS TORT DAMAGE LIABILITY. Plaintiff's non-economic damage recovery limited to defendant's liability based on defendant's percentage of fault. Fiscal Impact: Substantial savings to state and local governments. Savings could be several millions of dollars in a year, varying significantly from year to year.</td>
<td>YES 270</td>
<td>NO 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>COUNTY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county correctional facilities and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of four hundred ninety-five million dollars ($495,000,000).</td>
<td>YES 273</td>
<td>NO 274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgements against the City?</td>
<td>YES 278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?</td>
<td>YES 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>PROPOSITION C HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THE BALLOT BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disposiciones sometidas al voto de los electores — Proposiciones Estatales

262 SI 贷成
263 NO 反对

266 SI 贷成
267 NO 反对

273 SI 贷成
274 NO 反对

278 SI 贷成
279 NO 反对

281 SI 贷成
282 NO 反对

Responsabilidad civil de multitudes partes demandadas en juicios de agravios indemnizables. Limita la indemnización que puede recibir el demandante por daños no económicos a la responsabilidad del demandado basándose en el porcentaje de la culpabilidad del demandado. Impacto Fiscal: Ahorros sustanciales para los gobiernos estatales y locales. Los ahorros podrían ser algunos millones de dólares al año, que variarían significativamente de año en año.

Acta de bonos para desempeño de capital para instalaciones corregionales de condados de 1988. Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelación, y reemplazo de instalaciones corregionales de los condados y la ejecución del mantenimiento diario en las mismas. Se normalizan con una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos noventa y cinco millones de dólares ($495,000,000,000).

"¿Debería la ciudad establecer una oficina de administración del riesgo y un departamento de investigación y administración de demandas, para estudiar y reducir el riesgo de pleitos y sanciones contra la ciudad?"

"No debemos autorizar al Comprador a firmar contratos por menos de $50,000 sin la aprobación del Jefe Administrativo y a permitir que sus agentes firmen contratos en su lugar?"

Oficialmente Eliminada

正式撤消
# MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSITIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

288 SI "Deberá la Ciudad transferir la administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil a un departamento administrativo de personal que tenga poder para cambiar las normas del servicio civil que se presente en la Carta Constitucional?"

289 NO "反對"

292 SI "Deberá la Ciudad negar o revocar cualquier permiso de construcción para edificar en el Regreso Balboa en las Avenidas Ocean y Phelan en los próximos tres años?"

293 NO "反對"

296 SI "Deberá la Ciudad prohibir la defensa remunerada efectuada por oficiales de la Ciudad y legisladores estatales ante cualquier comisión de la Ciudad, y limitar la cantidad con la que una persona pueda contribuir para un candidato a una oficina municipal en $5000?"

297 NO "反對"

VOTER SELECTION CARD

PRIMARY ELECTION
JUNE 3, 1986

POLLS ARE OPEN
FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 236 237</td>
<td>A 276 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 239 240</td>
<td>B 281 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 242 243</td>
<td>C 286 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 246 247</td>
<td>D 288 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 249 250</td>
<td>E 292 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 254 255</td>
<td>F 296 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 258 259</td>
<td>G 300 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 262 263</td>
<td>H 303 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 266 267</td>
<td>I 307 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 270 271</td>
<td>J 310 311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR CANDIDATE SELECTION
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

D  Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?  YES 288  NO 289

E  Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?  YES 292  NO 293

F  Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?  YES 296  NO 297

G  Shall it be the policy of the people to encourage closest ties with South Africa?  

H  Shall it be the policy of the people and private organizations to encourage a peace council?  

I  Shall it be the policy of the people to prohibit the construction of a freeway?  

J  Shall it be the policy of the people to widen the La Jolla Freeway, if it would increase traffic?  

VOTER SELECTION CARD

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>County Central Committee*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>5.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td>6.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>7.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>8.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate</td>
<td>9.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td>10.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. Public Inst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to your sample ballot for the number of County Central Committee members to be elected. The number varies with each district.

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR PROPOSITIONS.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

BALLOT — An official list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL — See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION — This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

MEASURE — Another name for proposition.

CHALLENGE — Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

SUPERVISORS — Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — The charter is the basic set of laws for the city government. A charter amendment changes one of those basic laws. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE — A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

DECLARATION OF POLICY — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, the supervisors must carry out the policy, to the extent legally possible.

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

PETITION — A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

PERMIT (noun) — A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building. Proposition F concerns the issuance of a permit.

COMPENSATED ADVOCACY — Compensated means being paid for doing something; Advocacy means speaking or writing on behalf of someone else. Proposition F concerns the issue of compensated advocacy.

RISK MANAGEMENT — This field covers two areas: (1) deciding on when it is better to buy insurance and when it is better to be self insured or uninsured, then shopping for the insurance; (2) identifying hazardous conditions on one's property and seeing that they are corrected so that liability and damage claims will be avoided. Proposition A concerns risk management.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.
Risk Manager; Claims Investigation

PROPOSITION A

Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgments against the City?

YES 278
NO 279

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Consultants hired by the Chief Administrative Officer are available to City departments that have questions about "risk management", such as how to keep damage claims to a minimum and how to find the best insurance rates. In some cases, the departments use these consultants. In other cases, the departments make their own decisions. When damage claims are filed, some are handled by the City Attorney's Office and some are handled by City departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would amend the City Charter to create an Office of Risk Management, under the Chief Administrative Officer. The office would set risk management guidelines for all City departments, boards and commissions. Proposition A would also establish a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration in the City Attorney's Office. The bureau would be responsible for investigating, evaluating and processing all damage claims made against the City, except those claims made against the Public Utilities Commission and the Police Department. The bureau would also have the power to investigate potential suits against the City and to make settlements within dollar limits to be set by ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer and a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want damage claims and risk management decisions to continue to be handled the way they are now.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not affect the cost of government. However as a result of its potential future application and the exemption of certain employees from the civil service provisions of the Charter, costs may be affected in an amount presently indeterminate."

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On March 10 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted "No."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON A

Last fiscal year, over 6,400 claims and law suits were filed against the City, costing us more than $10 million in settlements. I believe that it is time to change the way we handle our claims, secure insurance, prevent risks and settle legitimate claims against the City.

Last summer, we appointed a task force of citizens, under San Francisco Bar President Jerry Falk, to make recommendations on how to streamline our procedures and save money at the same time. The present system is very slow, costly, and inefficient.

Currently, all claims are investigated by the department involved. The City Attorney cannot act on any claim until the department is ready. This results in delay and duplication of effort and increased costs. A centralized and accountable Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney would be more efficient, cost-effective, and professional. It would enable the City to settle many claims quickly, before litigation is begun, saving the City the costs of defending itself in court and lowering the average cost of settling a case.

This can be accomplished without creating new jobs by simply moving into one office the city positions presently scattered throughout the government.

Vote “Yes” on A. Reduce the cost of City government.

Adoption of this measure would also formally establish responsibility for Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer, where it has been unofficially since 1978. With this strengthened authority, the Risk Management Office would be responsible for the gathering of claims data on a City-wide basis, the creation of incentives for both reducing the possibility for injuries and damage and the number of claims for each department, the coordination of insurance purchasing and specific suggestions to avoid and reduce risk.

This amendment is presented with the recommendation of the Mayor’s Task Force on Claims and Judgments, the Chief Administrative Officer, City Attorney, the President of the San Francisco Bar Association, and the President of the Lawyers’ Club of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Each year the City spends almost $10 million to settle damage claims. It is estimated that the overall costs to the City for all risk-related activities exceeds $125 million a year. It is time for action to be taken to reduce these huge expenditures. This charter amendment is designed to do just that.

Claims Investigation and Adjustment

Right now, the City claims investigation process is decentralized and largely unorganized. Each department investigates its own claims. Investigators may or may not be specially trained for their duties. There is no uniformity of investigation procedure or claims reporting. In only a few departments do investigators contact injured parties within days of an accident in order to settle the claim quickly and economically.

This amendment will create a claims investigation and adjustment bureau in the Office of the City Attorney. Claims investigation and adjustment activities will be centralized, economized and made much more efficient. The new bureau will be able to respond immediately to accidents and claims, providing quick compensation to deserving persons while at the same time producing a prompt, professional investigation. This reform is greatly needed.

Risk Management

Presently, there is no overall plan for the management of the City’s risk exposure: insurance purchasing, avoidance of industrial accidents, gathering data on accident patterns, etc. Again, risk management as a function is fragmented among the various City departments. As a consequence, departments cannot develop the necessary expertise to manage themselves to reduce risk-related costs.

This measure will establish a risk manager under the Chief Administrative Officer. For the first time, overall City planning will be possible in order to control risk. Departments will be told what activities are producing injuries or damage and advised on corrective measures. Private industry has been utilizing risk managers of this type for years. It is time that the City did the same.

This amendment will reduce the cost of government and insure a more efficient delivery of City services to all San Franciscans. We urge you to give it your unqualified support.

Board of Supervisors

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This charter amendment was proposed by a citizens' task force appointed by Mayor Feinstein. Its mission was to propose ways of reducing the number and financial costs of claims and lawsuits against the City.

The amendment has two principal features. The first is to centralize within the City Attorney's office the investigation of claims filed against city departments. This will allow for improved training and supervision of the investigators, who presently are scattered throughout city government. The result will be more efficient, cost-effective and professional investigation of claims. By improving the quality of claims investigation, the City can identify those claims which have merit and attempt to reach early — and less costly — settlements. Meritless claims will be denied with greater confidence that if suit is filed it can be defended successfully.

The second major feature of the amendment will establish a Risk Management office under the Chief Administrative Officer. Risk management is a concept widely used in private business. Risk managers are professionals skilled in reducing the overall cost of claims. The Risk Manager would be responsible for coordinating the City's insurance program, data collection, and correcting problems within the City which lead to claims. The Risk Manager would review those claims which have been filed against the City. Where it appears that an unsafe condition or practice has led to a claim, the Risk Manager would suggest to the affected department that corrective measures be taken. Reports to the Mayor and to the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors of the recommended corrections and the actions taken would ensure that the various departments will be responsive.

The City cannot eliminate claims and lawsuits against it. But it can limit its exposure by managing the claims process more effectively. This measure will reduce injuries and reduce claims, and that is good for everyone.

Jerome B. Falk, Jr.
Chair, Mayor's Task Force on Claims and Judgments Against the City

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN
KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, May 31, 1986
12 Noon  State Senate, Assembly, Congress and State Propositions
1:00  Proposition A — Risk Management & Claims
1:15  Proposition B — Purchaser & Contracts
1:30  Proposition D — Civil Service
2:15  Proposition E — Balboa Reservoir
2:30  Proposition F — Compensated Advocacy
3:00  Proposition G — Apartheid
3:20  Proposition H — AIDS
3:30  Propositions I, J — Embarcadero Freeway
3:50  Statewide Candidates

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION B

Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchaser must get the approval of the Chief Administrative Officer before signing certain contracts for more than $15,000. Only the voters may change that dollar limit. The Purchaser must personally sign every contract that comes through his office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would raise the limit on contracts requiring the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval to $50,000. It would also allow the Board of Supervisors to change that limit by ordinance. Proposition B would also permit the Purchaser to name certain people in his office to sign contracts on his behalf.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval only on contracts for more than $50,000. You also want the Purchaser to be able to name certain people in his office to be able to sign contracts on his behalf.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to require the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval on contracts for more than $15,000. You also want him to sign all contracts himself.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

“Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 3 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON B!

The City's Charter requires that a permanent, non-elected City official, the Chief Administrative Officer, review all purchases and contracts above $15,000. Of course, CAO approval of major contracts is very important. But, due to inflation, the number of contracts that have to go to the CAO for approval is always increasing. Today there are too many documents requiring CAO approval. This slows down the purchasing process, occupies staff time—and ultimately costs the City money. Proposition B will raise the CAO approval level to $50,000, and help the City to improve the efficiency of its purchasing operations.

The City's budget includes more than $250 million for purchases on tens of thousands of contracts. At the current $15,000 review limit, the CAO must approve thousands of documents every year—a costly, time-consuming process. In the long run the City loses money because of the inordinate length of time required to complete all the paperwork.

An adjustment must be made to remove the smaller contracts from this cumbersome process. Review and approval of contracts under $50,000 should be under the responsibility of the City Purchaser, a highly trained and experienced professional, who reports directly to the CAO. By changing the present $15,000 to $50,000, it will be possible for the CAO to give each document that comes to him the attention it requires. And, by placing its orders and paying its bills faster, both the City and businesses will benefit—especially small business and those owned by minorities and women.

Proposition B will allow future adjustments to the limit to be made by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility will ensure the City's ability to adjust to inflation and changes in the market.

This amendment comes to you with the recommendation of auditors, controllers, bankers, and others who exercise top fiduciary responsibility within their own organizations.

VOTE YES ON B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will make essential changes to update the purchasing and payment procedures under the Chief Administrative Officer. These measures are necessary and desirable because they will save the City money by significantly increasing our management efficiency.

Right now, the City loses because it takes too long for contracts to be reviewed and payments okayed, which means that early payment incentives go unutilized. The CAO has to approve every contract greater than $15,000—and with City purchases last year over $250 million, the paperwork logjam is vast and overwhelming.

An increase in the review limit from $15,000 to $50,000 will make an adequate adjustment for inflation—$50,000 now is only about $15,000 in 1967 dollars. Proposition B will also enable the City Purchaser, who reports to the CAO, to maximize potential savings through early payments by designating appropriate personnel to approve contracts up to $50,000. These “Good Business” amendments are consistent with private sector practices and should be incorporated by the CAO in the City’s best interests.

Finally, Proposition B will give the City the ability to respond quickly to changes in the market place by allowing changes in the CAO review limit by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility is necessary to ensure that in the future we will not lose money because of institutional rigidity. Control is maintained with the necessity of Board action and Mayoral approval to adjust the review limit, and this same feature will allow for change when desired.

Vote yes on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civil Service

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the civil service system of the City of San Francisco. The structure of the civil service system and certain rules governing its operation are written into the Charter and can only be changed by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would make major changes. A Department of Personnel Administration would run the Civil Service system and would be able to change rules with Commission approval. Major features of Proposition D are described below. The complete charter amendment is printed in this voters’ handbook.

Department of Personnel Administration

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Certain civil service rules governing the general operation of the system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs, are written into the Charter and carried out by the Civil Service Commission. Only the voters can change these rules.

THE PROPOSAL: A department of Personnel Administration would be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. A Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor would run the Department. Certain rules governing examination, selection and appointment would be taken out of the Charter. The Personnel Director would be able to change these rules with the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

Civil Service Commission

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the general operation of the civil service system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs. The Commission also hears and decides appeals on civil service matters.

THE PROPOSAL: The Civil Service Commission would no longer be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. The Commission could investigate the operation of the system, approve rule changes proposed by the Personnel Director, and hear and decide appeals only on claims of job discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest.

Employee Relations

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors appoints an Employee Relations Director to negotiate contracts with City employees; the Board approves all contracts.

THE PROPOSAL: The Mayor or his or her agent would negotiate with City employees; the Board of Supervisors would still approve all contracts.

What your vote means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing civil service system.

CONTROLLER’S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE
Controller’s Statement on “D”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not directly affect the cost of government, as it removes many civil service policy setting functions from the Charter and an independent Civil Service Commission and transfers responsibility for personnel matters, including labor negotiations, to the Mayor.

"As a product of its inherent flexibility and possible future application, costs could be affected or savings realized in amounts presently indeterminate but probably substantial."

How “D” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative Charter amendment rewriting the civil service provisions of the Charter had qualified for the June ballot.

Robert Bradford, Jonathan Bulkley, Lee Munsen and Mary Hilton, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 36,049 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 25,027 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

Polls Close at 8:00 p.m.

Text of Proposed Initiative Charter Amendment

Proposition D

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. Consistent with the City's and County's affirmative action goals, no applicant or employee shall be selected, appointed, reduced in rank, removed or in any way favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, union activities, political affiliation or sexual orientation.

(b) The purpose of the civil service system is to obtain for the city and county the best qualified persons to fill city and county positions in a timely and economical manner, using professional, fair and equitable personnel selection and personnel management practices with consideration of the following merit principles:

1. Recruiting, selecting and advancing employees on the basis of their ability, knowledge, skills and performance relative to the work to be performed.

2. Establishing equitable and adequate compensation, as provided elsewhere in this charter.

3. Training employees, as needed, to promote productivity and high quality performance and to facilitate career development.

4. Retaining employees during good service and separating employees for good cause.

5. Assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration, with proper regard for their privacy and constitutional rights; and assuring equal employment opportunity, based on the person's ability to do the job.

6. Assuring that employees are protected against coercion for political purposes and are prohibited from using their official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the outcome of an election or a nomination for office.

(c) This charter does not limit the power of departments, agencies, or other subdivisions of the city and county in their exercise of management prerogatives including but not limited to:

1. Directing employees in the performance of their duties;

2. Hiring, promoting, transferring and assigning employees from those qualified;

3. Classifying positions in accordance with Section 3.663 (f);

4. Disciplining employees;

5. Laying off employees because of lack of work, lack of funds or other reasonable cause; and

6. Determining the mission of its departments and divisions, and its budget, organization, the number of its employees, and the numbers, types, classifications and grades of positions or employees assigned to an organization unit, work project, shift or type of duty, and the methods and technology of performing its work.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. No person shall in any way be favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, age, religion, national origin or other non-merit factors.

(b) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in subsection (a) or any other provisions of the charter, it shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, consistent with a policy of acquiring qualified personnel for the service of the city and county, to encourage the hiring of blind persons. It shall further be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that no otherwise qualified blind person shall be discriminated against in an examination, re-examination, appointment, re-appointment, waiver of eligibility for appointment or re-appointment, promotion, or demotion in any class, subclass or position in the civil service unless eyesight is indispensable for the performance of the duties and responsibilities of the class, subclass or position. It shall be the duty of the commission to classify, and from time to time it may, in its discretion, alter the duties of any class, subclass or position. The duties of members of the civil service shall be the duties of which may be efficiently performed by qualified blind persons and to conduct appropriate examinations which will fairly test the capacity of blind persons as well as sighted persons to perform such duties.

3.203 Employee Relations Director

—Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3.510 of this charter, the employee relations director shall be appointed by the board of supervisors and shall hold office at the pleasure of said board.

3.102 Employee Relations

It shall be the duty of the mayor to meet and confer with employee representatives on behalf of the city and county and all its constituent boards, commissions, departments and agencies as required by applicable law. These duties may be performed by a designee of the mayor who shall serve at the pleasure of the mayor. Nothing herein shall limit the mayor from contracting for the performance of these duties.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the mayor shall submit all memoranda of understanding or ordinances to be enacted pursuant to Article VIII of this charter herein to the Board of Supervisors for its approval or rejection.

3.660 Commission; Composition; Meetings

There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county, shall have the general powers and duties set forth in section 3.661.

The civil service commission shall consist of five members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and this charter section as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members whose offices are created by this amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed. The respective terms of the commissioners who shall hold office on the effective date of this section as amended shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date. Thereupon, the mayor shall appoint continued on page 73
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Vote YES and join 34,000 San Franciscans who signed petitions to get this crucial reform on the ballot. “D” clears the way to modernize Civil Service so that it is fair and efficient. The present system is a 50-year conglomeration of rules that tie the City’s hands—

— A protest by one applicant can hold up hiring for an entire job classification for months—even years.

— Often tests cannot be given frequently enough to maintain current tests of qualified employees. This leads to delays and temporary appointments that make hiring top candidates all but impossible.

— Appointments to jobs are restricted to the top three names on a list even though more than three people have the same score!

— Many provisions are out of date. Some deal with hiring during the Korean War. Others limit our ability to carry out affirmative action.

“D” would remove archaic rules from the Charter so they could be changed as the times require—subject to meet and confer and public hearings. Job tests could be expedited; hiring and promotions speeded up; opportunities opened to women and minorities.

Specifically, Proposition D:
1) Creates a Department of Personnel Administration at no additional cost. Like other U.S. cities, day-to-day administration would be the responsibility of a director, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Supervisors.
2) Makes the Civil Service Commission the oversight body to set policy and hear appeals. Rulings would have to be within 60 days, eliminating endless delays.
3) Moves the office of labor relations from the Supervisors to the Mayor, who must make the tough-minded decisions to balance the budget. Never again could the Board give labor $27 million for “comparable worth.”

This reform is the product of years of work with SPUR, League of Women Voters, Chamber of Commerce. Members of the Board of Supervisors could have put the reform on the ballot last year but bowed to some labor leaders, and 34,000 San Franciscans had to do the job for them.

Proposition D will enable City government to work better for you. Vote YES.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON ‘D’

Proposition D is a complex proposition with a simple goal: remove the archaic restrictions on the hiring, promotion, or firing of city employees and bring San Francisco’s personnel system into the modern age.

Archaic is the only way to describe a system that keeps equally qualified people from competing for a job, and that takes months—sometimes years—to fill vacancies.

For example, if 50 people score equally high on a competitive examination, shouldn’t they all have a chance for any job for which they are eligible? Not under the current system, which requires complicated tie-breaking rules not at all related to a person’s qualifications or abilities.

Or what about being able to hire the best person available for a given job? Currently, eligibility lists are frozen for two years and every person on each list, including the lowest-scoring, must be offered a job before the highest-scoring person on a more recent list. Private businesses couldn’t function saddled with such absurdities.

Proposition D cuts through the red tape. It creates a modern personnel department, with a director responsible for carrying out rules to ensure fairness and efficiency. Accountable to the Mayor, the director would be selected from a list provided by the Civil Service Commission, and subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.

The Civil Service Commission remains an independent body, with the right to approve new personnel rules and hold hearings on abuses. Also under ‘D’, negotiations with employee unions would be under the Mayor, subject to approval by the Supervisors, providing checks and balances in balancing our budget.

With greater accountability and continued checks and balances, Proposition D will open the way to more efficient government in our City.

Bill Maher, Supervisor
Louise Renne, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON ‘D’

Proposition D is a necessary reform to the City’s Civil System. As the City’s Chief Administrative Officer for almost ten years, I have found that quality employee hiring is difficult and the process causes long delays.

The current system is:
• inflexible. The City cannot hire and promote the most qualified persons.
• inefficiently administered by a commission. Other large
cities do not have such a bureaucratic process.

- antiquated. Civil service rules represent practices of the 1950s rather than the 1980s.

The new system:

- allows the Mayor to appoint an effective personnel director, who controls administration and procedures.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

It's 1986 and we're still trying to manage City business as if it were 1932. As heads of City departments, charged with the daily responsibility of putting out fires, fighting crime, maintaining hospitals, parks, libraries and providing other essential services, we know from bitter experience about shortcomings of the existing Civil Service System.

Enacted with the City Charter in 1932, the system is foundering in red tape. Outdated rules are the subject of endless challenges. Tests are put off; vacancies go unfilled; promotions delayed; any appeal, however groundless, stops the process in its tracks.

Proposition D would take old procedures out of the Charter so they could be changed in an orderly process by the Civil Service Commission, which also would hear appeals.

Day-to-day administration of the tests — the content, scoring, all the myriad details of managing a complex system, would be put into a modern, highly professional personnel office. Tests would be speeded up. Hiring would keep pace with need. Promotions would be on the basis of competence. High performance would be the standard. Discipline could be imposed with working rights fully protected, and women and minorities would be assured equal opportunity.

Proposition D will help improve management and the quality of City services. Vote Yes on D.

Frank Jordan, Chief of Police
Emmet Condon, Fire Chief
Don Barrer, Director, Public Works
Mary Burns, General Manager, Recreation & Park
John Frantz, City Librarian
Eugene Garland, Director, Port
Marvin Geislinger, Purchaser
Wilbur Hamilton, Executive Director, Redevelopment Agency
Claire Isaac, Director, Arts Commission
Ray King, Director, Parking Authority
Dean McAdams, Director, City Planning
Grant McKinnon, Director, Human Rights Commission
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, PUC
Joyce Ream, Director, Aging
Ed Sarsfield, General Manager, Social Services
Thelma Shelley, Managing Director, War Memorial
Moina So, Executive Director, Community Development
Louis Turpen, Director of Airport
Dr. David Wendegar, Director, Health Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The hiring practices outlined in San Francisco City Charter have been virtually unchanged since 1931, a severe handicap in running a modern city. Proposition D is designed to streamline the charter and ensure that the rights of present city employees and candidates for city jobs are protected, while improving the hiring process itself. The initiative also builds management accountability in the city system.

Proposition D Is More Fair, More Efficient, More Economical

The day-to-day personnel functions, including hiring, will be consolidated under a Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. Decisions of the Director of Personnel on examination content and administration are final, unless a decision is stayed during the appeal process by a unanimous vote of the Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D will make it easier to modernize the many archaic Civil Service rules and procedures now included in the Charter, while maintaining a strong and independent Civil Service Commission to safeguard the merit system and protect the rights of city employees. Many detailed rules will come out of the Charter and will become personnel regulations. These regulations can then be modernized, but only through a process which includes public hearings and meet and confer sessions with the union involved. In addition, the Civil Service Commission must approve any changes or new regulations governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfer, resignation and terminations.

Proposition D Will Improve Performance And Public Confidence

The openness and fairness of the proposition will benefit everyone. Well-qualified job candidates will have a better chance of being hired, and well-qualified job holders will have a better chance of being promoted. This means generally better job performance in all departments, resulting in higher employee morale and more public confidence in city government.

Submitted by
Louis Hop Lee, President
Civil Service Commission
Lee Munson, Member Civil Service Commission and Treasurer, San Franciscans for Fair and Efficient Government
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VOTE YES ON D

Cities can survive only with strong management. The greatest budgetary restraint must be exercised to assure that full value is received for each tax dollar spent.

With firm limits on what it can spend and faced with a possible loss of Federal funds next year, the City must be managed with the greatest possible efficiency.

Essential to greater efficiency is the need for Civil Service reform. As members of City Commissions, we constantly confront the torturous delays and confused rules that gridlock the present system. The present system simply can’t respond to the City’s personnel needs.

Qualified applicants become frustrated and seek employment elsewhere. Promotions are blocked. Morale suffers. Temporaries fill in; overtime mounts. The ability to plan is crippled; management is weakened.

Proposition D would put the system on a business-like basis. A personnel department would handle day-to-day administration. The Civil Service Commission would be the watchdog to assure the integrity of the merit system.

This streamlined system would replace what is now inflexible and cumbersome. Testing could be accelerated; hiring made more efficient and promotions made on time. The result would be greater efficiency and elimination of costly waste.

Vote Yes on D.

Jerry E. Berg, President, Board of Permit Appeals
Henry Berman, President, Fire Commission
Mo Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Hector Chinchilla, Rent Board
Rev. Harry Chuck, Housing Authority
Dr. Arthur Coleman, President, Port Commission
Owen Davis, Police Commission
J. Edward Fleishell, Airports Commission
H. Welton Flynn, President, Public Utilities Commission
James Foster, Health Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation & Park Commission
James Fassell, President, Housing Authority
Anne Halsted, Port Commission
Tommy Harris, Recreation & Park Commission
Tom Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Walter Jibe, Public Library Commission
Jeffrey Lee, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Philip Lee, President, Health Commission
Bruce W. Lilenthal, Small Business Advisory Commission
Jacqueline Nemerovski, President, Arts Commission
Toby Rosenblatt, President, Planning Commission
Dr. David Sanchez, President, Police Commission
Jean San Jule, Housing Authority
John Patrick Short, President, Parking Authority
Marjorie G. Stern, President, Public Library Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D contains civil service reform measures urged by the League of Women Voters since 1969.

Proposition D will:
— Modernize the City’s outdated personnel system by creating a Director of Personnel, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors
— Preserve the principles of merit through policies set by the Civil Service Commission
— Create a more responsive Civil Service system at no additional cost to the taxpayer

EFFICIENCY AND FLEXIBILITY

Proposition D transfers authority for day-to-day management of the City’s personnel system from the Civil Service Commission to the Director of Personnel. This will:
— Prevent hiring delays
— Ensure only the most qualified individuals are hired and promoted
— Provide City managers with more administrative flexibility

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Fairness for Employees

Proposition D will:
— Safeguard the rights of City workers
— Protect gains made in hiring women and minorities
— Retain the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit appeals board
— Retain the ability of the City’s unions to negotiate working conditions
— Create a system that can respond quickly and fairly to the needs of City workers

Proposition D will bring the Civil Service system into the 20th century by making the Mayor accountable for the management of a system employing more than 25,000 people. Hiring by merit is still guaranteed by the Charter. Please join us in voting for this Reform!

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
Esther Marks, Past President

28

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civil Service

held the termination. Two months later, the employee petitioned the commission for reinstatement. The employee got his job back, not because the process of termination was wrong but because the commission had a long standing objection to using “absent without leave” as a reason for firing.

The quality of public services is dependent upon the effectiveness of the staff who deliver them. The primary role of the civil service commission should be to facilitate recruitment and retention of the best available personnel. It must protect against favoritism and must assure that everyone has an equal and fair chance at employment.

The present system does not do that. We feel this initiative will make the system work better, for the managers, for the employees and for the public.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco government is huge, with a budget of more than $1 billion per year and 25,000 employees. It is expected to solve serious problems. This requires that the City have the ability to hire and promote talented people to do the job.

The present civil service system is so tied up in red tape that jobs remain vacant for six months to a year, and all too often someone who is not capable of doing a good job is hired. Your tax dollars are being wasted, and you are not receiving the quality of services you need and deserve.

Proposition D will modernize San Francisco’s civil service system. It separates the personnel department from the Civil Service Commission, and puts the department under the Mayor where it belongs. The Mayor is responsible for balancing the budget and delivering city services as efficiently as possible. She cannot do this unless she can find capable people to do the job. That is the task of the personnel department in any organization.

Proposition D will also insure that the independent Civil Service Commission has sufficient authority to require the personnel system to be fair in its treatment of City employees. The Commission will be able to issue subpoenas and require testimony of witnesses on investigations it conducts. Should it find that discrimination has occurred, it can issue orders that must be obeyed.

Most major American cities, and virtually all cities and counties in California, have the kind of civil service system that will be established by Proposition D. San Francisco’s present system is still mired in the past. It hobbles the ability of the City to deliver services and spend your tax dollars as efficiently as possible.

SPUR has not placed a statement in the Voter’s Handbook for any other issue over the past 15 years. We feel that Proposition D is so vital for San Francisco’s future that we are making this appeal for your support.

Vote “YES” on Proposition D.

SPUR—The San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Reform Initiative, will give San Francisco citizens the HIGH PERFORMANCE GOVERNMENT necessary to meet the many challenges of the future. Proposition D corrects the outdated and inflexible requirements originally written in San Francisco’s City Charter in 1931. It will eliminate the problems which prevent San Francisco’s personnel system from operating with efficiency the City’s voters and taxpayers deserve:

Proposition D insures City jobs will be filled from current lists of the most qualified employees.

Proposition D prevents ungrounded appeals from delaying for years the appointment or promotion of qualified employees.

Proposition D eliminates the repetitive tasks currently monopolizing the Civil Service Commission meetings and directs the Commission to serve as an appellate body to protect the City’s good employees.

Proposition D centralizes the day-to-day operation of the civil service system and makes the Director of Personnel responsible to the Mayor.

Proposition D simplifies the budgetary process by making the Mayor the City’s chief labor negotiator, responsible for setting working conditions within the City’s financial capacity.

Proposition D is the result of years of painstaking review by the most experienced, able and respected management experts in San Francisco. It is a plan intended to move City government out of the 1930s and equip San Francisco to enter the twenty-first century without being burdened by the red tape of the past.

After ten years of commitment to improving our City, the Mayor’s Fiscal Advisory Committee is convinced adoption of Proposition D is one of the most important issues facing the voters, CHANGE IS LONG OVERDUE. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by,
The Mayor’s Fiscal Advisory Committee

David Ancher
Jerome Anderson
Richard Blum
Charles Chapman
Arthur Cooke, Jr.
Benton Dial
James Edgar
Ruben Garcia

Robert Hayden
Walter Hoadley
John Jacobs
Michael McGill
Ellen Newman
Roy Nordman
Frank Tatman
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PERSONNEL MANAGERS SAY YES ON PROPOSITION D

As the personnel managers for City Departments, we are charged with the responsibility of managing the City's personnel system. The activities include examinations, hiring, training, discipline, union-management relations, affirmative action and compensation. No one knows better than we the frustrations experienced in attempting to monitor an unbelievable sequence of overlapping bureaucratic activities in attempting to get the job done.

Proposition D will bring our personnel system into line with most other public personnel systems. The improved system will create the potential for being more responsive to the needs of operating departments. It will improve labor relations by transferring this function to the executive branch of government where it belongs.

Proposition D will streamline certain routine procedures resulting in a reduction of cost and time. Under the current system delays are experienced due to lengthy appeals during which time the departments' objectives are delayed.

Proposition D will create an atmosphere of increased accountability for department managers in the areas of affirmative action, discipline and job performance.

Proposition D has been endorsed by the San Francisco Council of Human Resource Managers, the association of over one hundred personnel managers in City government.

Proposition D strengthens merit system principles. Civil Service commissioners will have more time to enforce and protect these principles rather than being bogged down in the day-to-day activities of administration.

Proposition D will help bring about improved methods and practices in personnel administration and should result in a more competent and effective workforce which the citizens of San Francisco have a right to expect.

Alvin W. Schauf
Personnel Director
Recreation and Park Department

Marsha Ramirez
Personnel Officer
San Francisco Port

Edward M. Gazzino
Personnel Director
Department of Health

James Horan
Senior Personnel Officer
Department of Social Services

James Ilinski
Personnel Director
San Francisco International Airport

Andrea R. Gourdin
Manager, Bureau of Personnel & Training
Public Utilities Commission
Morik Noguchi
Senior Department Personnel Officer
Mary Smith
Senior Personnel Officer
Laguna Honda Hospital
Thelma Poteet
Senior Personnel Officer
San Francisco General Hospital
John Burke
Personnel Director
Controller's Office

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will assist the Department of Public Works by streamlining the Civil Service process.

- Under the current system, the duration of eligible lists from 2 to 4 years hampers the Department from hiring graduates of colleges and universities on an annual basis. Consequently, many excellent candidates are not entered into the Civil Service System. Passage of the proposition will improve the quality of the pool of applicants and thereby the quality of public service given by the Department.

- The establishment of a Personnel Director to administer the day-to-day tasks of the system will speed up the decision making process to the advantage of employees and management alike.

- The proposition still calls for checks and balances in that the Commission will continue to hear appeals on discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest. The Commission will act as a watchdog while leaving the general administration to the Personnel Director.

The initiative will make for an improved system for employees, management and the citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Donald Birrer
Director of Public Works

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Passage of this amendment will update our civil service system. These changes will make it comparable to other merit system agencies. Some of these changes are

(A) removal of administrative details from the charter which inhibit timely and effective personnel actions.

The following subjects will be placed in personnel regulations:

- Protests of written questions and answers
- Protests of tentative employment lists
- Promotional examinations
- Examinations for employees on military leave
- Certification of eligibles—Rule of three
- Duration of employment lists
- Temporary employee appointments

(B) allows continuous updating of employment lists.
(C) allows equitable treatment of job candidates with same test score.

(D) realigns responsibilities: the Civil Service Commission dealing primarily with compliance and adjudication activities.
Civil Service

while the Personnel Department administers the day-to-day operation of the merit system.

Equally important the amendment retains important merit system provisions dealing with:

- Employee salary setting procedures
- Positions subject to merit system examinations
- Public hearing and meet and confer requirements
- Penalties for examination fraud
- Seniority, meritorious service and applicable educational credits for promotional examinations in the Police/Fire De-

PARTMENTS

- Termination of unsatisfactory employees
- Disciplinary suspensions
- Conflict of interest
- Creation of positions

Proposition “D” merits a ‘YES’ vote.

John J. Walsh
General Manager Personnel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Initiative, is a long-overdue reform to streamline antiquated hiring practices in San Francisco’s fifty-year-old charter. Proposition D will ensure that the best and brightest job candidates are chosen to serve our city, thus promoting excellence in job performance and helping to eliminate incompetence. This initiative builds management accountability in the city system, while giving the Civil Service Commission the independence to protect the rights of women and minorities.

A Better, More Efficient System at Less Cost

Proposition D consolidates personnel functions, including hiring, under a new Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. The Director has final authority over content of examinations given city job applicants, so more flexibility is possible in finding truly qualified candidates.

Proposition D redefines the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit systems appeals board and policy-setting body. The merit principles are spelled out in the Proposition. This allows the Commission to protect the rights of women and minorities at no cost to the public.

More Fair to Everyone

Proposition D greatly improves the city charter. Well-qualified job candidates have a better chance to be hired and well-qualified job holders have a better chance to be promoted. The public is rewarded with the better job performance, efficiency and friendliness one expects from good government employees. All of these improvements are at no additional cost to the taxpayer.

Submitted by
James W. Haas

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service System, as presently constituted, (vintage 1932)!, is uncivil, and there is nothing “systematic” about it! It's pure, unadulterated municipal lunacy and chaos! Remarkably, BOTH Management and Labor despise it. It certainly is NOT producing the best qualified persons to fill City jobs!

Let's follow Mayor Feinstein's recommendations. If this operation doesn't dramatically improve, there are always FUTURE ELECTIONS where additional, more Draconian changes can be considered by the voters.

As matters now stand, it is far better to light a candle than just sit and curse the darkness! Any changes will be an improve-

ment! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

For more than a half-century, San Francisco Mayors have abided by the employee examination, hiring and promotion policies administered by a strong and independent Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D is a deceptive and dangerous scheme that would give future Mayors and top-level bureaucrats the power to ignore competence and reward political loyalty.

Proposition D would take key Civil Service employment rules out of the City Charter and make them subject to wheeling and dealing by City Hall politicians.

There’s an old saying — "if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.”

Civil Service has worked well for more than 50 years. Proposition D is unnecessary, ineffective and even counter-productive.

It’s not just deceptive, it’s dangerous.

Joseph L. Alioto
Former Mayor of San Francisco
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Time and time again, different groups have put various propositions on the ballot to weaken our Civil Service System and reintroduce political patronage into City employment practices. And every time the voters have wisely rejected these schemes, no matter how cleverly they have been disguised. Proposition D is just another power grab by bureaucrats at the top in City Hall.

We've said NO! loud and clear in the past. Let's say NO one more time.

Submitted by:
TAXPAYERS FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT
Thomas Scanlon
City Treasurer, Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "D"!!!!

During the eight years while a member of the Board of Supervisors, I fought hard to reform the Civil Service Commission and to bring working conditions and city workers’ pay equitable to both workers and taxpayers. I fought to insure an independent Civil Service Commission that would remain just that—independent and free from political influence and political patronage of particularly the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

I am truly saddened by the Mayor’s insistence in bringing this disastrous Proposition “D” before the voters. Some of the Supervisors rejected this misguided measure for what it is; an unwise consolidation of authority to hire, fire and promote city workers by the Mayor and newly created personnel officer.

My efforts to bring pay equity to both taxpayers and city workers were continually squashed by then Supervisor Feinstein and Supervisor Molinari. Finally, in 1975, shortly after a disastrous city strike, I was able to place on the ballot, for voter approval, a measure that almost eliminates the power of the Mayor and Supervisors to manipulate the pay of city workers. This measure was overwhelmingly passed by the voters that year and we have not had any labor unrest since that date.

Vote No on “D”!
“D” stands for disaster. It will undo many of these reforms. Also, right now, the City is almost broke, thanks to the manipulation of Mayor Feinstein and her chief ally Supervisor Molinari.

If “D” passes the cost of operating our city government will increase in the next 24 months by not less than $60,000,000.

Contrary to the provisions of Proposition 13, property taxes would be increased, thus forcing up rents.

Vote No on “D”.

Don't weaken our Civil Service Commission, whereby least deserving city employees could be promoted because of connection or clout.

Vote No on “D”.
We now almost have more problems than we can handle. We don’t want our city turned into another Chicago, wherefor nearly half a century a corrupt political system flourished under Mayor Richard Daley.

John Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We join San Franciscans for Fair Employment in opposing the Civil Service Initiative, Proposition D.

This measure will severely hamper the well-being of the San Francisco Fire and Police Departments. These departments are two of the finest in the Country and have consistently protected life and property in a professional manner. They must continue that tradition with a civil service system based on MERIT and not political patronage.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Andrew C. Casper
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Keith P. Calder
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

William F. Murray
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Donald M. Scott
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Our present Civil Service system was designed to keep corruption out of government. It has generally served that purpose well. This proposition would dismantle that system and in my opinion open the doors to nepotism, favoritism, patronage and corruption. Better a city government that is bureaucratic than one that is corrupt. Vote NO on D.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is an attack on the merit system and an attempt to return patronage to the Mayor’s office by eliminating the authority of the Civil Service Commission and its built in checks and balances.

The present Civil Service system is not perfect, but corrections can be made within the Charter without destroying a system that has worked for over 50 years and has been free from fraud and corruption.

This proposition will do nothing to improve the caliber of police performance and could have the opposite effect.

I urge you to vote NO on PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by
The San Francisco Police Supervisors and Investigators Association

Don Goad, Captain SFPD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D could be a dangerous first step toward weakening the independent, impartial administration of our City government.

Proposition D would transfer power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor. The Director’s decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline and certification would be final. The Commission would have no right to hear examinations or disciplinary appeals.

With the transfer of duties and responsibilities from the Commission to the Mayor’s appointed Personnel Director, the Mayor would have control over personnel functions. Currently, commissioners have independent status and can be dismissed for cause. The Personnel Director could be dismissed at will.

The Merit System could be replaced by a patronage system. Proposition D could open the door to rules permitting the Personnel Director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his or her position on the list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Proposition D is NOT a reform package. The checks and balances for efficient City government would be lopsided, with too much power in the hands of unknown future Mayors.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
John L. Melinari, President
Harry G. Britt
Richard Hongisto
Willie B. Kennedy
Wendy Nelder
Nancy Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Beware of PROPOSITION D!

Powerful special interest groups are attempting to remove key City employees from the independent and impartial Civil Service system in the name of “reform”.

They want instead to make these employees answerable directly to future Mayors and politically-appointed Personnel Directors and department heads.

PROPOSITION D got on the ballot because the Chamber of Commerce and such companies as Pacific Bell and PG&E paid a professional southern California campaign firm, $70,000 to collect signatures.

They’re trying to destroy the merit system and replace it with an old-fashioned patronage system.

Department heads will be able to ignore examination scores and reward loyalty rather than competence in promotions and hiring.

Don’t let the Chamber of Commerce, big business and their allies in the City bureaucracy dictate who’s hired, fired and promoted among public employees.

PROPOSITION D is not just deceptive, it’s dangerous!

Vote NO on PROPOSITION D!

Libby Denekeim,
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Ron Haberman
Vice-Chairman, Democratic Central Committee
Jim Wacob
Democratic Central Committee
Roberto Esteves
President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Rick Pacurar
President, Harvey Milk Lesbian Gay Democratic Club
Walter L. Johnson
Exec. Secty., S. F. Labor Council
Michael Bernick
Linda Post
Sal Rotelli
Deborah Stein
John Mehring
Pat Norman
Nancy Walker
Gwen Craig
Harry Britt
Louise Minnick
Carole Migden
Agor Juecks
Jack Morrison
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D places too much power in the hands of ONE. Proposition D will provide for a personnel director to be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. The Mayor now appoints five members of the Civil Service Commission who also serve at her pleasure.

You work for years to climb the civil service ladder and then somebody comes along with an idea to cut you off at the pockets.

Proposition D will lock in all the employees employed in the Mayor’s office and will control the appointments of any new staff by the next Mayor elect in 1987 and years thereafter.

Like controlling your estate from the grave.

Vote NO on D.

Marguerite Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service Merit System has served our City well, giving San Franciscans an equal opportunity. It has helped us obtain employment and earn promotions based on objective examinations.

The Civil Service Merit system replaced the old patronage system that rewarded political loyalty more than competence.

Now the supporters of PROPOSITION D want to create a new Personnel Director, accountable only to the Mayor, and give department heads the absolute power to decide who works for the City and who gets promoted.

If PROPOSITION D passes, equal opportunity would give way to opportunity based on membership in the bureaucratic “establishment”.

Keep our Civil Service Merit System strong and free from the political abuses of the past.

Vote NO on D!

Wille L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly
Ben Ten
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
JoAnne Miller
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
A. Richard Cerbata
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Sedonia Wilton
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, President
S. F. Community College Governing Board
Julie Tang
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Alan S. Wong
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Henry Der
Albert Chang
Rudy Maraz
Robert “Bob” Morales
Yuri Wada

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Can you imagine studying for a civil service examination, being rated at the top of the eligible list and never receiving the promotion? That’s exactly what Proposition “D” will do should the electorate adopt this amendment.

The civil service merit system has defects, but to totally eliminate the system and replace it with a patronage system where promotions are based on who you know, rather than what you know is scandalous.

Civil service was put into place to prevent scandal and the “favor seeking” individual from getting a paid position because he/she happened to support the right elected official.

Proposal “D” will allow one person, chosen by the Mayor, to decide who will be promoted, hired and fired. This is awesome power for one single individual to have at any level of government.

Our current Mayor may choose a fair person for this position, but will future Mayors be as careful? As each new Mayor assumes office, the civil service system will again change. The potential to favor one individual or group over others is great.

Proposition “D” has a great potential to diminish the quality of services we now provide to our citizens, as the future of how people are hired and promoted in the San Francisco Police Department is completely unknown.

It’s true our promotional system is fraught with delays and delays frustrate us all, but Proposition “D” is not the answer. Proposition “D” will only add to our existing problems. Several years ago, our citizens elected a Charter Commission to streamline city government and make civil service work more efficiently. The voters eventually rejected those proposals. The checks and balances that make our government stable were no longer present. It simply went too far.

Proposition “D” goes even further. It brings about a system of patronage and should be defeated lest we want to engage in “free-wheeling and dealing” of civil service jobs and promotions.

We urge a strong No vote against Proposition “D”!

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS’ ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry, President
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The purpose of the Civil Service Commission is to ensure that the merit system would be the only criteria in any examination process.

If Proposition D passes, all authority concerning examinations would be taken from the Civil Service Commission and given to a Personnel Director, who is appointed by the Mayor. This Personnel Director would have the authority to hire and fire at his discretion, with no appeal available. This proposition is contrary to everything the Fire Department and all City employees have strived for over the years.

The Civil Service Commission in its present form was instituted to prevent any possibility of a patronage system, where one person has complete control.

This proposition would do nothing to improve your Fire Department. If you are satisfied with the work and make up of the San Francisco Fire Department in its present form, "Vote No On Proposition D". You will be doing a service for the San Francisco Fire Department, and the people of San Francisco.

Submitted by the San Francisco Fire Chiefs' Association
John Flaherty, Battalion Chief SFFD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is bad government and bad politics, changing our independent civil service system into a system dominated by the Mayor:

- By shortening the six year terms of Civil Service Commission to conform to the Mayor’s four year term of office.
- By transferring most of the Commission’s powers to a Personnel Director who serves solely at the Mayor’s pleasure.

Keep politics out of employment services. Vote NO on Proposition D!

Alice B. Toklas, Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Roberto Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

- Proposition D fails to offer enough new and improved procedures to cure the current defects in the civil service system. Charter sections and civil service rules are repealed without specific known replacements.

Proposition D transfers power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created personnel director appointed by, and to serve at the pleasure of, the Mayor. The director’s decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline, and certification would be final. The commission would have no right to hear examination or disciplinary appeals.

There are hidden costs with Proposition D because the new Personnel Administration Department will employ a personnel director, and other employees “as may be necessary to carry out (its) functions and duties.”

The Merit System could be replaced by an old style Patronage System. Proposition D could open the door to rules which permit the personnel director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his/her position on the civil service testing list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Police and Fire Commissions would lose functions as a result of the personnel director’s new power. The director’s unlawful employment discrimination policy would be binding upon department administrators. The director’s procedure for employee dispute resolution must be used by all department heads and appointing officers.

Proposition D is not the answer. The checks and balances for efficient city government would be lopsided.

I urge a no vote on Proposition D.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, 17th Assembly District
Sala Burton
Congresswoman
Art Agnos
16th Assembly District
Milton Marks
State Senator

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Balboa Reservoir Development Ban

PROPOSITION E
Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission declared Balboa Reservoir South (located across Phelan Avenue from San Francisco City College) surplus in 1984 and made the site available for low, moderate and market rate housing. In July 1985, a City-community advisory committee chose a developer to build 203 single-family homes on the 13 acre site. Construction has not yet begun.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would prohibit granting new building permits and would revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site (Assessor’s Block 3180, Lot 1) between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit granting any new building permits and you want to revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to allow building permits to be granted for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “E” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for a three-year ban on development of the Balboa Reservoir site had qualified for the June ballot.

Sidney Kass and Jesse David Wall, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 12,430 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 10,012 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 77
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Having been responsible for providing leadership at City College from 1947 to 1977, we cannot stand by and see this site converted to housing. We must speak out. Such a move would preclude forever the logical and much needed campus expansion to what was once our West Campus. We left that site reluctantly to make way for water storage. If it is no longer required for that purpose, let us return it to City College.

Thousands of San Franciscans—high school graduates, dropouts, veterans, re-entering women—representing all of the city's diverse ethnic groups, have been prepared for transfer to four-year colleges, profitable careers, and have had their lives enriched at the City College of San Francisco. Without City College's open door and easy access, many would have been deprived of these opportunities.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 'E'

We question:
1. Why no EIR was required when the proposed development could have a substantial impact.
2. Whether the future needs of City College for classrooms, housing, and parking have been considered.
3. What the impact on taxpayers is with below market land sale and construction financing by bonds.

This moratorium will permit adequate study of these issues. Vote YES on Proposition 'E'.

Bruce Bonacker, President
Board of Directors, Glen Park Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let a developer make a mint on land across from the most overcrowded college in the Bay Area! Parking is already an impossibility for residents near City College...adding 200 homes to this land would make the situation much worse.

It's simple: a college which can't find room for more students at a time when more people are returning to education doesn't serve the community.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

You'd probably be upset. We certainly are. Please help us protect our neighborhood. Please vote YES on proposition E.


Sunnyside Residents: Ellen Wall Melissa Volmonad David Wall

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let the greedy developers take this potentially picturesque open space. A yes vote means you want more time to consider its future use. All we ask is time to think and plan.

John Barbagelata
Former member, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Suppose there was a publicly owned open space across the street from the main U.C. Berkeley Campus. Can you imagine for one moment that it would be passed into private ownership?
Vote Yes on E for Equality and Excellence in Education

City College Students:
William Lew, Student
Tim McGuire, Student Council Member
Joseph Goldstein, Student Council Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

In 1952, the “Experts” said we needed reservoirs. They felt so strongly that they condemned the City College West Campus, destroyed the buildings, and constructed the reservoirs—all at taxpayer’s expense.

Now, in 1986 with more demand for water, the “Experts” say the reservoir is no longer needed. What is the concerned taxpayer to believe?
When in doubt, the city should hold on to the expensive things already paid for.

Stop the reservoir giveaway. Vote YES on E.

Taxpayers for Preserving the Reservoir.
Richard Pannerson
Dorice Murphy
Lucille Carson
Daniel Gutierrez
Franz Witt
Bernhard Scholand
Ruth Hanson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This is a Planning issue
We have been accused of trying to stop housing for poor people. Not true. In the first place, the price levels are certainly middle income and above, but our main objection is that this badly done plan is damaging to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as to the over-crowded community college across the street.

WHAT WE WANT
Even our critics point out that we originally SUGGESTED housing for that site, but they don’t talk about what else we suggested. We want two levels of parking under a City College Library, Bookstore, and Auditorium, with housing on top. Furthermore, let the housing be TRULY affordable—for students and seniors. We are trying to stop the bureaucrats’ subsidized middle income housing project because it makes our dream impossible.
We ask for three years to give the neighborhood and the college a chance to produce a better plan.
SNaP (Sensible Neighborhood Planning Committee)

Helen Crizer, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council, representing 17 neighborhood associations in the area of the surplus reservoir property in question has voted to endorse the three-year stop of private construction on the old West Campus of City College.
Dr. Louis Batmale, Chancellor of City College from 1970-1977 has persuaded us that City College needs the lands.

Juanita Raven, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPPOSITION E

Be a sport.
Give City College a vote of support.
City has 23,000 students and badly needs a library. The only place to put it is in the reservoir site. City College has walked closely with San Francisco for five decades. The reservoir site has always been understood to be reserved for City College.
Until now when someone wants it for housing. Housing is important, but it can be anywhere in town. But a City College library can only be located at the College.
Vote yes to support a book—and a reader.
Reading, studying, writing and research make up our town also.
It is hard to understand criticism of City for wanting to keep this area for a library. Sure, housing sites are at a premium—but even more so a library site for City which is one of the largest schools in the Nation.
Some people blast City for wanting a library because of the need for housing. Housing is needed. But some of those very same people want a big battleship stationed here that will bring in 15,000 new family members.
The Educational and cultural growth of San Francisco mandates living space for the City College library.
If this measure gets a no vote, it means there will be no site for a Library. This is the last chance. Vote YES to help out a book—and a reader.
State financing, when approved, will construct this building. It is the top building priority at City College.
A YES vote here means there will be time to think about the use of the site. During that three year period, cooler heads may realize this is the only site for a Library. If the housing goes in there will be no library there.
Vote yes for a book, for a good school and a better City.

John Riordan, Board of Governors
San Francisco Community College District.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPPOSITION E

The Sunnyside Neighborhood Association is not against housing, but we are trying to stop a hasty and short-sighted plan. We are asking for this moratorium to get time for a better plan that will answer a variety of needs and benefit the entire city as well as our community.
This is a planning issue.
The release of the reservoir property as surplus by the water department came as a surprise to our neighborhood. The June 1984 "Residence Element" of the city's Master Plan did not even list the land as surplus. By 1985 major decisions were being made for use of the land without adequate neighborhood input.

There were some meetings attended by a few people carefully selected for their zealous pro-housing views or potential financial gain. The resulting plan has gone out of control. Now it benefits only the developer and the lucky few who will get houses on free land.
Proposition E is not an attack on housing.
Please help us save our neighborhood against poor planning by voting YES on Proposition E.

Joe Mahoney, President
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPPOSITION E

The Miraloma Improvement Club urges a YES vote on Proposition E.

Frank Mastro, President
Arnell Rodrigues

Maggie Kroll
Dorothy Evers

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPPOSITION E

All the talk in the world can't change the fact that City College has fewer acres of land relative to its student population than any college in the Bay Area.
Enrollment at City College is increasing, as is the enrollment of the San Francisco public schools from which City College draws most of its students. It is obvious that City College needs and deserves the reservoir land. The three year moratorium will give time to produce a better plan which will have in-

put by faculty, students and alumni who know the college's needs and want to support it.

Sid Kass
Susie Langdon Kass
Phil Kass
City College Student

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The homeowners of Westwood Park, a neighborhood adjacent to the Balboa Reservoir, support the ballot initiative calling for a 3 year development moratorium. We believe that the City and City College should take additional time to determine their needs and how they might be met by using the Reservoir. In the event that City College does not need this property, we support its development as open space or as single family detached housing.

Westwood Park Association
Don C. Swander
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Let's not aggregate the traffic problem around City College before we first develop solutions for the existing problems. A three-year moratorium only buys our neighborhood and elected officials time to find solutions; it doesn't say no to housing. A YES vote is a vote for prudent development. A YES vote helps to preserve the family character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ken Hoegger
Realtor and community Activist

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As representatives of the students of City College, we understand first-hand, the intense need to reserve a site for future school expansion. Preservation of the Balboa Reservoir, a site directly adjacent to the campus, is particularly crucial. The facilities that CCSF requires, such as a library and an auditorium, are essential to the main structure of the campus. Unlike classrooms, it would be unreasonable to build an auditorium or a library on an off-campus site, since these facilities are integral to the main function of the school.

In short, opposition to the moratorium based on the notion that alternate sites could be secured, is misleading. Once a site near the college is taken, any hope of expansion would be eliminated.

Associated Student Council of City College
Jack Lee, Vice President of Associated Counsel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Local 2121 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, representing City College faculty, urges a yes vote on Proposition E.

While this project provides short-term employment for a few, we are more concerned about the thousands of students who would benefit from planning and development that would better serve the community and the college.

Yes on E for continued excellence in community college education.

Anita Martinez, President
San Francisco Community College District
American Federation of Teachers

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is twice as crowded as any community college in northern California. It needs a much larger library, bookstore and auditorium, and more parking.

The college has always expected to use the empty SOUTH reservoir for educational needs. That land is finally surplus. Neither the college Governing Board nor the Chancellor attended the Mayor's planning sessions for the property and the faculty was not informed. When the 12.3 acre site was offered to a developer for $36,900 for subsidized housing, the Chancellor said, "We are at a crossroad and the correct path is for the Board of Supervisors, with the Mayor's support, to deed this surplus land to City College so that the college may continue to serve the city effectively for the next 50 years as it has for the past half century." The Mayor refused. Now only Board member John Riordan supports the correct path.

The Water Department says it may need the NORTH reservoir now used for student parking. If that crisis occurs, the Chancellor says, "We'll deal with the situation then." How, if the south reservoir is gone?

(continued)
When land is available other community colleges finance large projects through alliances with civic, athletic and cultural organizations, and through property sales. New methods for public funding are being developed.

The faculty would like three years of careful study to unravel misunderstandings and poor management, and to find the best way to be a good neighbor.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College needs land now for desperately needed facilities, one of which is a library. City College has an enrollment of 23,000 students but our library has seating for 450. There are other possible locations for new housing, but City College can't be moved. Give us an opportunity to plan a development for the community and the college.

Annie M. Young
City College Library Faculty and Staff

AROGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty and staff members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Darlene Alloco
Mary Allen
Mary Ansley
Tom Angeloff
Robert Balesteri
Don Bateni
Diana Bernstein
Joe Berry
Anna Britton
Thomas Brunel
James Bristol
Richard Brongel
Laurent Brown
Philip Brown
Barbara Cabral
John Caffin
John Carlin
Frank Cerrato
Rosemary Clark
Perry Close
Kurt Common
Walter Cribbs
George Crippen
Patricia Davis
Guy DePrima
Edward Dienauf
Sharon Edwards
Larry Ernst
Mary Erwin
Rae Fong
William Funk
Terry Greenfield
Robert Griffin
Michael Guthrie
Mary Hanna
YenKuang Ho
Peter Hoch
Ronald Hochschild
Myra Holden
Katherine Houdam
Michael Hulbert
Edward Hunt
Frank Ingersoll
Elaine Johnson
Wendy Kaufman
Jo Kennedy
Mercedes Kai
Rosalind Kow
Don Leffery
James Lallas
Steve Levinson
Sue Light
Gary Ling
Amelia Lippi
Dave Lubbert
Leon Luey
Dusmane Macalou
Marion McManus
Patricia Madigan
Michael Malachowski
Mary Mari
Maria Marias
Sylvia Marshall
Valerie Moreau
Joe Mejia
Margot Michelmore
Deanne Milan
Cindy Moody
Thomas Munro
David Myhr
Deborah Nagle
Glen Nance
Herbert Naylor
Willard Neff
Dennis Piankowski
Francine Podenski
Theresa Poredes
Solomon Raja
Mary Riordan
Parthos Saniee
Marvin Schneider
Fred Schneider
Earl Smissner
Andy Scal
Ken Shen
Robert Struckman
MoShiue Tom
Edward Taylor
Pierce Thiry
Barbara Thomas
Clare Thompson
Willie Thompson
Mary Thurber
Robert Tricaro
James Truinter
Joanne Tuminina
George VoiBazay
Cherie Wetzel
Austin White
Joan Wilson
Ronnie Wolf
Christina Yee

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Water Department has begun a resource study of water use, due for completion in two or three years. The study may well indicate that one or both reservoirs will be needed. The American Water Works Association states that reservoirs should be used in pairs. This is particularly important because it is the only reservoir at an elevation of 305 feet.

The Mayor twisted the arm of the Water Department to declare one of these reservoirs surplus before the water resource study is completed. Don't let her get away with this kind of political manipulation.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Kurt Common
Ken Crizer
Ed Dierauf
Herb Naylor
CCSF Engineering Professors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The South Balboa Basin has been unused since college leased buildings, including a large auditorium, were torn down on that site thirty years ago. We hope that three years of thorough planning would explore the possibility of returning a part of that property to the college for the development of a multi-purpose medium-sized auditorium which could be shared with community groups.

Robert Buxton
Mack Crooks
Bob Davis
Helen Dilworth
Franz Encio
Richard Eternman
Richard Fennar
Lawrence Ferrara
Ted Fleming
Peggy Garish
William Grothkopf
David Hardiman

Judy Hubbell
Charles Hudspeth
Sieglinde Issam
Baruch Klein
John Kongsmark
Joshua Law
Steven Lopez
Jerry Mueller
Madeline Mueller
Marvin Tarak
Frank Townsell
City College Music Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition E. This moratorium is necessary because there are too many worthy uses for this land to make a hasty and potentially very costly decision. Only through careful planning can the limited land available for development be best used.

Jerome Hasken
Robert Koor
James Korch
Dick Lee
Chelsie Liu
William Maynez
Annette Rappleyea
Oleg Rebsti
David Wall
City College Physics Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, as Physical Education Instructors, have always been committed to a diversified program for our students and community. The reservoir space is a natural land resource for a Multi Educational and Cultural Center.

Your YES vote on E will allow us the freedom to explore ways that this property could most constructively benefit all.

Gail Burton
Curtis Decker
Brad Dugan
Tanaka Hagiwara
JoAn Hahn
Daniel Hayes
Lene Johnson
Grover Klemmer
Paula McCullum
Art Octavio
Louise Scourcks

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, full-time faculty of the Computer and Information Science Department of City College, urge a YES vote to postpone the decision until additional planning and surveys can be conducted. The current proposal would negatively impact the College's enrollment.

William Beaver
Ronald Cerruti, Chairman
Kirk Gibson
Howard Granger
Frank Helden
Michael Kelly

George Lanyi
Norbert Ludkey
Charles Metzler
Charles Miller
Marilyn Schnake
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

A YES vote on Proposition E helps STOP a scheme to GIVE AWAY $12,300,000 worth of City land for $1,800,000 (or less) to a Redwood City real estate developer.

A YES vote will SAVE taxpayers $550,000 per year. The housing project will produce $240,000 in taxes, but supplying City services will cost $790,000 per year.

The Controller's cost estimate does NOT account for the $12,300,000 land value, since land sale below value is NOT technically a cost of government. The Controller also is NOT permitted to assume that the housing project will be constructed, since construction has NOT yet been ordered by the Board of Supervisors.

The plan does NOT restrict housing sales to moderate-income first-time buyers. The plan only restricts use of tax-subsidized funds. Any person favored by the developer or politicians can buy these dwellings and get the benefits of the public land giveaway.

The houses are made "affordable" by giving away the land far below market value, by City-backed low interest, and by cutting construction corners.

The real beneficiaries of the subsidized housing project are the financiers (NOT the project dwellers). Bondholders receive 9.6% average tax-free interest, which is equivalent to 24.6% taxable interest at 61% maximum tax. The developer and bond establishment receive $5,340,000; this is $26,300 (or 22.40%) for each $117,400 unit.

The City loses $51,700 worth of land GIVEN AWAY for each unit.

Vote YES on Proposition E for good fiscal management.

William Marquardt
Financial Analyst, SNaP
Helen Crizer, Treasurer, SNaP

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is by far the most crowded community college in the Bay Area. With 22,600 students on a 56 acre campus, it is more than twice as crowded as any of the others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of College</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Campus (acres)</th>
<th>Area/1000 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City College of SF</td>
<td>22,624</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laney College, Oakland</td>
<td>9,805</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot College, Hayward</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa College</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of San Mateo</td>
<td>13,820</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>11.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Marin</td>
<td>6,663</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given these facts, why does the Governing Board not try to get the old West Campus back? Why don't they support this moratorium to delay the land grab?

The Governing Board is under political pressure from City Hall. They have been threatened with the loss of the north reservoir parking lot and funding for special projects. Forgive them. Vote Yes on E.

Friends of City College
David Newton
Glen Simpson
Jack Baker
Thomas Velasquez
Tillie McCullough

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The student population at City College is increasing. This semester's enrollment is up 1,265 students over last semester.

The enrollment in the San Francisco public schools has been increasing by 1,218 per year for the last three years. City College draws most of its enrollment from public schools in San Francisco.

Obviously, City College will have a larger enrollment in the future years, and will be in desperate need of space if we do not give it back its old West Campus.

Please reserve this public land for the college.
Please vote YES on E.

Barbara Holman

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON E

In 1981, I launched a six-point program to expand San Francisco’s housing supply and the voters had approved a City policy to add 20,000 new housing units within five years. This Proposition would destroy a major portion of the effort to build affordable, single-family housing in our city.

The Balboa Reservoir Site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now a site for development of 203 new single-family homes, most with three bedrooms and two baths. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed as other homes built under the City’s program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom could not afford homeownership. It is believed that these new homes will sell rapidly.

The Balboa Reservoir site is one of the few sites large enough to accommodate a substantial number of new homes. Please do not let a few people stop a major opportunity for new housing. Vote no on Prop E.

Not only would Proposition E halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site, but the 9.8% fixed-rate, 30-year mortgage money set aside for the housing would also be lost.

Nothing constructive is accomplished by this measure—it does not provide additional land or facilities for City College. As a matter of fact, City College has neither plans nor money to use the property. Further, the Community College Board of Directors, the governing body for City College, has voted overwhelmingly to oppose the initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No on E.”

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the site of the unused Balboa Reservoir and the 9.8% fixed-rate 30-year bond funds for mortgages would be lost.

These homes are desperately needed for San Franciscans who can’t afford to buy in the city where the average house is selling for over $160,000. The proposal for 203 single-family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

The homes would be built on land that belongs to the City. Over two years ago, it was declared surplus and available for housing. It is not part of City College, and City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

We urge you to vote no on Proposition E if you want more affordable housing for San Franciscans.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

In 1980 San Franciscans voted overwhelmingly (63% yes to 37% no) to construct 20,000 housing units. Good progress is underway towards achieving the voter goal. A 1986 report by Mayor Dianne Feinstein states, “In the last five years, 3,559 new housing units completed with another 3,000 by 1988 and 20,000 more in 10 to 15 years”. Most of this housing will be built in underutilized commercial districts; not in existing residential neighborhoods.

The 203 affordable owner occupied single family units slated for the southern portion of Balboa Reservoir are part of the 1988 total. Our progress in addressing the City’s housing shortage will be curtailed if this ill-advised initiative is approved. SUPPORT OWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Housing production is essential to check rising prices and to maintain our social, economic, and ethnic population diversity. AS A SAN FRANCISCO VOTER, YOU CAN BE PART OF OUR HOUSING PROGRESS BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Do not be misled. The Community College Governing Board opposes this initiative. The district does not have any future building plans for this housing site.

WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT THE CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY HOUSING BY VOTING NO ON PROP- OSITION E.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt construction of affordable housing at Balboa Reservoir site. This surplus public property empty for 30 years was declared surplus by the City in 1984. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders. The housing is desperately needed. San Franciscans need affordable housing.

Doris M. Ward, Member
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

A critical issue facing San Francisco today is the lack of housing middle class San Franciscans can afford.

That is why I have joined these neighborhood associations to support the Balboa Reservoir neighborhood housing proposal. Those participating in the development of the proposal includes:

O.M.I. Community Association
Dorado Terrace Association
Outer Mission-Ingleside
Political Action Committee
Greater Ingleside Community
Mount Davidson Manor
Ocean Avenue Merchants Association
Ingleside Terrace Association
The San Francisco Open Space Committee
City College of San Francisco

From early in 1985 I worked closely with these neighborhood groups in the discussions between city government and community leaders concerning the development plans for this desperately needed new housing at the unused Balboa reservoir site. THESE ARE THE REASONS YOU SHOULD VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

1. The neighborhood housing proposal that this initiative seeks to stop is the result of months of hard work by the largest coalition of neighborhood associations ever to join together to plan a housing development in San Francisco.

2. The housing at the Balboa Reservoir site was designed with the involvement of the coalition of neighborhood associations to enhance the surrounding community.

3. The governing Board of the Community College District has made clear that they have no plans for the site and no ownership rights to it. City College does not oppose the construction of this development and opposes this initiative.

4. Self-proclaimed “Friends” of City College want to stop the proposal in order to preserve the site for future faculty parking. A clique of City College staffers involved in a neighborhood association pose as community opposition to this development even though a representative from this organization, the Sunnyside Neighborhood Association, had helped plan and support the proposal.

5. By masquerading as concerned neighbors these self-appointed “friends” of City College hope to prevent the construction of 204 critically needed units of housing and pull off one of the biggest land grabs in San Francisco’s history.

DON'T BE FOOLED. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Residence Element of the Comprehensive Plan of the City and County of San Francisco assesses the City’s housing needs and lays out specific steps to meet those needs. This document was adopted by the City Planning Commission in 1984 after extensive public review at neighborhood meetings and public hearings, and consideration of the detailed Environmental Impact Report.

The first objective of the Housing Element is “to provide new Housing for all income groups” in locations appropriate for residential development. To meet this goal, development of housing is to be aggressively pursued and encouraged on surplus, underused and vacant public land.

Proposition E would halt construction of affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site. This public property, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City in 1984. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

If you want more affordable housing in San Francisco vote no on Proposition E.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Susan J. Biernan, City Planning Commissioner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on E.

Proposition E deprives San Franciscans of one of their last real chances to become homeowners at an affordable price. At the South Balboa Reservoir we have City-owned land on which 203 units of three-bedroom, two-bath homes can be built at low prices which average San Franciscans can afford to pay. These homes need to be built now, not in three years. In three years the low interest rates on mortgages and the bond financing will be gone. Two hundred families will have lost the opportunity to become homeowners, and the City will have lost the opportunity to ease the tight market in rental housing.

Nor does this ill-conceived initiative help City College in any way. City College does not need this land. Speculation that the College may at some future date find a use for the land is not founded on fact. The College may never be able to build on the reservoir. Their enrollment has dropped by over 4000 students in the last few years.

This initiative is designed to confuse you. It will make our housing shortage worse for three long years. If you support affordable housing in our City, Vote NO on Proposition E.

Bill Maher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Balboa Reservoir site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now planned for development of 203 new single family homes. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed—other homes built under this program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom would not otherwise be able to afford home ownership.

San Francisco has the most expensive housing in the nation where last year the average home sold for over $160,000. Housing is difficult to produce because the obstacles are great—little land on which to build, high construction costs and uncertain interest rates.

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost. The initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional land or facilities for City College. The Community College Board, the governing body of City College, in fact recently voted to oppose this initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting "No" on Proposition E.

John L. Molinari

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

In 1980, the voters of the City and County of San Francisco approved a measure making it City policy to add 20,000 new units of housing within five years. In 1984 in an effort to satisfy this objective, the Board of Supervisors adopted a policy encouraging the expansion of the City’s housing supply. Making surplus City-owned land, such as the site at Balboa Reservoir, available for affordable housing was an important part of that policy. A proposal to build 203 homes on the unused Balboa Reservoir site was advanced to help implement the pro-housing policy.

Approval of Proposition E would HALT construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.

The Balboa Reservoir homes would be built on land currently belonging to the City and County of San Francisco. The property IS NOT part of the City College, and City College has neither plans or money to buy the property and convert it for City College use.

The only debatable issue is the future of affordable housing on the Balboa Reservoir site.

As we are all aware, San Francisco has the most expensive homes in the United States. The average cost of a home is $152,000. Not many can afford such prices. However, the housing proposed for the Balboa Reservoir will give many more citizens the opportunity to become homeowners. The homes to be built will be sold to first-time buyers at prices ranging from $83,000 to $145,000.

Other homes built in San Francisco under the direction of similar affordable housing programs have been snapped up quickly by San Franciscans. Without the program, most would not have been able to purchase the home and become homeowners.

Again, if you desire to preserve the construction of more affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site, vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Willie B. Kennedy
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Additional single family housing is undeniably San Francisco's most acute social need. When some vacant surplus City land (12 acres) finally becomes available for 203 additional new private homes there will always be some selfish individuals who are in favor of new housing "just so long as it is not built across the street from me!"

This unused, vacant City reservoir land hasn't generated a dime of taxes for over thirty years! Let's add 203 NEW home-owner taxpayers to the City's rolls as quickly as possible.

Stop these self-serving no-growth obstructionists! Please vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Prop E would halt affordable housing construction at the Balboa Reservoir site. Many gay people need affordable housing, too, and we join with other community groups urging you to vote NO on Prop E.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Robert Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E, if approved, would block the construction of 203 badly needed single-family homes on the south portion of the Balboa Reservoir in San Francisco. Sixty percent of these homes would be available for purchase by moderate and middle income families at purchase prices between $80,000 and $120,000. They would be constructed on surplus public land and financed by the sale of mortgage revenue bonds to enable the developer to sell the homes at below market prices.

A neighborhood group headed by two city college faculty members is responsible for placing Proposition E on the ballot. The group contends that the land which is intended to be used for the project should be made available instead to City College for the construction of new teaching facilities even though enrollment at City College is declining and the City College Board has voted 6 to 1 to oppose the initiative.

Like many other areas of the country, San Francisco suffers from a shortage of housing. Purchase prices here are among the highest in the nation. The use of surplus public lands and revenue bond financing provide a means for making single family homes available to a broad spectrum of families at affordable prices.

The Balboa Reservoir project is supported by the leaders of 8 neighborhood groups in the area surrounding the location of the proposed project and by a majority of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, as well as by Mayor Dianne Feinstein. We urge you to encourage the construction of this type of housing in San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition E.

San Francisco Board of Realtors
William L. Jansen, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

SAVE OUR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS!
BERNAL HEIGHTS SAYS, "VOTE NO ON PROP E!"

We are residents of Bernal Heights in San Francisco. We've worked hard to build affordable family and senior citizen homes in our neighborhood.

We need more affordable housing in our City to survive. The real issue in Prop E is affordable family housing — a "yes" vote prevents the construction of 203 family homes. That's crazy! Join us in preserving what's best in our City.

Vote "no" on Prop E!

Sylvia M. Yee, Bernal Heights Community Foundation Board of Directors***
Frank Hutchins, BHCF Board*
Mary Lou Bertolotti, BHCF Board*
Lela Havner, BHCF Board*
Elizabeth Egger, BHCF Board*
Sister Janet Sinious, BHCF Board*
Stephen Antonaros, BHCF Board*
Lorenzo R. Dill, BHCF Board*
Barbara Bagon, BHCF Board*
Margaret C. Randolph, Northwest Bernal Block Club*
Maureen Lamb, NWBBC*
Tim Molinare, BHCF Planning & Dev't Committee*
Buck Borgen, BHCF P & D Committee*
***Organization for identification purposes only.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco Needs Affordable Housing—
Vote No on Proposition E

Everyone agrees that San Francisco needs affordable housing. The questions are how and where that affordable housing can be built.

The Balboa Reservoir housing development, to be built on the site of a reservoir built thirty years ago and unused since that time, answers those important questions for more than 200 San Francisco first-time homebuying families by providing:

- 203 new affordable three-bedroom, single family homes
- 9.8% fixed-rate financing
- A mix of 30% low-income, 30% moderate-income and 40% market-rate first time buyers
- A convenient site that has been declared “surplus” by the City and “available for development of affordable housing”

The Balboa Reservoir housing development is a small but significant step in the effort to generate affordable housing in our City.

Thousands of San Franciscans from every community, neighborhood group and viewpoint agree that the Balboa Reservoir development is good for San Francisco. Virtually every elected official, including the Governing Board of City College also agree.

All these San Franciscans ask you to say “yes” to affordable housing and “NO” to Proposition E.

San Francisco Coalition for Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar, Executive Director

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The viable plan for affordable single family housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site is being threatened by Proposition E. If Proposition E passes, 203 single family homes will be lost to the citizenry of San Francisco at a time when they are greatly needed.

The facts about the proposed housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site argue strongly against Proposition E. All 203 homes will be for first time home buyers. One-third of the homes will be available to households earning $27,000. Another third of the homes will be available to households earning $36,000. Adequate parking will be provided within the development itself, thus answering any concerns that traffic in the area will be congested.

City College has no need or plan to use South Balboa Reservoir for its facilities. City College's priority is to develop its existing campus. South Balboa Reservoir should therefore be used for one of the City's greatest needs: increased and affordable housing which is available to lower and middle income families.

As homeowners who live in the vicinity of South Balboa Reservoir, we welcome its planned use for single family housing and feel it will become an integral and contributing part of the community. We therefore urge you to vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Submitted by:
Stephen Graham, Chairman of the Housing Sub-committee of the Citizen's Committee for Community Development
Roderick A. McLeod, Vice-Chairman of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing is a group of neighbors which consists of many of the renters of Westwood Park and Sunnyside neighborhoods as well as owners and renters of Ingleside which are the closest neighbors to the Balboa Reservoir along with some of the students and teachers of City College.

We strongly support the Balboa Reservoir for housing. We believe that the Balboa Reservoir is an ideal spot for housing.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

As Merchants as well as residents of Ocean Avenue, Greater Ingleside and San Francisco, we support the Development of the Balboa Reservoir as housing.

A Traffic Survey has stated that there will be minimal impact on the existing patterns of traffic by this development.

Additional City College Parking is being considered on another location off I-280 to keep the college congestion away from the neighborhood's streets.

City College has 44 more acres in which to expand and existing buildings at City College have viable means to expand.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
We believe that housing on the Balboa Reservoir is the most viable solution to develop a vacant piece of property that is directly adjacent to our stores on a Transpreferential Street.

Affordable housing is in great need in San Francisco and is as much needed here as anywhere. We want to help provide this need. Vote No on Prop. E.

Ocean Avenue Merchants Assoc.
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughy
Submitted by Patricia Vaughy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction on much-needed affordable, single-family housing at the long vacant south Balboa Reservoir site. This proposition would also block a major housing development that would bring jobs into an area of the city that has little industry or private business.

Sale prices for these units are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the San Francisco housing market, where the average home is selling for $160,000. Construction of these homes will help all young, first-time home buyers and will require only 5% down, instead of the 20% down payment on houses bought with conventional home mortgages.

This plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by nine nearby neighborhood organizations. If Proposition E is approved and this project is blocked, more young adults will purchase their first home in Vallejo or some other outlying area, further draining San Francisco of the young families that every growing community needs.

San Francisco residents will gain apprenticeships, jobs, contracts and subcontracts from this development.

This plan calls for 2 and 3 bedroom, family-sized houses, with space for another bedroom which can be finished when needed.

Each house will have 2½ parking spaces in front and would not cause parking problems in the area. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

City College of San Francisco has no plans to buy the property, has no money for institutional expansion, nor any mention of this land in any master plan. Some supporters of this proposition are motivated by racist notions and have said they fear that this development will become another “Geneva Towers.” This type of thinking is similar to support for apartheid practiced in South Africa and must be defeated by progressive San Francisco voters. Property values will increase, instead of a decrease as a result of this project.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition E.

Larry Ukali Johnson-Reed — President, O.M.I. Pilgrim Community Center Inc.
Maria Campbell-Casey — Program Director, Bay Area Engineering Societies Committee for Manpower Training, Inc.
Clara Mills-Braddock — Program Director, O.M.I. Senior Center
John C. Jackson
Linda Rose-Gipson
Jon Still — Secretary, Young Adult Committee
Kenneth Butler

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family-sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided — 2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Affordable Housing Alliance — Mitchell Onerberg, Director
Bay Area Urban League — Gregory Best, Field Representative
Bernal Heights Community Foundation — Andre Lennell Doye
Community Educational Services — Dorothy Chen, Executive Director
Japanese Community Youth Council St. Francis Square Apartments, Inc. — Sandra Mayor-Jenkins, Secretary
Minority Contractors Association of Northern California — James Haugabook, Secretary, Board of Directors
National Community Congress — Dr. Eddie C. Welborn
Parkmerced Residents Organization, Inc. — Ricardo A. Callejo, Esq.
Potrero Hill Neighborhood House — Enoia Maxwell
San Francisco Building Trades Council — Stan Smith
San Francisco Housing & Tenants Council — Joseph Lacey
San Francisco Tenants Union — Jim Faye
Rev. Amsor C. Brown — Local Pastor & Community Servant
Greg Day — Chairman, Citizens Committee on Community Development
Polly V. Marshall — Commissioner, San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
Regina A. Sneed
Jim Wachob — San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Michael E. Wilts, AIA — Fleming Corporation

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided—2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote "No" on Proposition E.

S.N.I.G.
Will H. Reno
Larry Daniels
Ted McKeithan

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided—2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote "No" on Proposition E.
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: With certain exceptions, City officers, including elected officials and commission members, may represent clients before City boards and commissions other than their own, and be paid for their services. State legislators may represent clients before City boards and commissions, and be paid for their services. Any person may contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would prohibit City officers from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay. This proposition would prohibit State legislators from appearing before City boards, commissions and departments on behalf of clients for pay. City officers would be prohibited from discussing with these officers and legislators matters that the City is deciding. Proposition F would also prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit City officers and State legislators from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to allow City officers and State legislators to represent clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to allow any person to contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “F” Got on Ballot

On February 26 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for limitations on compensated advocacy and campaign contributions had qualified for the June ballot.

Quentin Kopp, Marth Gillham and Cheryl Arenson, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 9,400 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,986 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The purpose of Proposition F is to cut campaign contributions by large contributors (and thus reduce campaign spending) and eliminate undue influence by officeholders retained as paid lobbyists for projects requiring City approval.

Let's take a minute to analyze the untrue arguments against Proposition F:

- The opponents claim that Proposition F will force half the City's Commissioners to resign. In fact, Proposition F does not force any Commissioners to resign. It simply says they can't be a paid lobbyist and a City Commissioner at the same time. Does a commissioner value making money by lobbying more than public service?
- Some have also alleged that Proposition F will prevent duly-elected union leaders from serving as City Commissioners. No it won't. Proposition F prohibits "compensated advocacy"—that means lobbyists hired by an organization, not members of the organization itself. Proposition F does not apply to salaried employees of labor unions, corporations, or non-profit agencies. Moreover, Section 8.105 of the Charter precludes it specifically from applying to any member serving as a representative of any profession, trade, business, union or association on any board or commission which requires membership of representatives of specific professions, trades, businesses, unions or associations.
- Another untrue argument against Proposition F is that it prohibits City officials only from discussing pending issues with other City officers or State Legislators who are also acting as paid lobbyists in a matter and doesn't stop those officeholding lobbyists from writing City officials about their clients' objectives. That's not so. Proposition F applies to all such lobbying, written or oral. (The dictionary defines "discuss" as "to examine by means of speech or writing.")

End government decision-making by "insiders" and reduce the influence of money on local campaigns.

VOTE YES ON F.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
San Franciscans for Good Government

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

In all our years of observing San Francisco City government, we have found one maxim to be true time after time: a good idea gets copied, especially among politicians.

For no sooner did Quentin Kopp promise to bring Proposition F to the voters than did Mayor Feinstein come up with an informal, administrative version of her own. Fine, you say (and the Mayor says), then why vote Yes on Proposition F?

(1) The Mayor's remedy of asking City Commissioners who also act as lobbyists before City agencies to resign is nothing more than a hand slap, and is good only as long as she is mayor.
It's not binding on future mayors and could be changed without any vote of the Board of Supervisors, let alone the people of San Francisco. Proposition F prohibits this kind of conflict-of-interest, and it will be the law, no matter who is mayor.

(2) The Mayor's action did nothing to state legislators who can also act as lobbyists before City Boards and Commissions, nor did her action stop the law or business partners of City Commissioners from picking up the slack in big-money lobbying. Proposition F will stop these practices in their tracks.

(3) What about the other half of Proposition F, which reduced the campaign contribution limit to $500 so that all San Franciscans can enjoy equal access to City officials, not just the ones with the big bucks? The Mayor can't do anything about this, and she hasn't. Only a Yes vote on Proposition F will reduce the weight of big money and ensure our full voice in City elections and City government.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. If it's important enough for the Mayor to copy part of it administratively, it's important enough to do the job right and make it a law.

John J. Barbagelata
Harry Ahe
Jane Cahn
Dorothy Fartridge

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The worst and most persistent problem in American politics is that politicians and political races can be "bought". Reducing the size of campaign contributions will be a step forward in reducing the role of money in elections. Vote yes for more honest government.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

RESTORE to the people their rightful and equal power as individual voters by reducing the monetary clout and influence of private interests who make the laws and the policies as City officials and Commissioners or State legislators.

TELL the special interests that their money and influence can no longer interfere with representative government.

TELL the special interests that the voters will no longer tolerate the influence-buying which comes with large campaign contributions.

TELL the special interests that this measure will encourage highly talented citizens to serve San Francisco honestly and responsibly.

VOTE YES ON F.

Cheryl Arenson
Anne Renfrew
David Pacheco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

"Government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

These noble words from Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, cast in bronze at the entrance to City Hall, seem to have escaped the attention of some City officials who pass by them every day. For in San Francisco City government, Lincoln's simple formula for representative government would read quite differently: "Government of the powerful, by the lobbyists, and for the wealthy."

Government of, by, and for the privileged few is bad government. Government of, by, and for all the people is good government. It's as simple as that—as simple as Lincoln first put it.

Proposition F, the Good Government Initiative, will help San Franciscans maintain control of their government and will prevent undue influence by City officeholders.

To reduce undue influence, Proposition F outlaws the practice of City Commissioners and State Legislators representing special interests for pay before City Commissions and Boards. City Commissions should render their decisions deliberately and impartially, not be swayed by the political clout of the lobbyists appearing before them, or by any political favors those lobbyist/politicians might promise. "I'll scratch your back if you scratch my back" bargaining do not belong in government. And until such backroom bargains are made illegal, City government will not belong to the rest of us either.

Proposition F also reduces the maximum amount that anyone can give to a local candidate from $1,000 to $500. If large contributors and other special interests can't give as much money, they can't buy as much influence with elected officials. And the lower the contribution limit, the less campaign spending and the more City government will be responsive to all San Franciscans.

You can "buy back" City government from the privileged and powerful with the most precious of all political commodities: your vote.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Mary Lohneis
Peter Fattoh
Judith Thorson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F, an initiative of the people, is needed to protect the voters and the integrity of the legislative process from being corrupted by the power of money and influence. It prevents City officials and State Legislators from lobbying the City on behalf of high-powered special interests. It also lowers the campaign contribution limit from $1,000 to $500, thus reducing the influence of those same special interests over our elections and elected officials.

The bogus argument that the Mayor won't be able to find qualified people to serve on City commissions if Proposition F is adopted ignores the plain fact that there are 700,000 people in San Francisco, a pool of civic-minded citizens more than large enough to accommodate the 250 commission appointments available in our City government. For example, there are plenty of architects to fill the one architectural appointment on the Art Commission, just as there are plenty of non-lobbyist business people and lawyers available to serve on other commissions.

Thousands of San Franciscans, not just the "insiders", are ready, willing, and able to serve the public.

Proposition F deserves your vote: Restore integrity to City government. Restore the confidence of the citizens of San Francisco in that government. Let's have no more Wilkes Bashford situations.

VOTE YES ON F.

Oscar Sutro
Martha Gillham
Marguerite Warrent
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE "NO" ON F

This proposition disguises itself as "good government" but, in reality, would drive good people out of government. It is so crudely drawn — so sweeping in its implications — that it would bar from government almost anyone with even a remote business or community tie to government.

It would purge from City commissions anyone who "directly or indirectly" receives compensation from any "interests" with an issue before any City agency. Effectively, this could discriminate against employees from community and neighborhood groups, civil rights organizations, non-profit corporations, labor unions, merchant and business groups, as well as architects, lawyers and other professionals.

Actually, there currently are no commissioners who represent any clients before any City agency. All who are appointed in my administration sign a statement saying they will not advocate for any paying client before any official body of the City while they are commissioners. This proposition simply is not necessary.

Proposition F also would lower the limit for any individual campaign contribution from $1000 to $500. Although this sounds good, it would permit a wealthy person with various businesses and numerous family members to contribute many thousands of dollars through different sources. This would encourage "hidden" contributions. We must strive for disclosure of contributions, not a system which drives contributions underground. Candidates must be able to raise funds enough to put their message before the voters. Reducing the contribution limit can be a tactic to discourage persons from challenging incumbents.

Vote no on Proposition F.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition F purports to achieve a noble objective: The removal of "influence peddling" from City Hall. In fact, Proposition F is so poorly-crafted, it may have exactly the opposite effect on City government. It is not a "good government" initiative. It is bad legislation.

Proposition F provides no definitions and no standards for the public to judge whether City officials comply with its restrictions. Its uncertainties will be chaotic and lead to endless, needless lawsuits.

A measure similar to Proposition F was rejected by the Board of Supervisors because no public hearings were ever held on the legislation. If the public had had a chance to comment on this initiative, it might not have the critical shortcomings, deficiencies and uncertainties that now warrant its rejection by responsible San Franciscans.

In the coming months, the Board will review good government measures that are comprehensible, effective and, most important, certain. Proposition F is a misguided disaster.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

This should properly have been titled the "SINK WILLIE BROWN ORDINANCE"! The "meat of the cocoanut" is in Section 4.

Supervisor Kopp's intentions are good, however this sloppily drafted and incomprehensible measure succeeds in "burning down the barn" to eliminate a couple of rats!

Under this proposal, to avoid any potential INDIRECT conflict of interest, (which is undefined), one would have to be a destitute, unemployed welfare recipient to qualify for service on any City Board or Commission! The Mayor has already solved this "hired advocacy" problem with the "conflict of interest" affidavits she demands IN ADVANCE from any prospective appointee.

Quentin's proposed $500.00 campaign contribution limit is an "inside joke" and he, of all people, knows it! It merely obliges a heavy contributor to have his wife, children, business associates, or friends send in SEPARATE $500.00 checks if he wants to contribute more than $500.00 to a politician's campaign.

These proposals require additional City employees for enforcement and wind up doing far more harm than good. Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr., President
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Union members and labor officials have legitimate reasons for meeting with City officers. It is unfair and wrong to lump them in the same category as special interest lobbyists, yet that's exactly what Proposition F does. Working people deserve representation on City boards and commissions. VOTE NO!

Walter Johnson
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council
LeRoy King
James Elliot
Keith Eickman
Reeva Olson

Jeff Greendorfer
Stan Smith
Larry Griffin
Steve Bobbina
Terrence Ryan
Jack Beggs
Tony Marovich

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

If you want to ban business owners and executives from serving on City boards and commissions, then vote for Proposition F.

If you think board members of non-profit corporations and employees of community agencies have nothing to contribute to City government, then vote for Proposition F.

If you believe union members and labor officials should not have a voice at City Hall, then vote for Proposition F.

But if you share our belief that these individuals have legitimate concerns and expertise that is valuable in running major City departments, then join us in voting NO on Proposition F.

Proposition F is a simplistic, sloppily-drafted, meat axe approach to a problem already resolved by Mayor Feinstein's ban on commissioners lobbying on behalf of private clients.

Proposition F is not good government and it is not reform. Proposition F is bad legislation. VOTE NO.

Hon. Douglas Engmann
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Amy Meyer
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Walter Jebe
Hon. Bruce Lilienthal
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Jean Korum
Hon. Thomas Horn
Hon. Henry Berman
Hon. Robert McCarthy
Hon. Richard Guggenheim
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Hon. Patrick McGrew
Hon. Kirk Miller
Hon. Melvin Lee
Hon. Jerry Berg
Hon. Bonnie Gibson
Hon. Mary Noel Pepys
Hon. Mark Buell
Hon. Tim Carrico
Hon. Jo Hanson
Hon. Kevin Malone
John Sanger
Tom Moore
Donald Dizer
Jim Wachob
Anne Daley
Linda Post
Lynne Williams
Todd Dickinson
Peter Hanson
Herbert Kurian
William Scoorts
Van Hart
Iris Fluellen
Noam Rand
John Schmidt
James Mock
Thomas Kauzaki
Wendy Goldberg
Joseph Schwartz
Belle Lazarus
Antonio Barrios
Bruce Barrett
Charles Howell
Walter McGuire
Sharon Duvall
Joyce Mauriello

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

We're sympathetic to the need for political reform. But it's a complicated problem, and Proposition F just isn't the way to go.

Frankly, we can't tell who is and isn't affected by this measure. While a handful of people sometimes might abuse their positions, that's no reason to question the integrity of so many solid citizens who give tirelessly to public service. Proposition F is simply the wrong approach. Please join us in voting NO.

William E. McDonnell
Frances May McAteer
N. A. Sapunar
Caroline and Michael Figoni

Martin D. Murphy
Eugene C. Payne III
Suzanne B. McCarthy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Concerned about elected officials spending $400,000 to run for supervisor and $1 million on a mayor's race? Then vote NO on Proposition F.

That's right. NO.

Proposition F isn't going to do anything about campaign spending. Prop F simply limits the size of contributions, reducing the current limit from $1,000 to $500. Supervisors can and will continue spending outrageous sums on their re-election campaigns. With Proposition F they'll just spend twice as much time raising money from twice as many sources, and that makes special interests even more powerful. They can always find ways around campaign limits.

We need campaign spending reform, but Proposition F doesn't provide it. Please join us in voting NO on F.

District 8 Democratic Club
Stephen L. Taber
Ruth Gravanitis
Alan Ruzick
Miriam Blaustein

Linda Chapman
Dale Carlson
James Hirth
Debra Barnes
Lew Serbin
Debra Stein

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

When campaign contributions are limited, political freedom suffers. Your right to free speech includes not only your right to express your views, but also your right to support as much as you want, any candidate who speaks for you.

Minority viewpoints depend heavily on the contribution of a few dedicated supporters to get your message out. To limit your financial support of your beliefs is to silence your political voice.

Only incumbents, who have many opportunities for free media exposure benefit from this assault on free speech. The dangers of a campaign contribution limit far outweigh any possible benefit from this proposition. Defeat Proposition F!

San Francisco Libertarian Party
Michael R. Fowler, Secretary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

You may think Prop F only applies to big-time lawyers and a few legislators who represent developers. Think again!

Prop F would prohibit many community leaders from public service. If it passes, board members and employees of community and charitable organizations could be banned from serving on City boards and commissions.

We appreciate the public need for a government free of "influencing peddling." But restrictions on "compensated advocacy" ought to be clearly and carefully crafted to protect the voices of community leaders who argue on behalf of the public interest, not private special interests.

Vote No.

Hon. Juanita Del Carlo
Mission Hiring Hall
Bob Ross
Publisher, Bay Area Reporter

Hon. Jeffrey Ken Mori
Japanese Community Youth Council, Inc.
Bill O'Callahan
American Red Cross
Hon. George Suncin
Horizons Unlimited
Hon. Jean Rita Alviar
Mission Education Project
Hon. Greg Day
Polk Street Town Hall
Hon. Naomi Gray
Hon. James Foster
Carol Wong
Marlena Marseille
Lee Woods
Jo Daly
Dennis Collins
Hon. H. Welton Flynn
(Organizations listed only for purposes of identification.)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will have no effect on developers' lawyers.

None.

It won't make any difference to state legislators either.

Don't kid yourself. This is not "reform" and it isn't "good government." Proposition F will allow the special interests and influence peddlers to continue exercising influence over our elected officials. It has so many loopholes, lobbying will actively continue, untouched, in the back rooms of City Hall.

And developers will always find ways around campaign contribution limits. As Common Cause has noted, Prop F simply makes tracing their dollars more difficult for the public.

Real reform would directly attack the source of huge contributions—the developers and other special interests that employ the lobbyists to peddle their influence.

VOTE NO.

Sue Hester
Calvin Welch
David Loosman
Michael Mason
Rich Waller
Susan Klugerman
Rene Canenvae
Margie O'Driscoll

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
South Africa Boycott

PROPOSITION G

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?

YES 300
NO 301

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has adopted an ordinance prohibiting the City, with certain exceptions, from purchasing goods or services from companies doing business with South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a declaration of policy that says the City must try to avoid doing business with companies that significantly profit from or help maintain the Apartheid system in South Africa. It calls on other public bodies and private groups to adopt similar policies. It directs the Board of Supervisors to identify the companies which have the greatest ties to Apartheid so that the public can also boycott those companies.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to avoid doing business with companies that help maintain Apartheid, and you want a public boycott of those companies.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

“The proposed Declaration of Policy be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “G” Got on Ballot

On November 6, 1985 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for the City to boycott businesses with significant ties to South Africa had qualified for the June ballot.

Arlo Hale Smith, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,546 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on October 11.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,941 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:
It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar:
(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
South Africa Boycott

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This measure calls for a public boycott of companies that aid apartheid.

Any claim of "conflict" between Proposition G and existing anti-apartheid legislation is imaginry: It is the legislative intent of supporters of this measure that it can be construed as a directive for making existing law tougher.

Personal attacks have no legitimate place in a ballot measure campaign. As proponent of this measure, I repudiate all such tactics.

Vote NO on apartheid. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Arlo Hale Smith

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Boycotts are grassroots politics. They’ve helped the farmworkers, they’ve helped win integration, and they can help end the legal racism called “Apartheid”.

A Gallup poll found 77% of South Africa’s black majority favoring international economic boycotts to force the Apartheid regime to accept reform peacefully.

After the Boycott Initiative made the ballot, the San Francisco Supervisors unanimously passed a similar city purchasing policy. The issue that remains is whether to call on the general public to join in, boycotting companies identified by the Supervisors as the worst offenders in each industry.

The companies that would be targeted consider profits to be the “bottom line”. Economic pressure is all they understand.

The AFL-CIO, NAACP, and NOW have called a boycott of Shell Oil because of its profiteering from South Africa's oppressive economic conditions. Proposition G supports that and would put the same pressure on other industries as well.

This proposition is supported by the elected county central committee of the Democratic Party, the Peace-and-Freedom Party and the Humanist Party, and by leading attorneys, such as Terry Francois, Terence Hallinan, Tony Serra, Lewis Hope Lee, Marc Van Der Hout, Abby Ginsberg and Terence Redmond. If South Africa were a democracy, its majority would long ago have voted to end Apartheid. We need to vote Yes — because they can’t.

Attys. Arlo Hale Smith, Democratic Party County Central Committee
Paul Kangas, Peace and Freedom Party
Lois Salisbury, Public Advocates *
Dr. Kevin Danaher, Food First*
Jesse James, Mission Rebels
Terry Collins, Community Activist
Stony Geber, Election Action
Robert McCall, Hotel & Restaurant Employees
Executive Board Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Attorneys speak out against Apartheid:

South African police can arrest anyone without charge. They can hold you incommunicado — no contacts with family, lawyers or press.

They regularly censor news, books, music. They have banned Christmas caroling, funerals and other peaceful gatherings. Groups which criticize the government are forbidden to hold meetings.

Blacks are subject to legal segregation; their property and employment rights are greatly restricted; often, they are simply murdered.

As attorneys, we help people who have legal rights that are being violated. But what can we do for those who have no legal rights?

Boycotts and other economic sanctions are the only way to make the Apartheid government accept reform peacefully.

In the Court of World Public Opinion, Apartheid has been convicted of crimes against humanity. By imposing a sentence of economic isolation, we can end Apartheid.

Vote Yes—take a stand for justice.

Terence Hallinan
Arlo Hale Smith
Terry Francois
Karen Anderson Ryer
Robert R. Bryan

Ann Menasche
Rachel Ginsburg
Leo Fuoli
Gabriel Gesmer
Ona Proukovich

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is a moderate, responsible but effective proposal to bring economic pressure on the South African government to establish constitutional rights for all of its citizens. Vote Yes.

Terence Faulkner, Republican
Mike Garza, Republican

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

All decent Americans abhor apartheid. However, boycotting U.S. investment in South Africa is counterproductive; it only penalizes the actual victims of apartheid.

U.S. international firms have acted as progressive agents for change through the Sullivan principles. Their investments have improved the social and economic condition of the labor force. It is improper to penalize their positive contributions.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

We are individuals and organizations working actively to end the racist system of apartheid in South Africa. And we are voting NO on Proposition G.

Why?
(1) Because Proposition G will weaken San Francisco’s present divestment law. This law requires companies doing business with the city to sign affidavits that they will make no new contracts with South Africa.

Proposition G has no such provision.

(2) Proposition G provides no mechanism or funding to carry out its declared purpose of “boycotting” South Africa.

Proposition G will not stop South African products from entering the Port of San Francisco.

Vote against this useless, confusing, and deceptive initiative.

Preserve the stronger divestment law San Francisco already has. Vote NO on Proposition G!

Yvonne Golden
Geraldine Johnson
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
AFT 2121 Anti-Apartheid Committee
Artists Against Apartheid
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Coalition of Conscience
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club Executive Committee
ILWU 10 and SEIU 250 Southern Africa Liberation Support Committees
National Conference of Black Lawyers
San Francisco Anti-Apartheid Committee
Southern Africa Freedom Committee/All Peoples Congress

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1983 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
AIDS Research

PROPOSITION H

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Several city and private agencies conduct various programs related to AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a declaration of policy that says San Francisco should support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council, consisting of a Committee on Education and a Fund-Raising Committee. The Research Committee would make recommendations on the most useful AIDS research projects and try to prevent duplication of efforts. The Education Committee would inform the public about the latest research and about ways to prevent AIDS. The Fund-Raising Committee would seek donations and grants for AIDS research and education projects.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

“The proposed Declaration of Policy for an AIDS research and education council and the formation of advisory committees of civic leaders would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, additional expenditure of public funds for AIDS research may result, the amount of which cannot be determined.”

How “H” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for AIDS research had qualified for the June ballot. Stony Gebert, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 10,540 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on December 6, 1985.

A check of each signature on the petition showed that 7,564 of the signatures were valid. This is more than 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We need a council to expose and address major AIDS issues without the impasse of present medical/political bias.

As taxpayers, we are subsidizing a treadmill of continual AIDS casualties. There are major oversights where AIDS is concerned. Only recently was it learned that CDC statistics suggest 79% of early AIDS cases appear drug-related. We hear AIDS is 100% fatal. Perhaps that is because death may also be drug-related in the way of immuno-suppressive antibiotic and radiation overloads to already compromised immunity systems. Prevailing medicine is both tunnel-visioned and high-profit motivated. Also well-funded. This solution may be part of the problem. Some physicians are beginning to feel where AIDS is concerned many current practices are ethically, medically bankrupt.

Remissions occur. Largely through immunity-enhancing, holistic medicine. Significantly, only 1% of AIDS cases occur among people at risk in the Asian community. Perhaps this is due to less drug abuse or use of an unfunded, ignored resource: herbology as part of diet. More options: homeopathy, acupuncture, etc.

If, as anticipated, upwards of 40% of those testing positive come down with AIDS, we may become overburdened. To ignore all of the above becomes part of the problem. Vote Yes on Proposition H.

Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Rich McKirkeby, Former Orderly,
Marketing Associate, Pacific Bell
Joseph P. Clady, AIDS Hospice, Shanti Counselor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There is great need for research and education about AIDS and related conditions.

We need to attack the disease, not its victims.

Knowledge is the only vaccine available today.

Vote Yes.

John Lorenzini, President,
People With AIDS Alliance
Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Jan Beck, Steven Russell, Eugene Ewins, ARC/AIDS Vigil

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There are many possible treatments for AIDS and related conditions which are not being examined by the federal government, especially therapies based on natural substances and processes.

Vote Yes for an AIDS Research Council open to all viewpoints.

Scott Gregory, M.D.
Paul Kangas

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A tape recording (Talking Book) of the San Francisco Voter Information pamphlet is available from the San Francisco Public Library’s branch for the blind. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar’s Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name______________________________________________________________

Address___________________________________________________________________ Apt. #________

Telephone No. (required)________________________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): ________________________________

Second choice locations (if any)________________________________________

Signature____________________________________________________________
PROPOSITION I
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway? YES 307 NO 308

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the Freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a policy statement asking whether or not the Embarcadero Freeway should be torn down.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City’s policy to remain as it is, and you want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to change the City’s policy, and you do not want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

Controller’s Statement on "I"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway demolished, in my opinion; based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by at least $10.2 million in local funds. Potential private sector financing and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “I” Got on Ballot

On March 3 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy placing the question of demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway before the voters had qualified for the June ballot.

Richard Hongisto, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 11,119 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,720 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land now under the Broadway ramps is put back on the tax rolls, with low-rise buildings limited by restrictive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when united with Proposition J, recognizes these facts:

1) The Embarcadero Freeway is what is left of a never-completed elevated freeway that would have ringed the City through North Beach and Marina neighborhoods to the Golden Gate Bridge.
2) Today this massive freeway, which separates us from our waterfront, would never be built.
3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.
4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman’s Wharf will be preserved.
5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked for this new system.
6) Only that portion of the Embarcadero Freeway east and north of the Main and Beale Street ramps—basically the portion directly on the waterfront—will be removed to make way for the new system. The removal cost, approximately $10 million to be paid for with privately-generated new revenues, is a relatively small part of the overall new system.

As for Proposition I, vote “YES, let’s tear down the Embarcadero Freeway.” Then turn to Proposition J and support the plan for a beautiful waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Removing the Embarcadero Freeway will allow San Francisco to:

• Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero.

• Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway.

• Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula.

• Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.

• Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won’t benefit San Francisco. Don’t let outsiders determine our future. Vote YES on I.

Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Jack Wholey
Roger Boyer
A. Lee Knight
Robert Bradford
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Donald A. Crosby, AIA
Rai Y. Okamoto
Robert Meyers
Ralph Hurtado
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Douglas G. Wright
Anita Sanchez
Chuck Forester
Fritz Arko
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Dohart, AIA, AICP
Bennie B. Jones
Randal Ross
Karl Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
Jon Titchell
June Winstead

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON I

This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY—VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds—without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city’s fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT—VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to 15.7 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown, Fisherman's Wharf and the financial district would be reduced.

Travel within the city would be slowed down at all hours. Vote no to the destruction of the freeway.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled. Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land now under the Broadway ramps is put back on the tax rolls, with low-rise buildings limited by restrictive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when these facts:

1) The Embarcadero completed elevated free through North Beach an Gate Bridge.

2) Today this massive

FROM:

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMÓ SU APLICACIÓN?)

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK — VOTE YES ON I

This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY — VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds — without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city's fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT — VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree — it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don’t let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to 15.7 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown, Fisherman’s Wharf and the financial district would be reduced.

Travel within the city would be slowed down at all hours. Vote no to the destruction of the freeway.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
• Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
• Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
• If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that — By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections — an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections — an increase of only 76%.
• Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
• MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 63% increase in person hours of travel.
• Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City’s plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Judith Tornese

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Tear it down? The concept is preposterous! There are 70,000 cars a day whizzing by on this high speed downtown elevated waterfront freeway! Where will they all go?

Aside from the outrageous demolition costs involved, (some engineers estimate $40,000,000 of taxpayer money!), eyeball observation, logic, and just plain “common sense” dictates that ground level “total gridlock” will result if this expensive freeway is now destroyed.

Nostalgic individuals must realize that the times have changed! We can’t bring the Bay back up to Montgomery Street! On behalf of San Francisco’s overburdened taxpayers, we urge a NO vote!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
W. F. O’Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled.
Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

— LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic? YES 310  NO 311

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a policy statement that says that the City would replace the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt a policy statement which says that the Embarcadero Freeway would be torn down if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt a policy statement to replace the Embarcadero Freeway under these conditions.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

"The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway replaced with a tree-lined six lane boulevard and other traffic and transit improvements, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by approximately $27.5 million. This includes a one-time freeway demolition cost of $10.2 million plus $17.3 million required to match potential federally-funded transit improvements. Potential financing by the State and private sector and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost."

How “J” Got on Ballot

On March 5 a declaration of policy regarding the future of the Embarcadero Freeway was delivered to the Registrar from the Mayor and several supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows the Mayor or four or more supervisors to submit a declaration of policy to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

In addition to Mayor Feinstein, the March 5 document was signed by Supervisors Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker, Molinari, Kennedy and Nelder.

POLLS ARE OPEN
FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans now have a chance to remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with an at-grade, six-lane parkway, which will open our waterfront and restore views blocked for years by this large freeway.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for traffic and transit improvements:

- New, shorter freeway ramps connecting directly with The Embarcadero;
- A tree-lined, at-grade, 6-lane Embarcadero Boulevard, with a new waterfront Muni line, a jogging and bicycle path from Fisherman’s Wharf to Mission Bay;
- Extension of Muni Metro south to the Caltrain station at 4th and Townsend;
- New ramps connecting I-280 with The Embarcadero;
- Changes in traffic flow and improvements to existing freeway ramps.

Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman’s Wharf will be preserved and enhanced.

The Board of Supervisors has specified that the Embarcadero Freeway will be torn down only if preliminary engineering during the next two years confirms—as traffic and environmental studies already have—that removal of the freeway will not result in more problems than it solves.

San Francisco became eligible for $88 million in federal highway funds for this new system when the Supervisors approved the plan in 1980. The $10.2 million cost of freeway demolition itself can be paid from revenues from low-rise development of the parcels now under the Broadway ramps and the increased values of nearby properties. Strict waterfront zoning limits the size of any development.

Traffic and environmental studies by the California Department of Transportation since 1980 clearly indicate that the new waterfront transportation system will be vastly superior to the existing situation, and that traffic congestion levels will not be notably different with the elevated structure removed.

Vote Yes on J and let’s remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with a parkway and transit system—once again let us see our waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J gives the voters a chance to be heard on an important and timely issue. This issue is the replacement of a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway as one element of a comprehensive package of transportation improvements in the Waterfront area.

Last fall, the Board of Supervisors adopted for further study a set of traffic and transit improvements for the Waterfront. These improvements include:

- a new landscaped surface-level boulevard
- replacement of the Clay/Washington and Broadway on and off ramps with new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom
- removal of the unused stub of I-280 and construction of new ramps connecting the new waterfront boulevard to Route I-280
- a new light rail transit line linking Fort Mason with the Caltrain Depot
- extension of the Muni Metro to the train depot, improving the Peninsula Commute Service

A YES vote on Proposition J does not allocate funds for these projects. It does allow for further design and engineering studies, including cost analysis, assessment of impacts on traffic, and other matters. The studies will then be presented to the Supervisors so that they can make an informed decision on the plan. If the studies prove positive, San Francisco will be able to transform its Waterfront for the benefit of all.

Proposition J will insure that the City will not proceed with the removal of any of the Freeway until all the studies are completed and all potential consequences are assessed. This is the responsible approach. Vote YES on J.

SPUR
League of Women Voters
Embarcadero Citizens Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SAN FRANCISCO’S NEIGHBORHOODS ASK YOU TO VOTE YES ON J.

REDUCE TRAFFIC CONGESTION—YES ON J: Traffic backed up by the Embarcadero Roadway slows travel and creates congestion in North Beach and other nearby neighborhoods. J will speed traffic flow.

IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION—YES ON J: Proposition J will provide regular streetcar service along the Embarcadero and extend Muni Metro service to the south, ultimately extending to Bayview-Hunters Point.

PROMOTE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY—YES ON J: If Proposition J does not pass, San Francisco could lose $88 million in federal funds for traffic improvements.

(continued)
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RESTORE THE WATERFRONT—YES ON J!
San Francisco's waterfront could become a focal point for the city, graced by a grand promenade, instead of the dismal, deteriorating eyesore it is now.
San Francisco's neighborhoods join together to ask for support for an improved Embarcadero. We guarantee the freeway will not be removed unless it is replaced by facilities that will assure a smoother, more efficient traffic flow. YES ON J!
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Robert Bradford
Ruth Gravants
Hon. Toby Rosenblat
Anita Sanchez
Nancy Katz
Robert Katz
Beverly Mills
North Beach Neighbors
John Behanna
Herbert D. Kosovitz
Jerry Hartado
Gregory E. Jones
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors
Dale A. Carslen
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Ralph Hurtado
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Chuck Forester
David M. Hartley
Donald P. Black
Mrs. Bland Platt
Richard Reinhardt
James W. Haas
James Ream
Jill M. Jones
Peter J. Locke
Marjorie G. Stern
John B. Lowry
Lawrence Ferlinghetti
Nancy Peters
Steven Taber

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J
SUPPORT PUBLIC TRANSIT—VOTE YES ON J.
SAVE SAN FRANCISCO FROM GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON J.
The revitalization of the Northeastern Waterfront...as included in San Francisco's Master Plan and transit plans, as overwhelmingly approved by the Board of Supervisors and as urged by Mayor Feinstein...will allow almost $90 million in unused federal highway funds to be used for vital downtown and waterfront transit and street improvements which will be a key to reducing needless auto congestion in San Francisco.
PROPPOSITION J SUPPORTS IMPORTANT TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS TO THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT. It will:
- extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific/CalTrain depot
- create a new rail line (possibly using historic streetcars) to connect the entire waterfront from Mission Bay to the Ferry Building to Fishermans Wharf and Fort Mason
- set the stage for a possible streetcar line along Third Street
Since the city of San Francisco adopted the Transit First policy in the early 1970's, transit investments in the Muni Metro,
in new electric trolley an articulated bus service, and in BART and Golden Gate Transit, have saved downtown San Francisco from gridlock!
IF you are concerned about the future of transit in San Francisco, IF you are concerned about reducing needless auto congestion, THEN we urge you to join Mayor Feinstein and the majority of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in voting Yes on Proposition J.

Norman Rolfe
San Francisco Muni Coalition
California Transit League
Jack Wholey
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Regina Sned
Tony Kilroy
Hon. Jack Morrison
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Bay Area Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Hon. Amy Meyer, Recreation and Park Commissioner
Alan Lablinder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J
A SOUND BUSINESS PROPOSITION—YES ON J!
Common sense and good business demand we make the most of our resources. San Francisco's waterfront is an economic and civic asset unrivaled anywhere—yet much of it is cut off by an ugly, noisy, elevated roadway. The traffic improvements called for by Proposition J will benefit workers, tourists, property owners, neighborhoods,...and business.
Traffic flow and transit will move quickly on a realigned, reorganized Embarcadero Roadway, allowing easier, more pleasant access to waterfront businesses.
An improved and beautified Embarcadero will create new commercial opportunities and increase the value of existing property and businesses.
New jobs and an expanded tax base will generate increased revenue for the city as several lots now covered by freeway ramps return to productive private ownership. Though limited to low rise development (40 to 65 feet), tax revenues from development will more than make up the city's share of the project.

Robert Meyers
Dennis J. Foss
Kenneth R. Lerch
M. Arthur Gensler, Jr., FAIA
James T. Choppell, AIChE
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berber
H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AIChE
Bonnie B. Jones
Randall Rossi
Karl A. Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
Jon Twitchell
Fritz Arko
Michael J. O'Shea

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J OFFERS RESIDENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO A ONCE IN A LIFETIME OPPORTUNITY TO RECAPTURE THEIR WATERFRONT.

Covert the Embarcadero into a tree-lined boulevard and building a new streetcar line will make the waterfront more pedestrian and transit oriented, that is, more people oriented.

A freeway structure that is a source of objectionable noise and casts a pall over a large part of the waterfront will be removed. The waterfront will be opened up to sunlight and fresh air and made more inviting and cheerful to those who wish to walk on one of the world's outstanding waterfronts. Air pollution that is now retained by the existing elevated structure will be dissipated.

The transit orientation of the new waterfront will encourage energy conservation. Proposition J will:

—Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero
—Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway
—Remove the unused stub of 1-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula

—Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero
—Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line
—Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won't benefit San Francisco. Don't let outsiders determine our future.

VOTE YES ON J FOR A BETTER SAN FRANCISCO.

Sierra Club
Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage
Willinda McCrea* Bob Crumer* Rebecca Evans* Richard Livingston* Marilyn Clenens* Jennie Lee* Jeffrey Henry* Jane Winslow* Roger Boyer

A. Lee Knight
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Patrick S. Hobin
Monica Stallman
Walter K. Morris
Lisa Klairemonts
Jeffrey Heller
Bob Issacs
George T. Ruckrose, FAIA
Jon Twichell
Marc Kasby

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J GIVES US A CHANCE TO CORRECT A COLOSSAL MISTAKE!

The Embarcadero Freeway should never have been built. The original plan was to build a freeway from bridge to bridge, destroying the Northern Waterfront, Fisherman's Wharf, Fort Mason, and Marina Green in the process. When the people of San Francisco saw what was happening, they stopped it in mid-air—literally.

Walk under it. Hear the noise. Feel the gloom. See how it cuts out light.

It's time to remove this mistake.

The new waterfront plan will give us a tree-lined boulevard, a new streetcar line, and a Muni Metro extension to the Southern Pacific/Caltrain depot. It will give us a transit and pedestrian oriented waterfront that will give us pride and pleasure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J!

San Francisco Tomorrow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, with a membership of 1700 working architects in San Francisco, urges a "YES" vote on Proposition J. In 1968 the citizens of San Francisco stopped highway planners from ringing our waterfront with freeways. Today voters have another opportunity to return the waterfront to our citizens. Removal of the Embarcadero Freeway is one part of a carefully researched transit plan for San Francisco. This proposition supplies an unique opportunity to carry out a broad range of transportation improvements that will have many positive effects on the City of San Francisco.

Removal of the freeway will:

1. Return the waterfront to the people by removing this barrier to access and view.
2. Facilitate needed MUNI improvements.
3. Encourage development of the Embarcadero as a grand civic boulevard unifying the City of San Francisco.

The members of the American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, urge you to vote "YES" on Proposition I and "YES" on Proposition J.

Donald Kennedy, FAIA
President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans love Their City, the ambiance, the Bay, waterfront, the views, the healthy neighborhoods.

Freeway builders did their dammed to destroy the City and divide our neighborhoods.

Now we can remove that damned spot, the concrete dinosaur, the hideous barrier that destroys our scenic views, the fence that keeps us from the Bay, the concealer of the Ferry Building.

Correct a mistake.

VOTE YES ON J.

Miriam Blaustein
Charlene Clark
Marie Cleasby
Zach Cowan
Dick Grosboll
Rick Haupman

Tony Kilroy
Jean Kerstan
Ira Kurlander
Jack Morrison
Andy Nash
Norman Rolfe

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

NO ON PROPOSITION J.

“J” is for JOKE—a cruel joke on us. What will I really do? Add traffic to every street east of Gough. Delay the construction of waterfront streetcar service. Cost millions in local dollars needed to improve MUNI. Create a ground-level freeway on the waterfront as big as Van Ness, with more cars.

I’m a private citizen who’s concerned about traffic and what it’s doing to our City. If you are too, vote NO on Proposition J.

Steve Colman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:

• Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
• Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
• If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that—By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
  — Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
  — MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
  — Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Blair C. Pusco

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION A

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by boldface type.

3.202 Office of Risk Management

There is established under the chief administrative officer an office of risk management which shall review, analyze and report to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the finance committee of the board of supervisors the practices of the several departments, boards and commissions of the city and county regarding loss prevention and risk management, including the insurance requirements of the city and county. The office shall also establish and assist in the implementation of planning and operational guidelines regarding risk management and loss prevention for each department, board or commission. The chief administrative officer may appoint, at his or her pleasure, or contract with, a qualified individual or organization for the operation of the office. The qualifications of the individual or organization operating the office shall include relevant education, training and experience in insurance and risk management.

3.401 City Attorney

(a) The city attorney shall be an elective officer. He shall furnish an official bond in the sum of ten thousand dollars ($10,000). He shall appoint, and at his pleasure may remove, all assistants and employees of his office. He shall devote his entire time and attention to the duties of his office. He must, at the time of his election, be an elector of the city and county, qualified to practice in all the courts of the state, and he must have been so qualified for at least 10 years next preceding his election.

The city attorney must represent the city and county in all actions and proceedings in which it may be legally interested, or, for or against the city and county, or, any officer of the city and county in any action or proceeding, when directed so to do by the supervisors, except where a cause of action exists in favor of the city and county against said officer. Whenever any cause of action exists in favor of the city and county, the city attorney shall commence the same when within his knowledge or when directed to do so by the supervisors. He shall give his advice or opinion in writing to any officer, board or commission of the city and county when requested. Except as otherwise provided in this charter, he shall not settle or dismiss any litigation for or against the city and county, unless, upon his written recommendation, he is ordered so to do by ordinance.

The city attorney shall prepare, or approve as to form, all ordinances before they are enacted by the supervisors. He shall approve, by endorsement in writing, the form of all official or other bonds required by this charter or by ordinance before the same are submitted to the proper commission, board or office for final approval, and no such bonds shall be finally approved without such approval as to form by the city attorney. Except as otherwise in this charter provided, he shall prepare in writing the draft or form of all contracts before the same are executed on behalf of the city and county. He shall examine and approve the title of all real property to be acquired by the city and county.

He shall keep on file in his office copies of all written communications and opinions, also all papers, briefs and transcripts used in matters wherein he appears; and books of record and registers of all actions or proceedings in his charge in which the city and county or any officer or board thereof, is a party or is interested.

(b) The duties of the city attorney in connection with the bureau of delinquent revenue collection shall be transferred to and performed by the attorney for said bureau who shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

(c) There is established in the office of the city attorney a bureau of claims investigation and administration which shall have the responsibility of investigating, evaluating and processing for the several boards, commissions and departments all claims for money or damages made upon the city and county pursuant to section 2.703 of this charter or the general law of the State of California. Claim investigation functions of the police department in existence on June 4, 1986, shall continue as an adjunct to the bureau established under this section. Claims functions of the public utilities commission shall remain under that commission unless transferred to the bureau of claims investigation and administration by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the bureau shall also have the power to investigate events and occurrences giving rise to potential civil liability against the city and county and adjust and settle demands, within dollar limits to be established by ordinances, prior to their presentation as claims. There shall be established by ordinance a revolving fund to satisfy such demands adjusted prior to their presentation as claims. The bureau shall be responsible for the investigation of all claims and the analysis of city policies and practices upon which the bureau shall report and advise the several departments.

The city attorney shall appoint a chief of the bureau who shall serve at his or her pleasure. The chief of the bureau may appoint, subject to confirmation by the city attorney, investigators who shall serve at the pleasure of the chief; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of civil claims investigator or any equivalent classification on the date of approval of this amendment by the electorate shall continue to have civil service status to said position under the civil service provisions of this charter.

(TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION B)

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by boldface type; deletions are indicated by horizontal strikeouts.

7.100 Materials, Supplies and Equipment

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreements for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for constructing operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head change thereof and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract. All purchases in excess of one thousand dollars ($1,000) shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases and a permanent record of all such quotations shall be kept. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) for materials, supplies and equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient encumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of materials, supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two or more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the articles requisitioned and may advertise for
bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall direct the rejection of all articles which may be below standards, specifications or samples furnished. He shall not approve any bill or voucher for articles not in conformity with specifications, or which are at variance with any contract.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall also have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, except the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment purchased and in use in all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.

7.03 Procurement, Contract and Payment

Purchases orders and contracts shall be based on written requisitions, or, for materials, or supplies in common use in the various departments, on the purchaser's record of average use by all departments. Purchase orders and contracts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) must be approved by the chief administrative officer. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by an amount not to exceed fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) and not performed under contract or written order of the city and county materials, and supplies, shall not be performed under contract, be covered by written order or agreement which shall be based on not less than three bids, notice of which shall be given by three days' posting of Records of Account of the department.

When the expenditure for any public work or improvement shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), the same shall be done by contract, except as otherwise provided in this chapter. The head of the department in charge of or responsible for the work for which a contract is to be let, or the purchaser of supplies in the case of purchases of materials, supplies and equipment, shall let such contract to the lowest reliable and responsible bidder not less than ten days after advertising by one publication for sealed proposals for the work, improvements or purchase contemplated. Each such advertisement shall contain the reservation of the right to reject any and all bids. The officer responsible for the awarding of any such contract shall require from all bidders information concerning their experience and financial qualifications, as provided by general law relative to such investigations authorized by department of public works.

The purchase of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer for bids in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), or the department head concerned, with the approval of the board or commission to which he is responsible, may reject any and all bids and readvertise for bids.

The department head or the purchaser of supplies, as the case may be, shall have power to sign such contract for the estimated expenditures thereunder not in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000).

Any contract involving the expenditure of more than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), if for the purchase of materials, supplies, or equipment, shall require the joint approval of the purchaser of supplies and the chief administrative officer. If such contract is for any public work or improvement, it shall require the joint approval of the department head and the chief administrative officer for amounts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000).

In any case where the lowest price or unit cost bid is not accepted, and a contract is entered into with another bidder, written report shall be made to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the controller to the officer authorized to execute the contract, with the reasons for failure to accept such lowest bid.

If any provision of this section is in conflict with any provision of section 7.100 of the charter, the provision contained in section 7.100 shall govern and control.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this chapter. The Public Works Contract Procedure by Ordinance. Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter and, in particular, the provisions of section 7.200, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to determine the monetary limits not to exceed fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), within which the construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements, may be done by contract or by written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly from the city and county.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D, Continued from page 25

point two commissioners to terms of one year each, one commissioner to a term of two years, one commissioner to a term of three years and one commissioner to a term of four years. The terms of the commissioners shall be for four years from the commencement thereof. Not less than one-fourth members of said commission shall be of the same sex, and one member shall have prior experience representing labor and one member shall have prior experience representing management.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am op- posed to appointments to the public service as a re- ward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in civil cases, and after being heard for defense.

Special meetings of the commission for the pur- pose of considering and adopting examination ques- tions, or for the purpose of making examination rules, shall require twenty-four hours' notice. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission, after the regular daily working hours of the city and county. Such person or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

In accordance with section 3.800, the commis- sion shall have the power and it shall be its duty to appoint an executive assistant to be the adminis- trative head of the affairs under its control who shall serve at its pleasure; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the posi- tion of assistant secretary to the civil service commis- sion on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to have civil service status in the position of executive assistant under the civil service provisions of this charter.

3.661 General Powers and Duties
(a) The civil service commission shall be the employment and personnel department of the city and county and shall determine appointments on the basis of merit and fitness, as shown by appropriate tests.

The commission shall classify, and from time to time may reclassify, in accordance with duties and responsibil- ies of the employment, and training and experi- ence required, all places of employment in the departments and offices of the city and county not specifically exempted by this charter from the civil service provisions thereof, or which may be created hereafter by general law and not specifically ex- empted from said civil service provisions. The com- mission shall likewise classify all other positions or other places of employment in the city and county service specifically exempted from the civil service provisions of this charter, but which, by the provi- sions of section 3.801, thereof, are made subject to classification for salary standardization purposes on the basis of duties and responsibilities of the employ- ment and training and experience required. The civil service commission shall be the judge of such classifi- cation.

The commission shall, also, in accordance with duties and responsibilities, allocate, and from time to time may re-allocate, the positions to the various
classes of the classification. The allocation or re- allocation of a position shall not adversely affect the civil service rights of an occupant regularly holding the position. The commission shall establish the classification to which he has been appointed, provided that every employee of any department or office shall discharge any of the duties pertaining to such department or office to which his chief may tem- porarily assign him.

The decrease in the class number assigned to posi- tions by the commission shall be used in all records, reports, statements and communications, including the classification schedule, annual budget and salary ordinance, payrolls, and appropriation ordinances.

The commission shall adopt rules to carry out the civil service provisions of this charter and, except as otherwise provided in this charter, such rules shall govern applications; examinations; eligibility; duration of eligible lists; certification of eligibles; ap- pointments; promotions; transfers; resignations; lay-off or reduction in force, both permanent and temporary, due to lack of work or funds, retrench- ment, or completion of work; the filling of positions; temporary, seasonal and permanent; classification; approval of payrolls; and such other matters as it may determine. "Told appointment" shall be made upon one-week's notice, make changes in the rules, which change shall thereupon be printed, and be in force; provided that no such changes in rules shall af- fect a case pending before the commission. The secretary may certify eligibles and payrolls and con- duct examinations under the rules of the commission.

The commissioners shall have power to institute and prosecute legal proceedings for violations of any of the civil service provisions of this charter.

(b) The civil service commission shall establish an inspection service for the purpose of investigating the conduct of and action of appointees in all positions and of securing records of service for promotion and other purposes. All departments shall cooperate with the commission in making its investigations and any person hindering the commission or its agents shall be subject to suspension.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the civil service commission shall by rule estab- lish procedures to review and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of race; religion; sex; national origin; marital status; physical handicap; per- sonal affilitation; sexual orientation; ancestry; mar- ital status; color; medical condition or other non-merit factors. The determination reached under civil ser- vice commission procedures shall be final and shall forthwith be enforced by every employee and officer.

3.661 General Powers and Duties
(a) The civil service commission shall have the power to inquire into the operation of the person- nel system of the city and county and to ensure compli- ance with the principles set forth in section 3.810. After such inquiry, the commission may recom- mend to the personnel director, as established pursuant to section 3.663, the mayor or to any other officer of the city and county such action as the commission believes necessary to carry out the civil service provisions of this charter. In any hear- ing conducted by the civil service commission or by any hearing officer it appoints, the commission or the hearing officer shall have the power to sub- poena and require the attendance of witnesses and the production of records as provided in section 3.701.

(b) The civil service commission may require periodic reports from the personnel director in a manner and form which it shall prescribe.

(c) The civil service commission may hear ap- peals from an action of the personnel director with respect to:
1. Allegations of discrimination. Notwith- standing any other provisions of this charter ex- cept the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the civil service commission regarding allegations of discrimination shall forthwith be enforced by every officer and employee;
2. Regulations of the charter; and
3. Allegations of conflict of interest, pursuant to section 8.105.

(d) No action by the personnel director which is the subject of any appeal shall be stayed during the appeal process except by the unanimous vote of the civil service commission.

(e) The commission shall be notified of the pro- posed adoption, amendment or repeal of personnel regulations and may comment on such proposals. The adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing fraud or allega- tions of discrimination shall be subject to ratification by the commission. In addition, the adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing merit system principles on civil service, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfers, resignations and terminations shall be subject to ratification by the commission.

The commission shall ratify or reject any such regulation within 60 days of receipt. The commis- sion's failure to act shall be deemed approval.

3.662 Department of Personnel Administration
There is hereby established a department of personnel administration which shall consist of a personnel director and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. Any employee who was a perma- nent civil service appointee assigned to the civil service commission and whose job function is placed under the department of personnel admin- istration shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job function had been, by amendment to this charter, been placed under the jurisdiction of the department of person- nel administration.

The department of personnel administration shall be the personnel department for the city and county and shall perform the duties of certifying, appoint, train, evaluate, promote career development, classify positions, administer sala- ries, administer employee discipline, discharge and other related personnel activities in order to maintain an effective and responsive work force.

3.663 Personnel Director
(a) A personnel director shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the mayor; provided, however, that the personnel director shall be selected from candidates nominated by any civil service commission and confirmed by vote of the board of supervisors. The nominee of the mayor may be appointed acting personnel direc- tor pending confirmation. The person so ap- pointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appoint- ments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of personnel director in the spirit of this declaration."

(b) The personnel director shall conduct appropriate examinations for employment, establish eligible lists based on their results and provide for certification of eligibles. The action of the person- nel director on examination matters including,
but not limited to, announcements, minimum qualifications, classes of applicants, components, construction, weighting, content, type, list length, duration and certification shall be final.

(e) The personnel director shall adopt personnel regulations which, except as otherwise provided in this charter, shall govern the administration of the department of personnel administration and the exercise of the authority granted in this section, including, but not limited to, recruitment; applications; examinations; eligibility; duration of eligible lists; certification of eligibles; permanent, temporary or conditional appointments; preliminary appointments; temporary appointments; transfers; resignations; layoffs or reduction in force due to lack of work or lack of funds, reorganization, retraining or completion of work; and classification. No personnel regulations shall be adopted, amended or repealed without a prior public hearing upon at least two weeks public notice by the personnel director and after meet and confer sessions with recognized employee organizations as required by state law. All civil service commission rules relevant to the foregoing as well as the provisions of former sections 8.324, 8.325, 8.326, 8.328, 8.329, 8.330, 8.331, 8.332, and 8.333 of this charter shall be considered civil service regulations on the effective date of this charter amendment.

(f) The personnel director shall conduct the salary surveys for the civil service commission as set forth elsewhere in this charter.

(g) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall establish procedures for review and review and disapproval of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. No employee is standing on any other provisions of this charter except the classification provisions hereof, the decision of the personnel director shall forthwith be enforced by every employee and officer, unless the decision is appealed to the civil service commission in accordance with personnel regulations.

(h) The personnel director shall investigate all employee complaints concerning job related conduct of city and county employees and shall promptly report to the source of the complaint.

(i) The personnel director is authorized to report all personnel regulations concerning personnel programs that endanger high productivity and exemplary performance.

(j) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall provide a procedure for resolution of employee disputes which shall be consistent with the personnel regulations of this charter and shall be utilized by all department heads and appointing officers upon the expiration of the existing term of any otherwise binding agreements.

(k) Consistent with the foregoing and other applicable provisions of this charter, the personnel director shall delegate to the various appointing officers appropriate personnel responsibilities, including but not limited to, enrollment and discipline, and shall consult with appointing officers with respect to personnel regulations affecting their operations.

(l) Personal services contracts shall be reviewed and approved by the personnel director in accordance with the provisions of appropriate personnel regulation and are not required to involve payment by the city and county of more than twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000) shall also be reviewed and approved by the Commission. Failure of the Commission to act within thirty days of submission of the contract by the personnel director shall be deemed to constitute approval by the commission.

(m) The personnel director shall establish a system of job classification. The provisions of section 8.200 shall govern whenever new classifications are created or existing positions are reclassified.

(n) The personnel director shall be the judge of such classification determinations.

(o) From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the department of personnel administration shall determine whether a position within a classification is, "in character," temporary or permanent. Appointments may be made on a permanent, temporary or, where confirmation is required, a provisional basis.

(p) Excepting sections 3.500, 3.560, 3.561, 3.564, 3.805, 3.807, all the section to the last paragraph of section 3.841, section 3.846, the last sentence of section 3.840, all but the last three words in the first sentence of the third paragraph of section 3.841, sections 3.843, 3.844, 3.845, 3.846, 3.847 and section 3.907, wherever the words "civil service commission" or "commission" appear in the personnel provisions of this charter, they shall be replaced by the words "department of personnel administration," "department," "personnel director" or "director" as the context permits, the word "rule" or "rules" shall be replaced by the words "personnel regulation" or "regulations," the words "general manager, personnel" and "secretary of the civil service commission" shall be replaced by the words "personnel director" and the words "section 3.661" shall be replaced by the words "section 3.662" or "section 3.663," as appropriate.

The clerk of the board of supervisors, after consultation with the city attorney, is hereby directed to conform the language of the charter as herein amended when next the charter is submitted for ratification.

8.322 - Protest of Written Questions and Answers

- After the written portion of a civil service examination has been held, the questions used and the answers thereto shall be available for review by the participants. This review period shall not apply to questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written test. During the review period, participants shall have the opportunity to protest questions or answers they believe to be incorrect or improper. All protest forms must be acted upon by the human resources department and the identification sheets have been opened; further changes in the rating key shall not be made.

8.323 - Protest of Tentative List of Eligibles

- Following the completion of any examination, a tentative list of eligibles shall be posted for the inspection of the public and of the participants. The posting period shall be for a minimum of three (3) working days for examinations of five (5) working days for promotional or combined entrance and promotional examinations. During this posting period, a fee for the inspection of the papers of each eligible shall be charged by the civil service commission. The amount of such fee shall be determined by the board of supervisors. The fee shall be waived for eligibles who wish to inspect their own papers. In addition, the inspection sheets shall include all documents supporting the eligibles rank and score except neither the identity of the examiner giving any mark or grade in an oral examination nor the questions answered on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written test shall be provided. Only participants in the examination may review the questions used in the examination. If no protests are received during the posting period, the eligible list is automatically adopted. If protests are received during the posting period, the investigation and action of the general manager, personnel shall be expedited as that final adoption of the eligible list is not delayed beyond sixty (60) days after the date of posting. Eligibles may request a notice of appointment regardless of the outcome of the protest in such case, be offered employment from among those pending the resolution of the protest(s) and amendment to the adopted eligible list.

8.326 - Promotions in General

- Except as specifically provided for in section 3.574, the civil service commission shall provide for examinations on an entrance, promotional or combination entrance and promotional basis. Consideration shall be given to permanent employees in separate promotional examinations and in promotional examinations which are combined with entrance examinations for city and county positions; when the passing list is obtained and maintained and may include evaluation of work performance and other credits. When an examination announcement is issued for a class on the basis of either a promotional or entrance basis, there shall be one resulting list of eligibles which shall include all successful candidates both promotional and entrance in order of relative performance.

- Nothing, anything, anything contrary to this, or any other provision of this charter, an employee who has been certified from a regularly adopted eligible list to a non-permanent position in a civil service classification shall be permitted to participate in either a promotional examination or entrance examination on the terms and conditions of a person holding a permanent appointment to a position in that same classification, subject to a demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the civil service commission. The provisions of this section, as herein amended, shall only be applicable to promotional examinations announced after its effective date.

8.328 - Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave

- Employees under permanent civil service appointment who, because of absence on duty or authorized military leave after June 27, 1950, did not participate in a promotional examination held after June 27, 1950, and during time of war as defined in section 3.324 of this charter, and in which examination the employee would have been otherwise eligible to compete had the war not intervened and which examination is herein referred to as the "original promotional examination," shall have the right to participate in a similar promotional examination. Provided that persons and employees who were on entrance or promotional eligible lists, shall, for the purpose of this amendment, be deemed to be appointees in their classification at the time their names were placed on the permanent certification while in the military service:

- In order to qualify for participation in a similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section, such employee who desires to participate therein must make application in writing to the civil service commission within thirty (30) days after the adjournment of his military leave, or thirty (30) days after the effective date of this amendment. Failure to file such written request to participate in a similar promotional examination as herein provided shall be deemed a waiver of all rights of the employee to participate in such similar promotional examination.

- The civil service commission shall arrange to hold such similar promotional examination within a reasonable time after employees eligible to request participation in any such similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section have indicated their desire to so participate; or have waived their right to participate; as herein provided, and shall be given the right to participate in such similar promotional examination:

- The civil service commission shall arrange to hold such similar promotional examination within a reasonable time after employees eligible to request participation in any such similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section have indicated their desire to so participate; or have waived their right to participate; as herein provided, and shall be given the right to participate in such similar promotional examination.
more than the minimum passing mark established by the civil service commission for inclusion on the list of eligibles resulting from the original promotional examination, his name shall thereupon be entered on the eligible list resulting from the original promotional examination; and if in the selection resulting from such examination he is not eligible, he shall be placed in the non-competitive class, and any such person, by the payment of additional fees, may be returned to the examination for an additional examination. The rules governing the selection procedures in the civil service examination shall also govern the selection procedures in the civil service examination for the temporary appointment of employees in the civil service examination for the permanent position within the same classification of a charitable or benevolent association or other non-profit organization.

The civil service commission shall make a report to the legislative body of the city or county in which the salary range is established. The report shall include a statement of the number of employees appointed under this section and the salaries paid to each employee. The report shall also include a statement of the number of employees appointed under this section who have been promoted to higher positions within the organization. The report shall be filed with the legislative body of the city or county in which the salary range is established, and a copy of the report shall be filed with the state board of civil service examiners.

A person who is a member of the civil service commission shall not serve on the board of any charitable or benevolent association or other non-profit organization that is authorized to make appointments under this section. A person who is a member of the civil service commission shall not serve on the board of any charitable or benevolent association or other non-profit organization that is authorized to make appointments under this section unless the person has been appointed to a permanent position in the organization.

The civil service commission shall make a report to the legislative body of the city or county in which the salary range is established. The report shall include a statement of the number of employees appointed under this section and the salaries paid to each employee. The report shall also include a statement of the number of employees appointed under this section who have been promoted to higher positions within the organization. The report shall be filed with the legislative body of the city or county in which the salary range is established, and a copy of the report shall be filed with the state board of civil service examiners.
3.840 Dismissal During Probation Period

Any person appointed to a permanent position shall serve a probationary period. The civil-service commission personnel director shall by rule establish a probationary period of not less than six months’ service and up to a maximum of twelve months’ service for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed ranks of the police department, fire department, sheriff’s department and San Francisco International Airport police force shall be for twelve months except that, with respect to members of the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve months’ service from the day following completion of the prescribed department field training officer program, but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment; provided further that probationary members of the uniformed ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in section 3.834 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four months may be established for executive and management classification. At any time during the probationary period the appointing officer may terminate the employment of the employee giving written notice of such termination to the employee, and to the civil-service commission specifying the reasons for such termination. Except in the case of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments, the civil-service commission shall review the termination. The civil-service commission shall by rule establish the procedures for such review. If the appointment resulted from an entrance examination, the commission may declare such person dismissed or may return the name to the list of eligibles under such conditions for further appointment as the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall be final. Immediately prior to the expiration of the probationary period the appointing officer shall report to the civil-service commission as to the competence of the probationer for the position, and if competent, shall recommend permanent appointment. Failing in this, the employee shall be dismissed. The civil-service commission, from reviewing terminations for the purpose of future employability, including terminations in the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments:

3.840 Definition of Generally Prevaling Rates of Wages

Notwithstanding any provision of section 3.840 or any provision of any other section of this chapter to the contrary, generally prevailing rates of salaries and wages for those employees covered by section 3.840 of the charter shall be determined by the civil service commission as set forth below.

The civil-service commission personnel director shall conduct a comprehensive investigation and survey of basic pay rates and wages and salaries in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment for like work and like service, based upon job classifications as provided in sections 3.869 and 3.869.2 of this charter and shall make its findings, based on facts and data collected, as to what are the generally prevailing basic pay rates for each benchmark class of employment solely in the manner hereinafter provided. A benchmark class is defined as a "key class" within an occupational grouping selected as the class for which a representative sample of data will be collected.

Basic pay rate data for public and private employment shall be collected solely from the Bay Area counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, San Francisco and Santa Clara; provided, however, that for any benchmark class of employment for which the civil-service commission personnel director determines that there is insufficient data from Bay Area public jurisdictions the civil-service commission personnel director shall survey major public agencies in the state employing such class, major public agencies to be defined as those employing more than 3,000 persons.

The civil-service commission personnel director shall collect basic pay rate data for like work and like service from Bay Area public jurisdictions as follows:

(a) The counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara;

(b) The ten most populous cities in these five Bay Area counties based on the latest federal decennial census.

(c) Agencies of the state and federal governments and from school districts and other special districts in the six Bay Area counties as determined by the civil-service commission personnel director. The civil-service commission personnel director shall collect private basic pay rate data from recognized governmental Bay Area salary and wage surveys of private employers in the city and county of San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. The data collected shall be limited to basic rates of pay and salaries actually being paid by public and private employers for like work and like service.

The term "prevaling rates of wages" for employers governed by charter section 3.840 and this section shall be defined as the rate ranges developed from the weighted average of the benchmarks of the basic pay rates, excluding fringe benefits, for surveyed public and private employers and the median of the pay rates for private employment to be determined as follows:

1. Multiply the medians from the private and the midpoints from public employment data base by the number of employees in the given classification from each data base.

2. Add the products of (1);

3. Divide the sum in (2) by the total number of employees surveyed for that classification; and

4. Extend this figure by 10 percent to establish the maximum of the range and reduce this figure by 10 percent to establish the minimum.

When fixing rates of compensation the board of supervisors shall fix basic pay rates as close as reasonably possible to prevailing rates, provided, however, that the board of supervisors shall not set the maximum rate of pay for any class in excess of the maximum prevailing rate for that class; provided further, however, that no employee shall have his basic pay rate reduced to conform to prevailing rates except as provided for in section 3.840. For those classifications of employment in which the practice is customary, the schedules of compensation shall provide for minimum, not less than three intermediate, and maximum pay rates and for a method of advancing the salaries of employees from minimum to intermediate to maximum with due regard for seniority of service.

The term "basic pay rate" as used in this section is hereby defined as applying only to the basic rate of wages, with included range scales, and does not include any other benefits of employment or working condition benefits.

It is the declared intent of the qualified electors of the city and county that neither the board of supervisors nor the mayor have any resources to provide for additional employment or other benefits which may be considered by the board of supervisors or the mayor as "fringe benefits" of employment and that the qualified electors express the right to such benefits by the vote of the electorate as defined in the charter or by the qualified electors of the county. The qualified electors of the city and county, however, may lawfully provide for additional employment or other benefits for employees of the city and county, such as employees of the city and county who are not classified by the civil-service commission. Any reference to "working conditions" shall mean those conditions which may be considered by the qualified electors of the city and county as working conditions.

2.900 Initiative, Referendum, and Recall

(a) The registered voters shall have power to propose by petition, and to adopt or to reject at the polls, any ordinance, act or other measure which is within the powers conferred upon the board of supervisors to enact, or any legislative act which is within the power conferred upon any other board, commission or officer to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinance, act, charter amendment or other measure may be so proposed by filing with the registrar a petition setting forth said measure in full, signed by registered voters of the city and county in number as follows:

1. As the percentages hereinafter required of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor cast at the last preceding regular municipal election.

Any declaration of policy may be submitted to the voters in the manner provided for the submission of ordinances and other measures by a majority of the qualified electors voting on said declaration, it shall then be the duty of the board of supervisors to enact an ordinance or ordinances to carry such policies or principles into effect, subject to the referendum provisions of this chapter.

Any ordinance which the supervisors are empowered to pass may be submitted to the electorate if a majority of the board at a general election or at a special election called for the purpose, said election to be held not less than thirty days from the date of the call.

Any such ordinance may be proposed by one-third of the supervisors, or by the mayor, and when so proposed shall be submitted to the electorate at the next succeeding general election. No ordinance passed by the supervisors granting any public utility franchise.
TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION E

NOTE: All sections are new.
Be it ordained by the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. This ordinance may be called the "City College Public Lands Preservation Ordinance."

Section 2. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall disapprove or deny, WITH NO EXEMPTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS, any building permit application for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, located across Phelan Avenue from the presently occupied campus of City College and consisting of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted, between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

Section 3. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall revoke or rescind, WITH NO EXEMPTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS, any building permit application previously granted for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, which consist of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION F

NOTE: All sections are new.
Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. No officer of the City and County of San Francisco shall not discuss matters pending before the commission or department with other City and County officials or state legislators when those other officers or state legislators are acting as compensated advocates for a private interest.

Section 4. No member of the California State Legislature shall appear before any City and County board, department, commission or as a compensated advocate representing a private interest.

Section 5. In the financing of city and county campaigns: (a) No person other than a candidate shall make, and no campaign treasurer shall solicit or accept, any contribution which will cause the total amount contributed by such person with respect to a single election in support of or opposition to such candidate, including contributions to political committees supporting or opposing such candidate, to exceed $500.00. (b) If any person is found guilty of violating the terms of this section, he may be held in contempt of court. (c) If any person is found guilty of violation of the terms of this section, he may be held in contempt of court. 

Section 7. If any provision of this ordinance, or its application to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, it is the expressed intent of the people of the City and County of San Francisco that the remainder of the ordinance, or the application of such provision, or any other provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.
The provisions of sections 3.100 and 3.100-1, relating to the emergency powers of the mayor, shall not be applicable to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

11.05 Effective Date of Amendments
The effective date of the amendments, additions
and deletions to the civil service provisions of the charter shall be ninety (90) days after the acceptance and filing thereof with the Secretary of State.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION G

The leadership and support of such an effort is everyone's responsibility.

The AIDS epidemic is a major public health problem of concern to everyone, requiring increased support for related medical, sexual health and education. It calls for a council for AIDS research and education or similar united effort to stop AIDS.

We, the people of San Francisco hereby adopt the following policy:
The AIDS epidemic has rapidly become a major public health problem, costly both in human lives and in significant community resources.
The first steps in dealing with such a crisis are:
1. The scientific research needed to discover and understand the nature, causes, co-factors, prevention, diagnosis and treatment of the disease, and,
2. The education of the public about the lessons of that research;
A proper program of research and education pays for itself in the long run;
Prompt action is urgent, because of the rapidly growing number of persons affected, increasing not only the suffering but also the difficulty of eradicating the disease;

The following language was printed on the petition which initiated proposition H

SUMMARY: This initiative asks "Shall we tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?" The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated portion of Route 480 known as the Embarcadero Freeway. This initiative declaration of policy will give the voters the opportunity to establish the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco regarding the proposed teardown of the Embarcadero Freeway.

The following language was printed on the petition which initiated proposition J

Shall the City replace a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if such replacement would open up the Waterfront to its citizens, improve the tax base, and create a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic?
Candidates

FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER
JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: The Bill of Rights guarantees that every person accused of a crime shall have the effective assistance of counsel. Whether an individual is rich or poor, that person is entitled to a competent and dedicated attorney.

In San Francisco it is the duty of the Public Defender to uphold this sacred right. In every case, we provide the client with the best defense under the law.

In the last 7 years, my outstanding staff has done this work with the highest degree of professionalism. In the next 4 years, that same strong, professional, independent and ethical representation will continue.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John D. Bardin, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Sala Burton, 8 Stout Blvd., Representative In Congress, 5th District
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Clerk
Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Artist/Community Organizer
Brian Getz, 55 22nd Ave., Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson, Sheriff of San Francisco
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., International Vice President, ILGWU
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for Children & Youth
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070 26th Ave., Executive Assistant to Sala Burton M.C.
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Community Health Director
Linda Ann Post, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative
Jim Rivaldo, 430 Steiner St., Political Consultant
Julia Tang, 788 18th Ave., Member, SF Community College District Governing Board
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel W. Walker, 562 Campbell Ave., President — Local 250-A Transport Workers Union of America
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilliitus Ave., Minister
Benny Y. Yes, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor
C. R. Zanca, 1966 Pacific Ave., Auto Repair Proprietor

FOR ASSESSOR
SAM DUCU

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I was elected your Assessor in 1978 and re-elected in 1982. My years in the Assessor’s Office were spent in a professional appraisal capacity personnel and administration. I have two university degrees, the coveted MAI designation, and am the recipient of a special Congressional Advisory Board award from the United States Congress. I have served in an advisory capacity, both nationally and internationally, in property tax administration and will continue to serve the taxpayers of the City and County of San Francisco in dealing with Article XIII A of the State Constitution. My community involvement includes participation in cultural, civic business organizations.

Sam Duca

The sponsors for Sam Duca are:
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
Eugene L. Friend, 2501 Lake St., Investor
Nancy Pelosi, 40 Presidio Ter., Housewife and volunteer in politics
Walter H. Shorenstein, 740 El Camino del Mar., Chairman, Milton Meyer & Co.
Stanley Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Emma W. Louie, 1257 Jackson St., Housewife
Alfred S. Wilsey, 2590 Jackson St., Ch. of Exec. Comm. of Diversified Holding Co.
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hinklely Walk, Physician
Gerson Bakar, 2310 Hyde St., Investor
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired
Joseph C. Oreno, Sr., 856 Faxon Ave., Publicity Dept. — S.F. Giants
James A. Seatena, 101 St. Elmo Way, Chairman of the Board, Seatena York Co.
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher
Frances May McAner, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Recreation & Park Commissioner
Frederick F. Campagnoli, 2609 Larkin St., Attorney
Betty Brooks, 1738 26th St., Field Representative
Jess Teruel Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Businessman
Cyriil I. Magnin, 994 California St., Merchant
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John H. Swanson, 145 Lake Merced Hill South, Bowling Alley Owner
Frances G. Goldman, 745 El Camino Del Mar, Child Guidance
Irma M. Bernardo, 2822 34th Ave., Housewife
Leo J. Murphy, 61 Annapolls Ter., Real Estate Broker
Charles M. Cunningham, 475 Connecticut St., Self Employed
Lawrence V. Epiphonite, 815 Fell St., Conf. Secretary
Mary M. O’Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Volunteer & Homemaker
Elizabeth R. Duca, 16 Wawona St., Homemaker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Application for Absentee Ballot
is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

Name ____________________________________________
Residence Address ________________________________________
Mailing Address ________________________________________
Signature ____________________________________________

If the person to whom this pamphlet is addressed no longer resides at this address, please draw a diagonal slash (/) through the address label and drop the pamphlet in the mailbox.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods. Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible. This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET
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Eleccion Primaria

Vote for One
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Vote par Uno

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
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PROPOSITIONS

PROPOSITION A
Would centralize the City's risk management and claims investigation functions.
Analysis ............................................. 19
Arguments .......................................... 20, 21
Legal Text ............................................ 71

PROPOSITION B
Would make technical changes in the role of the Purchaser regarding contracts.
Analysis ............................................. 22
Arguments .......................................... 23
Legal Text ............................................ 71, 72

PROPOSITION C
Proposition C was removed from the ballot by the Board of Supervisors on April 22.

PROPOSITION D
Would re-write the civil service provisions of the City Charter.
Analysis ............................................. 24, 25
Arguments .......................................... 26, 35
Legal Text ............................................ 25, 73-77

PROPOSITION E
Would ban development of the Balboa Reservoir site (near Ocean & Phelan Avenues) for three years.
Analysis ............................................. 36
Arguments .......................................... 37-50
Legal Text ............................................ 77

PROPOSITION F
Would ban "compensated advocacy" by City officials and legislators and would place a lower limit on campaign contributions.
Analysis ............................................. 51
Arguments .......................................... 52-56
Legal Text ............................................ 77

PROPOSITION G
Would declare it to be City policy that businesses with ties to South Africa be boycotted.
Analysis ............................................. 57
Arguments .......................................... 58, 59

PROPOSITION H
Would declare it to be City policy that an AIDS research council be established.
Analysis ............................................. 60
Arguments .......................................... 61

PROPOSITION I
Would declare it to be City policy that the Embarcadero Freeway be torn down.
Analysis ............................................. 63
Arguments .......................................... 64, 65

PROPOSITION J
Would declare it to be City policy that a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway be torn down, subject to certain conditions.
Analysis ............................................. 66
Arguments .......................................... 67-70

CREDITS

The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The active members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Suzanne Guyette, Mary Ann Aronson, Mary Martin and Tom Owen.
EXPLANATION OF YOUR SAMPLE BALLOT

At primary elections there aren’t enough voting machines to assign a separate machine to each party at each precinct; therefore, some of the machines will have to handle more than one party.

In each precinct we have assigned one or two voting machines to handle the ballots of the nonpartisan voters and the voters belonging to the American Independent Party, the Peace and Freedom Party and the Libertarian Party.

Since all four types of voters will be using the same machine (but with different ballots) it is possible that some confusion might result, so it is important that you study these pages carefully.

If you are in doubt as to what party you are affiliated with, check the address label on the back cover of this pamphlet. Your party affiliation appears above your name and address. Nonpartisan voters (those who have no party) are indicated on the address label as “D-S”; this stands for “Decline to State”.

Here is what you can expect when you go to your polling place on June 3:

**NONPARTISAN VOTERS:** You will get a BROWN ballot card. Go into the appropriately marked booth. Inside the booth you will vote on only the brown pages. There are four brown pages numbered 6, 7, 8 and 9.

**PEACE & FREEDOM VOTERS:** You will get a YELLOW ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the yellow pages and the brown pages.

**AMERICAN INDEPENDENT VOTERS:** You will get a BLUE ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the blue pages and the brown pages.

**LIBERTARIAN VOTERS:** You will be given RED ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the red pages and brown pages.

In other words, everyone votes on the brown pages of the voting machine and, in addition, members of the three smaller parties also vote on the color-coded page(s) that match the color of the ballot card that they are given.
# American Independent Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(GOBERNADOR)</td>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>GARY V. MILLER</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(VICEGOBERNADOR)</td>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>JAMES C. “JIM” GRIFFIN</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SECRETARIO DE ESTADO)</td>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>THERESA “TEN” DIETRICH</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CONTRALOR)</td>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>NICHOLAS W. KUDROVEFF</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(TESORERO)</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>MERTON D. SHORT</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PROCURADOR GENERAL)</td>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>GARY R. ODOM</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** This page will be blue. If you are affiliated with the American Independent Party, this will be the first page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED</th>
<th>NO SE HA PRESENTADO NINGUN CANDIDATO</th>
<th>NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED</th>
<th>NO SE HA PRESENTADO NINGUN CANDIDATO</th>
<th>NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED</th>
<th>NO SE HA PRESENTADO NINGUN CANDIDATO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN:): To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>(WRITE-IN:): To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>(WRITE-IN:): To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>(WRITE-IN:): To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>(WRITE-IN:): To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>(WRITE-IN:): To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now continue voting on the brown pages numbered 6, 7, 8, & 9. Continue votando en las páginas de color café, numeradas 6, 7, 8, & 9. 請在棕色紙第6、7、8及9頁上繼續投票。

(Note: This page will be blue)
If you are affiliated with the American Independent Party,
This will be the second page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the pages numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 to vote for nonpartisan offices and propositions. On your voting machine those pages will be colored brown.
**LIBERTARIAN PARTY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOBERNADOR</strong> (Governor)</td>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor of Economics/Profesor de Economía</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VICEGOBERNADOR</strong> (Lieutenant Governor)</td>
<td>NORMA JEAN ALMODOVAR</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author/Autora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECRETARIO DE ESTADO</strong> (Secretary of State)</td>
<td>RICHARD WINGER</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Election Law Consultant/Consultor de Leyes Electorales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTRALOR</strong> (Controller)</td>
<td>CAROLYN TREYNOR</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Administrator/Administrador de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TESORERO</strong> (Treasurer)</td>
<td>RAY CULLEN</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.P.A./Contador Público Certificado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROCURADOR GENERAL</strong> (Attorney General)</td>
<td>CAROL L. NEWMAN</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney, Private Practice/Abogado, Despacho Propio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(NOTE: THIS PAGE WILL BE RED)*

If you are affiliated with the **LIBERTARIAN PARTY**,

This will be the first page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE IGUALAMIENTO)</td>
<td>NO SE HA PRESENTADO NINGUN CANDIDATO</td>
<td>Voto por Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SENADOR DE ESTADOS UNIDOS)</td>
<td>BRECK MCKINLEY Financial Consultant/Consultor Financiero</td>
<td>Voto por Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS)</td>
<td>SAMUEL K. GROVE Electronic Technician/Técnico en Electrónica</td>
<td>Voto por Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Representative</td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SENADOR ESTATAL)</td>
<td>No candidate has filed/No se ha presentado ningún candidato</td>
<td>Voto por Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td>Write-in votes are permitted. Follow the posted instructions.</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL)</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED NO SE HA PRESENTADO NINGUN CANDIDATO</td>
<td>Voto por Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the State Assembly</td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MIEMBRO, COMITE CENTRAL DEL CONDADO)</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED</td>
<td>Vote for no more than 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, County Central Committee</td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now continue voting on the brown pages numbered 6, 7, 8, & 9. Continúe votando en las páginas de color café, numeradas 6, 7, 8, & 9. 請在棕色紙第6、7、8及9頁上繼續投票。

(Note: This page will be red) If you are affiliated with the Libertarian Party,

This will be the second page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the pages numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 to vote for nonpartisan offices and propositions. On your voting machine those pages will be colored brown.
## PEACE & FREEDOM PARTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>Cheryl ZuR</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labor/Latina Activist/Activista Laboral Latina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maria Elizabeth Munoz</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educador/Educatora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(NOTE: THIS PAGE WILL BE YELLOW)**

*If you are affiliated with the PEACE & FREEDOM PARTY,*

This will be the first page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the next page.
PEACE & FREEDOM PARTY

(MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE IGUALAMIENTO) 美国参议员
Member, State Board of Equalization

ROBERTO LOVATO
Medical Relief Coordinator/Coordinador de Auxilios Médicos
185

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

LENNI BRENNER
Author/Autor 副总统
189

PAUL KANGAS
Socialist Organizer/Organizador Socialista
190

(SENADOR DE ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美国参议员
United States Senator

THEODORE "TED" ZUUR
Worker/Trabajador
193

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

PAUL KANGAS
Socialist Organizer/Organizador Socialista
194

(REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美国众议员
United States Representative

No candidate has filed / No se ha presentado ningún candidato
197

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

(MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL) 州众议员
Member of the State Assembly

NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED / NO SE HA PRESENTADO NINGÚN CANDIDATO
201

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

(MIEMBRO, COMITÉ CENTRAL DEL CONDADO) 县中央委员
Member, County Central Committee

SUSAN M. GREENLAW
Worker/Socialist Candidate/Trabajadora/Candidata Socialista
204

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

205

Now continue voting on the brown pages numbered 6, 7, 8, & 9.
Continué votando en las páginas de color cafe, numeradas 6, 7, 8, & 9.

( NOTE: THIS PAGE WILL BE YELLOW)

If you are affiliated with the PEACE & FREEDOM PARTY,

This will be the second page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the pages numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 to vote for nonpartisan offices and propositions. On your voting machine those pages will be colored brown.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

Nota: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

STEP 1

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

B 第一步

请双手将选票插入自动投票机将整张选票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE_stub of your card fit down over the two red PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

C 第二步

请确认选票插入时，票尾之二孔，应
合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL [STRAIGHT UP]. PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfore con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

D 第三步

请把带针之选票插入，由小孔内垂直插入。打孔投票。

STEP 4

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE_stub SHOWING.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步

投票选票之后，把选票取出，放入空封
袋内，票尾凸出在外。

在封袋上，有空白格预備為投票人應用。

(Due to space limitations and requirements that the other sample ballot pages face each other, the voting instructions had to be placed in the middle of your sample ballot. When you go to the polls this page on your voting machine will be blank.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DANIEL NUSBAUM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEANNE BAIRD</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessors</td>
<td>SAM DUCA</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Veterans Bond Act of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $850,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Community Parklands Act of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for acquiring, developing, improving, rehabilitating, or restoring urgently needed local and regional parks, beaches, recreational areas and facilities, and historical resources.</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Water Conservation and Water Quality Bond Law of 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $150,000,000 to provide funds for water conservation, groundwater recharge and drainage water management, and clarifies language in the Clean Water Bond Law of 1984.</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Deposit of Public Moneys in Credit Unions. Authorizes Legislature to provide for deposit of public moneys in any credit union. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect. Legislation already approved implementing measure could result in greater interest income to state and local governments.</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Property Taxation. Provides exception to property tax limit when acquisition or improvement of real property approved by two-thirds of voters. Fiscal Impact: By itself, measure has no fiscal effect. No increase can occur in local property tax rate unless bond issue is approved by two-thirds vote. State costs for tax relief programs could increase. State income tax revenues could decline as taxpayers deduct greater amounts for property tax payments.</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Allocation of Vehicle License Fee Taxes to Counties and Cities. Requires allocation of Vehicle License Fee taxes to local governments. Fiscal Impact: Measure would have no direct fiscal effect. Prevents Legislature from changing the law to take vehicle license fees away from counties and cities. Measure would not prevent state reducing other forms of aid to local governments or changing existing formula for dividing vehicle license fee revenues between counties and cities.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Legislators' and Judges' Retirement Systems. Limits retirement allowances for persons entering Legislators' and Judges' Retirement Systems after January 1, 1987. Fiscal Impact: Minor savings to state in future years if rate of inflation exceeds increase in salaries paid to current officeholders.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N°</td>
<td>Propuesta</td>
<td>Voto</td>
<td>Texto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Acta de Bono para Veteranos de 1988. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $500,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en la compra de grados y casas para los veteranos de California.</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Estado dispone una emisión de bonos por $500,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en la compra de grados y casas para los veteranos de California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>Acta de Terrenos de Parques de la Comunidad de 1988. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición, desarrollo, mejoraiento, rehabilitación o restauración de parques, playas, leyes e instalaciones de recreación, y los recursos históricos locales y regionales.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Estado dispone una emisión de bonos por $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición, desarrollo, mejoraiento, rehabilitación o restauración de parques, playas, leyes e instalaciones de recreación, y los recursos históricos locales y regionales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Ley de Bono para la Conservación de agua y Control de la Calidad del agua de 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $50,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la conservación del agua, reabastecimiento de agua subterránea, manejo apropiado del agua de drenaje, y clarificación del lenguaje en la Ley de Bens para Agua Limpia de 1984.</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Estado dispone una emisión de bonos por $50,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la conservación del agua, reabastecimiento de agua subterránea, manejo apropiado del agua de drenaje, y clarificación del lenguaje en la Ley de Bens para Agua Limpia de 1984.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Depósito de Fondos Públicos en Cooperativas de Crédito. Autoriza a la Legislatura para que disponga el depósito de fondos públicos en cualquier cooperativa de crédito. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. La legislación ya aprobada que pone en efecto la medida podría resultar en mayor ingreso de intereses para los gobiernos locales y estatales.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Estado dispone de un acuerdo con el gobierno para que disponga el depósito de fondos públicos en cualquier cooperativa de crédito. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. La legislación ya aprobada que pone en efecto la medida podría resultar en mayor ingreso de intereses para los gobiernos locales y estatales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Fuente de Impuestos a la Propiedad: Dispone amonencia a los límites de impuestos a la propiedad en el caso de adquisición o mejoramiento de la propiedad inmueble si se aprueba por dos terceras partes de los votantes. Impacto Fiscal: Por el acta, la medida no tiene ningún impacto fiscal.</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Estado dispone de un acuerdo con el gobierno para que disponga el depósito de fondos públicos en cualquier cooperativa de crédito. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. La legislación ya aprobada que pone en efecto la medida podría resultar en mayor ingreso de intereses para los gobiernos locales y estatales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Assignación de Impuestos por Pagos de Licencia de Vehículos a los Condados y Ciudades. Requiere la asignación a los gobiernos locales de los impuestos recogidos en pagos por Licencia de Vehículos. Impacto Fiscal: La medida no tendría ningún impacto fiscal directo.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Estado dispone de un acuerdo con el gobierno para que disponga el depósito de fondos públicos en cualquier cooperativa de crédito. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. La legislación ya aprobada que pone en efecto la medida podría resultar en mayor ingreso de intereses para los gobiernos locales y estatales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Sistemas de Jubilación de los Legisladores y Jueces. Limita las pensiones de jubilación para aquellas personas que se afilien al Sistema de Jubilación de los Legisladores y Jueces después del 1 de enero de 1987. Impacto Fiscal: Aumentos menores para el estado en años futuros si la tasa de inflación excede el aumento en los salarios que se pagan a los que actualmente ocupan cargos.</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Estado dispone de un acuerdo con el gobierno para que disponga el depósito de fondos públicos en cualquier cooperativa de crédito. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. La legislación ya aprobada que pone en efecto la medida podría resultar en mayor ingreso de intereses para los gobiernos locales y estatales.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Measures Submitted to Vote of Voters

## State Propositions

**49**
**Nonpartisan Offices.** Prohibits a political party or party central committee from endorsing, supporting, or opposing a candidate for nonpartisan office. Fiscal Impact: No direct state or local government fiscal impact.

- **Yes:** 262
- **No:** 263

**50**
**Property Taxation. Disasters.** Base-year value of property damaged or destroyed by disaster transferable to comparable replacement property in same county. Fiscal Impact: Local property tax revenues would decrease by an unknown amount. County assessor and tax collectors would have nonsignificant higher administrative costs. State would replace revenues lost by school and community college districts. State income tax revenues could increase due to lower property tax deductions on replacement properties. These state costs and revenues cannot be estimated.

- **Yes:** 266
- **No:** 267

**51**
**Multiple Defendants Tort Damage Liability.** Plaintiff's non-economic damage recovery limited to defendant's liability based on defendant's percentage of fault. Fiscal Impact: Substantial savings to state and local governments. Savings could be several millions of dollars in a year, varying significantly from year to year.

- **Yes:** 270
- **No:** 271

**52**
**County Correctional Facility Capital Expenditure Bond Act of 1986.** This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county correctional facilities and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of four hundred ninety-five million dollars ($495,000,000).

- **Yes:** 273
- **No:** 274

## City & County Propositions

**A**
Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgments against the City?

- **Yes:** 278
- **No:** 279

**B**
Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?

- **Yes:** 281
- **No:** 282

**C**
Proposition C has been removed from the ballot by the Board of Supervisors.
CARROS NO PARTIDARIOS. Prohibe a un partido político a un comité central de un partido político patrocinar, apoyar u oponerse a un candidato a un cargo no partidario. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo a los gobiernos estatal o locales.

262 SI 贷成 263 NO 反对

IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE DEBASTES. El valor en aho base de propiedad inmueble exenta a destruido por un desastre puede ser transferido a propiedad inmueble de remplazo compatible en el mismo condado. Impacto Fiscal: Las reñidas previsiones de impuestos locales a la propiedad diagnostican en una cantidad desconocida. Los instructor y recientemente de impuestos del condado tendrían significativos costos administrativos adicionales. El estado imponería las reñidas que las ciudades escaparían y de categóricas de ahorro de superiores de percepciones. Las reñidas del impuesto exento a la renta podrían aumentar debido a menores deducciones en el impuesto a la propiedad en las propiedades de remplazo. Estos costos y reñidas estarían en calcular.

266 SI 贷成 267 NO 反对

RESPONSIBILIDAD CIVIL DE MULTIPLES PARTES DEMANDADAS EN JUICIOS DE AGRARIOS INDEMNIZABLES. Limita la indemnización que puede recibir el demandado por daños no económicos a la responsabilidad del demandado basándose en el porcentaje de la culpabilidad del demandado. Impacto Fiscal: Ahorro sustantivo para los gobiernos estatal y locales. Los alcaldes podrían ser algunas millón de dólares anual, que variarán significativamente de año en año.

273 SI 贷成 274 NO 反对

ACTA DE BONOS PARA DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA INSTALACIONES CORRECCIONALES DE CONDADOS DE 1996. Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelación, y remplazo de Instalaciones correccionales de los condados y la ejecución del mantenimiento diferido en las mismas en conformidad con una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos seiscientos y cinco millones de dólares (345,000,000).

273 SI 贷成 274 NO 反对

PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONTADO

278 SI 贷成 279 NO 反对

"¿Debe la ciudad establecer una oficina de administración del riesgo y un desecho de investigaciones y administración de demandas, para estudiar y reducir el riesgo de plagas y sannecencias contra la Ciudad?"

281 SI 贷成 282 NO 反对

"¿Debe autorizar al Comptroller a firmar contratos por menos de $50,000 sin la aprobación del Jefe Administrativo y a permitir que sus agentes firmen contratos en su lugar?"

OFFICIALMENTE ELIMINADA

正式撤消
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?</td>
<td>YES 288</td>
<td>NO 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?</td>
<td>YES 292</td>
<td>NO 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?</td>
<td>YES 296</td>
<td>NO 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?</td>
<td>YES 300</td>
<td>NO 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?</td>
<td>YES 303</td>
<td>NO 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?</td>
<td>YES 307</td>
<td>NO 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?</td>
<td>YES 310</td>
<td>NO 311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VOTER SELECTION CARD

PRIMARY ELECTION
JUNE 3, 1986

POLLS ARE OPEN
FROM
7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR CANDIDATE SELECTION

Fill out this card and take it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.
Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>County Central Committee*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>5.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td>6.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate (if any)</td>
<td>7.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>8.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate</td>
<td>9.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td>10.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. Public Inst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to your sample ballot for the number of County Central Committee members to be elected. The number varies with each district.

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR PROPOSITIONS.
PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

288 SI 贤成
289 NO 反对

“¿Debe el gobierno transferir la administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil a un departamento de administración de personal que tenga poder para cambiar las normas del servicio civil que el presente conozca en la Carta Constitucional?”

292 SI 贤成
293 NO 反对

“¿Debe el gobierno negar o revocar cualquier permiso de construcción para edificar en la Represa Bellosa en las Avenidas Ocean y Phelan en los próximos tres años?”

296 SI 贤成
297 NO 反对

“¿Debe el gobierno prohibir la defensa remunerada efectuada por oficiales de la Ciudad y legisladores estatales ante cualquier comisión de la Ciudad, y limitar la cantidad con la que una persona pueda contribuir para un candidato o una oficina municipal en $500?”

300 SI 贤成
301 NO 反对

“¿Debe ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el bolívar las empresas que tengan mayor vinculación con la segregación racial autodirigida?”

303 SI 贤成
304 NO 反对

“¿Debe ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el apeler a todas las organizaciones apropiadas, públicas y privadas, para establecer y mantener un Consejo para la Investigación y Educación sobre S.I.O.A. (A.I.O.S.)?”

307 SI 贤成
308 NO 反对

“¿Debe ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el demostrar el Autopista Emb阪sado?”

310 SI 贤成
311 NO 反对

“¿Debe ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el reponer parte de la Autopista Emb阪sado, si esto aumentara el acceso del público a la zona de los museos y mejorar el tráfico?”
Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

**BALLOT** — An official list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT** — If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL** — See Absentee Ballot, above.

**POLLLING PLACE** — The place where you go to vote.

**PROPOSITION** — This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

**MEASURE** — Another name for proposition.

**CHALLENGE** — Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

**SUPERVISORS** — Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

**CHARTER AMENDMENT** — The charter is the basic set of laws for the city government. A charter amendment changes one of those basic laws. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

**ORDINANCE** — A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

**DECLARATION OF POLICY** — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, the supervisors must carry out the policy, to the extent legally possible.

**INITIATIVE** — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

**PETITION** — A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

**PERMIT (noun)** — A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building. Proposition E concerns the issuance of a permit.

**COMPENSATED ADVOCACY** — Compensated means being paid for doing something; Advocacy means speaking or writing on behalf of someone else. Proposition F concerns the issue of compensated advocacy.

**RISK MANAGEMENT** — This field covers two areas: (1) deciding on when it is better to buy insurance and when it is better to be self insured or uninsured, then shopping for the insurance; (2) identifying hazardous conditions on one's property and seeing that they are corrected so that liability and damage claims will be avoided. Proposition A concerns risk management.

### RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.
2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).
3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.
Risk Manager; Claims Investigation

PROPOSITION A

Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgments against the City?  

YES 278  NO 279

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Consultants hired by the Chief Administrative Officer are available to City departments that have questions about "risk management", such as how to keep damage claims to a minimum and how to find the best insurance rates. In some cases, the departments use these consultants. In other cases, the departments make their own decisions. When damage claims are filed, some are handled by the City Attorney's Office and some are handled by City departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would amend the City Charter to create an Office of Risk Management, under the Chief Administrative Officer. The office would set risk management guidelines for all City departments, boards and commissions. Proposition A would also establish a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration in the City Attorney's Office. The bureau would be responsible for investigating, evaluating and processing all damage claims made against the City, except those claims made against the Public Utilities Commission and the Police Department. The bureau would also have the power to investigate potential suits against the City and to make settlements within dollar limits to be set by ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer and a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want damage claims and risk management decisions to continue to be handled the way they are now.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not affect the cost of government. However as a result of its potential future application and the exemption of certain employees from the civil service provisions of the Charter, costs may be affected in an amount presently indeterminate."

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On March 10 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted "No."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON A

Last fiscal year, over 6,400 claims and lawsuits were filed against the City, costing us more than $10 million in settlements. I believe that it is time to change the way we handle our claims, secure insurance, prevent risks and settle legitimate claims against the City.

Last summer, we appointed a task force of citizens, under San Francisco Bar President Jerry Falk, to make recommendations on how to streamline our procedures and save money at the same time. The present system is very slow, costly, and inefficient.

Currently, all claims are investigated by the department involved. The City Attorney cannot act on any claim until the department is ready. This results in delay and duplication of effort and increased costs. A centralized and accountable Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney would be more efficient, cost-effective, and professional. It would enable the City to settle many claims quickly, before litigation is begun, saving the City the costs of defending itself in court and lowering the average cost of settling a case.

This can be accomplished without creating new jobs by simply moving into one office the city positions presently scattered throughout the government.

Vote "Yes" on A. Reduce the cost of City government.

Adoption of this measure would also formally establish responsibility for Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer, where it has been unofficially since 1978. With this strengthened authority, the Risk Management Office would be responsible for the gathering of claims data on a City-wide basis, the creation of incentives for both reducing the possibility for injuries and damage and the number of claims for each department, the coordination of insurance purchasing and specific suggestions to avoid and reduce risk.

This amendment is presented with the recommendation of the Mayor's Task Force on Claims and Judgments, the Chief Administrative Officer, City Attorney, the President of the San Francisco Bar Association, and the President of the Lawyers' Club of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Each year the City spends almost $10 million to settle damage claims. It is estimated that the overall costs to the City for all risk-related activities exceed $125 million a year. It is time for action to be taken to reduce these huge expenditures. This charter amendment is designed to do just that.

Claims Investigation and Adjustment

Right now, the City claims investigation process is decentralized and largely unorganized. Each department investigates its own claims. Investigators may or may not be specially trained for their duties. There is no uniformity of investigation procedure or claims reporting. In only a few departments do investigators contact injured parties within days of an accident in order to settle the claim quickly and economically.

This amendment will create a claims investigation and adjustment bureau in the Office of the City Attorney. Claims investigation and adjustment activities will be centralized, economized and made much more efficient. The new bureau will be able to respond immediately to accidents and claims, providing quick compensation to deserving persons while at the same time producing a prompt, professional investigation. This reform is greatly needed.

Risk Management

Presently, there is no overall plan for the management of the City's risk exposure: insurance purchasing, avoidance of industrial accidents, gathering data on accident patterns, etc. Again, risk management as a function is fragmented among the various City departments. As a consequence, departments cannot develop the necessary expertise to manage themselves to reduce risk-related costs.

This measure will establish a risk manager under the Chief Administrative Officer. For the first time, overall City planning will be possible in order to control risk. Departments will be told what activities are producing injuries or damage and advised on corrective measures. Private industry has been utilizing risk managers of this type for years. It is time that the City did the same.

This amendment will reduce the cost of government and insure a more efficient delivery of City services to all San Franciscans. We urge you to give it your unqualified support.

Board of Supervisors

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This charter amendment was proposed by a citizens' task force appointed by Mayor Feinstein. Its mission was to propose ways of reducing the number and financial costs of claims and lawsuits against the City.

The amendment has two principal features. The first is to centralize within the City Attorney’s office the investigation of claims filed against city departments. This will allow for improved training and supervision of the investigators, who presently are scattered throughout city government. The result will be more efficient, cost-effective and professional investigation of claims. By improving the quality of claims investigation, the City can identify those claims which have merit and attempt to reach early — and less costly — settlements. Meritless claims will be denied with greater confidence that if suit is filed it can be defended successfully.

The second major feature of the amendment will establish a Risk Management office under the Chief Administrative Officer. Risk management is a concept widely used in private business. Risk managers are professionals skilled in reducing the overall cost of claims. The Risk Manager would be responsible for coordinating the City’s insurance program, data collection, and correcting problems within the City which lead to claims. The Risk Manager would review those claims which have been filed against the City. Where it appears that an unsafe condition or practice has led to a claim, the Risk Manager would suggest to the affected department that corrective measures be taken. Reports to the Mayor and to the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors of the recommended corrections and the actions taken would ensure that the various departments will be responsive.

The City cannot eliminate claims and lawsuits against it. But it can limit its exposure by managing the claims process more effectively. This measure will reduce injuries and reduce claims, and that is good for everyone.

Jerome B. Falk, Jr.
Chair, Mayor's Task Force on Claims and Judgments Against the City

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, May 31, 1986

12 Noon  State Senate, Assembly, Congress and State Propositions
1:00     Proposition A — Risk Management & Claims
1:15     Proposition B — Purchaser & Contracts
1:30     Proposition D — Civil Service
2:15     Proposition E — Balboa Reservoir
2:30     Proposition F — Compensated Advocacy
3:00     Proposition G — Apartheid
3:20     Proposition H — AIDS
3:30     Propositions I, J — Embarcadero Freeway
3:50     Statewide Candidates

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION B

Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchaser must get the approval of the Chief Administrative Officer before signing certain contracts for more than $15,000. Only the voters may change that dollar limit. The Purchaser must personally sign every contract that comes through his office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would raise the limit on contracts requiring the Chief Administrative Officer's approval to $50,000. It would also allow the Board of Supervisors to change that limit by ordinance. Proposition B would also permit the Purchaser to name certain people in his office to sign contracts on his behalf.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer's approval only on contracts for more than $50,000. You also want the Purchaser to be able to name certain people in his office to be able to sign contracts on his behalf.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to require the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer's approval on contracts for more than $15,000. You also want him to sign all contracts himself.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On March 3 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON B!
The City's Charter requires that a permanent, non-elected City official, the Chief Administrative Officer, review all purchases and contracts above $15,000. Of course, CAO approval of major contracts is very important. But, due to inflation, the number of contracts that have to go to the CAO for approval is always increasing. Today there are too many documents requiring CAO approval. This slows down the purchasing process, occupies staff time — and ultimately costs the City money. Proposition B will raise the CAO approval level to $50,000, and help the City to improve the efficiency of its purchasing operations.
The City's budget includes more than $250 million for purchases on tens of thousands of contracts. At the current $15,000 review limit, the CAO must approve thousands of documents every year — a costly, time-consuming process. In the long run the City loses money because of the inordinate length of time required to complete all the paperwork.
An adjustment must be made to remove the smaller contracts from this cumbersome process. Review and approval of contracts under $50,000 should be under the responsibility of the City Purchaser, a highly trained and experienced professional, who reports directly to the CAO. By changing the present $15,000 to $50,000, it will be possible for the CAO to give each document that comes to him the attention it requires. And, by placing its orders and paying its bills faster, both the City and businesses will benefit — especially small business and those owned by minorities and women.

Proposition B will allow future adjustments to the limit to be made by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility will ensure the City's ability to adjust to inflation and changes in the market.
This amendment comes to you with the recommendation of auditors, controllers, bankers, and others who exercise top fiduciary responsibility within their own organizations.

VOTE YES ON B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will make essential changes to update the purchasing and payment procedures under the Chief Administrative Officer. These measures are necessary and desirable because they will save the City money by significantly increasing our management efficiency.
Right now, the City loses because it takes too long for contracts to be reviewed and payments okayed, which means that early payment incentives go unutilized. The CAO has to approve every contract greater than $15,000 — and with City purchases last year over $250 million, the paperwork logjam is vast and overwhelming.
An increase in the review limit from $15,000 to $50,000 will make an adequate adjustment for inflation — $50,000 now is only about $15,000 in 1967 dollars. Proposition B will also enable the City Purchaser, who reports to the CAO, to maximize potential savings through early payments by designating appropriate personnel to approve contracts up to $50,000. These "Good Business" amendments are consistent with private sector practices and should be incorporated by the CAO in the City's best interests.

Finally, Proposition B will give the City the ability to respond quickly to changes in the market place by allowing changes in the CAO review limit by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility is necessary to ensure that in the future we will not lose money because of institutional rigidity. Control is maintained with the necessity of Board action and Mayoral approval to adjust the review limit, and this same feature will allow for change when desired.

Vote yes on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

---

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED

---

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!
You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
Civil Service

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the civil service system of the City of San Francisco. The structure of the civil service system and certain rules governing its operation are written into the Charter and can only be changed by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would make major changes. A Department of Personnel Administration would run the Civil Service system and would be able to change rules with Commission approval. Major features of Proposition D are described below. The complete charter amendment is printed in this voters' handbook.

Department of Personnel Administration

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Certain civil service rules governing the general operation of the system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs, are written into the Charter and carried out by the Civil Service Commission. Only the voters can change these rules.

THE PROPOSAL: A department of Personnel Administration would be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. A Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor would run the Department. Certain rules governing examination, selection and appointment would be taken out of the Charter. The Personnel Director would be able to change these rules with the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

Civil Service Commission

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the general operation of the civil service system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs. The Commission also hears and decides appeals on civil service matters.

THE PROPOSAL: The Civil Service Commission would no longer be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. The Commission could investigate the operation of the system, approve rule changes proposed by the Personnel Director, and hear and decide appeals only on claims of job discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest.

Employee Relations

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors appoints an Employee Relations Director to negotiate contracts with City employees; the Board approves all contracts.

THE PROPOSAL: The Mayor or his or her agent would negotiate with City employees; the Board of Supervisors would still approve all contracts.

What your vote means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing civil service system.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, and of itself it would not directly affect the cost of government, as it removes many civil service policy setting functions from the Charter and an independent Civil Service Commission and transfers responsibility for personnel matters, including labor negotiations, to the Mayor.

"As a product of its inherent flexibility and possible future application, costs could be affected or savings realized in amounts presently indeterminate but probably substantial."

How "D" Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative Charter amendment rewriting the civil service provisions of the Charter had qualified for the June ballot.

Robert Bradford, Jonathan Bulkeley, Lee Munsen and Mary Hilton, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 36,049 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 25,027 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

POLL CLOSE AT 8:00 p.m.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-faced type. Deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. Consistent with the City's and County's affirmative action goals, no applicant or employee shall be selected, appointed, reduced in rank, removed or in any way favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, union activities, political affiliation or sexual orientation.

(b) The purpose of the civil service system is to obtain for the city and county the best qualified persons to fill city and county positions in a timely and economical manner, using professional, fair and equitable personnel selection and personnel management practices with consideration of the following merit principles:

1. Recruiting, selecting and advancing employees on the basis of their ability, knowledge, skills and performance relative to the work to be performed.

2. Establishing equitable and adequate compensation, as provided elsewhere in this charter.

3. Training employees as needed to promote productivity and high quality performance and to facilitate career development.

4. Retaining employees during good service and separating employees for good cause.

5. Assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration, with proper regard for their privacy and constitutional rights; and assuring equal employment opportunity, based on the person's ability to do the job.

6. Assuring that employees are protected against coercion for political purposes and are prohibited from using their official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the outcome of an election or a nomination for office.

(c) This charter does not limit the power of departments, agencies, or other subdivisions of the city and county in their exercise of management prerogatives including but not limited to:

1. Directing employees in the performance of their duties;

2. Hiring, promoting, transferring and assigning employees among those qualified;

3. Classifying positions in accordance with Section 3.663 (g);

4. Discriminating employees;

5. Laying off employees because of lack of work, lack of funds or other reasonable cause; and

6. Determining the mission of its departments and divisions, and its budget, organization, the number of its employees, and the numbers, types, classifications and grades of positions or employees assigned to an organization unit, work project, shift or tour of duty, and the methods and technology of performing its work.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

— All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. No person shall in any way be favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, age, religion, national origin or other non-merit factors.

— Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in subsection (a) or any other provisions of the charter, it shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, consistent with a policy of acquiring qualified personnel for the service of the city and county, to ensure the hiring of blind persons. It shall further be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that no otherwise qualified blind person shall be discriminated against in examination, re-examination, appointment, re-appointment, waiver of eligibility for appointment or re-appointment, promotion or demotion, in any class, subclass or position in the civil service unless the sight of the employee is indispensable for the performance of the duties and responsibilities of the class, subclass or position. It shall be the duty of the commission to classify and from time to time to reclassify, reclassify, place and change the civil-service class of employment of the duties of which may be efficiently performed by blind persons and to conduct appropriate examinations which will fairly test the capacity of blind persons as well as sighted persons to perform such duties.

2.032-2 Employee Relations Director

— Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 3.510 of this charter, the employee relations director shall be appointed by the board of supervisors and shall hold office at the pleasure of said board.

3.030 Employee Relations

It shall be the duty of the mayor to meet and confer with employee representatives on behalf of the city and county and its constituent boards, commissions, departments and agencies as required by applicable law. These duties may be performed by a designee of the mayor who shall serve at the pleasure of the mayor. Nothing herein shall limit the mayor from contracting for the performance of these duties.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the mayor shall submit all memoranda of understanding or ordinances to be enacted pursuant to Article VIII of this charter herein to the board of supervisors for approval or rejection.

3.660 Commission; Composition; Meetings

There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county that shall have the general powers and duties set forth in Section 3.661.

The civil service commission shall consist of five members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in office at the time of the adoption of this charter and this charter section—amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed or provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981 and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July following the expiration of the terms of which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed.

The respective terms of the commissioners who shall hold office on the effective date of this section as amended shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date. Thereupon, the mayor shall appoint continued on page 73
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Vote YES and join 34,000 San Franciscans who signed petitions to get this crucial reform on the ballot. "D" clears the way to modernize Civil Service so that it is fair and efficient. The present system is a 50-year conglomeration of rules that tie the City’s hands—

— A protest by one applicant can hold up hiring for an entire job classification for months—even years.

— Often tests cannot be given frequently enough to maintain current tests of qualified employees. This leads to delays and temporary appointments that make hiring top candidates all but impossible.

— Appointments to jobs are restricted to the top three names on a list even though more than three people have the same score!

— Many provisions are out of date. Some deal with hiring during the Korean War. Others limit our ability to carry out affirmative action.

"D" would remove archaic rules from the Charter so they could be changed as the times require—subject to meet and confer and public hearings. Job tests could be expedited; hiring and promotions speeded up; opportunities opened to women and minorities.

Specifically, Proposition D:

1) Creates a Department of Personnel Administration at no additional cost. Like other U.S. cities, day-to-day administration would be the responsibility of a director, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Supervisors.

2) Makes the Civil Service Commission the oversight body to set policy and hear appeals. Rulings would have to be within 60 days, eliminating endless delays.

3) Moves the office of labor relations from the Supervisors to the Mayor, who must make the tough-minded decisions to balance the budget. Never again could the Board give labor $27 million for "comparable worth."

This reform is the product of years of work with SPUR, League of Women Voters, Chamber of Commerce. Members of the Board of Supervisors could have put the reform on the ballot last year but bowed to some labor leaders, and 34,000 San Franciscans had to do the job for them.

Proposition D will enable City government to work better for you. Vote YES.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON ‘D’

Proposition D is a complex proposition with a simple goal: remove the archaic restrictions on the hiring, promotion, or firing of city employees and bring San Francisco’s personnel system into the modern age.

Archaic is the only way to describe a system that keeps equally qualified people from competing for a job, and that takes months—sometimes years—to fill vacancies.

For example, if 50 people score equally high on a competitive examination, shouldn’t they all have a chance for any job for which they are eligible? Not under the current system, which requires complicated tie-breaking rules not at all related to a person’s qualifications or abilities.

Or what about being able to hire the best person available for a given job? Currently, eligibility lists are frozen for two years and every person on each list, including the lowest-scoring, must be offered a job before the highest-scoring person on a more recent list. Private businesses couldn’t function saddled with such absurdities.

Proposition D cuts through the red tape. It creates a modern personnel department, with a director responsible for carrying out rules to ensure fairness and efficiency. Accountable to the Mayor, the director would be selected from a list provided by the Civil Service Commission, and subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.

The Civil Service Commission remains an independent body, with the right to approve new personnel rules and hold hearings on abuses. Also under ‘D’, negotiations with employee unions would be under the Mayor, subject to approval by the Supervisors, providing checks and balances in balancing our budget.

With greater accountability and continued checks and balances, Proposition D will open the way to more efficient government in our City.

Bill Maher, Supervisor

Louise Renne, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON ‘D’

Proposition D is a necessary reform to the City’s Civil System. As the City’s Chief Administrative Officer for almost ten years, I have found that quality employee hiring is difficult and the process causes long delays.

The current system is:

• inflexible. The City cannot hire and promote the most qualified persons.
• inefficiently administered by a commission. Other large
cities do not have such a bureaucratic process.
• antiquated. Civil service rules represent practices of the 1950s rather than the 1980s.

The new system:
• allows the Mayor to appoint an effective personnel director, who controls administration and procedures.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

It’s 1986 and we’re still trying to manage City business as if it were 1932. As heads of City departments, charged with the daily responsibility of putting out fires, fighting crime, maintaining hospitals, parks, libraries and providing other essential services, we know from bitter experience about shortcomings of the existing Civil Service System.

Enacted with the City Charter in 1932, the system is founder ing in red tape. Outdated rules are the subject of endless challenges. Tests are put off; vacancies go unfilled; promotions delayed; any appeal, however groundless, stops the process in its tracks.

Proposition D would take old procedures out of the Charter so they could be changed in an orderly process by the Civil Service Commission, which also would hear appeals.

Day-to-day administration of the tests—the content, scoring, all the myriad details of managing a complex system, would be put into a modern, highly professional personnel office. Tests would be speeded up. Hiring would keep pace with need. Promotions would be on the basis of competence. High performance would be the standard. Discipline could be imposed with working rights fully protected, and women and minorities would be assured equal opportunity.

Proposition D will help improve management and the quality of City services. Vote Yes on D.

Frank Jordan, Chief of Police
Emmet Condon, Fire Chief
Don Birrer, Director, Public Works
Mary Burns, General Manager, Recreation & Park
John Frantz, City Librarian
Eugene Garland, Director, Port
Marvin Geistlinger, Purchaser
Wilbur Hamilton, Executive Director, Redevelopment Agency
Claire Isaccs, Director, Arts Commission
Ray King, Director, Parking Authority
Dean Macris, Director, City Planning
Grant Mickins, Director, Human Rights Commission
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, PUC
Joyce Beam, Director, Aging
Ed Sarfield, General Manager, Social Services
Thelma Shelley, Managing Director, War Memorial
Moira So, Executive Director, Community Development
Louis Turpen, Director of Airport
Dr. David Werdegar, Director, Health Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The hiring practices outlined in San Francisco City Charter have been virtually unchanged since 1931, a severe handicap in running a modern city. Proposition D is designed to streamline the charter and ensure that the rights of present city employees and candidates for city jobs are protected, while improving the hiring process itself. The initiative also builds management accountability in the city system.

Proposition D Is More Fair, More Efficient, More Economical

The day-to-day personnel functions, including hiring, will be consolidated under a Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. Decisions of the Director of Personnel on examination content and administration are final, unless a decision is stayed during the appeal process by a unanimous vote of the Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D will make it easier to modernize the many archaic Civil Service rules and procedures now included in the Charter, while maintaining a strong and independent Civil Service Commission to safeguard the merit system and protect the rights of city employees. Many detailed rules will come out of the Charter and will become personnel regulations. These regulations can then be modernized, but only through a process which includes public hearings and meet and confer sessions with the union involved. In addition, the Civil Service Commission must approve any changes or new regulations governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfer, resignation and terminations.

Proposition D Will Improve Performance And Public Confidence

The openness and fairness of the proposition will benefit everyone. Well-qualified job candidates will have a better chance of being hired, and well-qualified job holders will have a better chance of being promoted. This means generally better job performance in all departments, resulting in higher employee morale and more public confidence in city government.

Submitted by
Louis Hop Lee, President
Civil Service Commission
Lee Munson, Member Civil Service Commission and
Treasurer, San Franciscans for Fair and Efficient Government

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Cities can survive only with strong management. The greatest budgetary restraint must be exercised to assure that full value is received for each tax dollar spent.

With firm limits on what it can spend and faced with a possible loss of Federal funds next year, the City must be managed with the greatest possible efficiency.

Essential to greater efficiency is the need for Civil Service reform. As members of City Commissions, we constantly confront the torturous delays and confused rules that gridlock the present system. The present system simply cannot respond to the City's personnel needs.

Qualified applicants become frustrated and seek employment elsewhere. Promotions are blocked. Morale suffers. Temporaries fill in; overtime mounts. The ability to plan is crippled; management is weakened.

Proposition D would put the system on a business-like basis. A personnel department would handle day-to-day administration. The Civil Service Commission would be the watchdog to assure the integrity of the merit system.

This streamlined system would replace what is now inflexible and cumbersome. Testing could be accelerated; hiring made more efficient and promotions made on time. The result would be greater efficiency and elimination of costly waste.

Vote Yes on D.

Jerry E. Berg, President, Board of Permit Appeals
Henry Berman, President, Fire Commission
Mo Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
John Blumenthal, Health Commission
Hector Chinchilla, Rent Board
Rev. Harry Chuck, Housing Authority
Dr. Arthur Coleman, President, Port Commission
Owen Davis, Police Commission
J. Edward Fleishhelf, Airports Commission
H. Welton Flynn, President, Public Utilities Commission
James Foster, Health Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation & Park Commission
James Pastell, President, Housing Authority
Anne Halsted, Port Commission
Tommy Harris, Recreation & Park Commission
Tom Horn, President, World Memorial Board of Trustees
Warren Jebe, Public Library Commission
Jeffrey Lee, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Philip Lee, President, Health Commission
Bruce W. Lilienthal, Small Business Advisory Commission
Jacqueline Nemirovsky, President, Arts Commission
Toby Rosenblatt, President, Planning Commission
Dr. David Sanchez, President, Police Commission
Joan San Jule, Housing Authority
John Patrick Short, President, Parking Authority
Margaret G. Stern, President, Public Library Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D contains civil service reform measures urged by the League of Women Voters since 1969.

Proposition D will:
—Modernize the city's outdated personnel system by creating a Director of Personnel, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors
—Preserve the principles of merit through policies set by the Civil Service Commission
—Create a more responsive Civil Service system at no additional cost to the taxpayer

EFFICIENCY AND FLEXIBILITY

Proposition D transfers authority for day-to-day management of the city's personnel system from the Civil Service Commission to the Director of Personnel. This will:
—Prevent hiring delays
—Ensure only the most qualified individuals are hired and promoted
—Provide City managers with more administrative flexibility

FAIRNESS FOR EMPLOYEES

Proposition D will:
—Safeguard the rights of City workers
—Protect gains made in hiring women and minorities
—Retain the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit appeals board
—Retain the ability of the City's unions to negotiate working conditions
—Create a system that can respond quickly and fairly to the needs of City workers

Proposition D will bring the Civil Service system into the 20th century by making the Mayor accountable for the management of a system employing more than 25,000 people. Hiring by merit is still guaranteed by the Charter. Please join us in voting for this Reform!

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
Esther Marks, Past President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote Yes on Proposition D the Civil Service Modernization Initiative.

Prevent abuse of a system that was intended to serve the public and protect against favoritism. Prevent situations like this: an employee failed to report to work for a week without explanation; he was telephoned, notified by certified mail and a message left under his door; he was terminated 13 days later; he did not appeal the termination and the civil service commission up-
Civil Service

held the termination. Two months later, the employee petitioned the commission for reinstatement. The employee got his job back, not because the process of termination was wrong but because the commission had a long standing objection to using "absent without leave" as a reason for firing.

The quality of public services is dependent upon the effectiveness of the staff who deliver them. The primary role of the civil service commission should be to facilitate recruitment and retention of the best available personnel. It must protect against favoritism and must assure that everyone has an equal and fair chance at employment.

The present system does not do that. We feel this initiative will make the system work better, for the managers, for the employees and for the public.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco government is huge, with a budget of more than $1 billion per year and 25,000 employees. It is expected to solve serious problems. This requires that the City have the ability to hire and promote talented people to do the job.

The present civil service system is so tied up in red tape that jobs remain vacant for six months to a year, and all too often someone who is not capable of doing a good job is hired. Your tax dollars are being wasted, and you are not receiving the quality of services you need and deserve.

Proposition D will modernize San Francisco's civil service system. It separates the personnel department from the Civil Service Commission, and puts the department under the Mayor where it belongs. The Mayor is responsible for balancing the budget and delivering city services as efficiently as possible. She cannot do this unless she can find capable people to do the job. That is the task of the personnel department in any organization.

Proposition D will also insure that the independent Civil Service Commission has sufficient authority to require the personnel system to be fair in its treatment of City employees. The Commission will be able to issue subpoenas and require testimony of witnesses on investigations it conducts. Should it find that discrimination has occurred, it can issue orders that must be obeyed.

Most major American cities, and virtually all cities and counties in California, have the kind of civil service system that will be established by Proposition D. San Francisco's present system is still mired in the past. It hobbles the ability of the City to deliver services and spend your tax dollars as efficiently as possible.

SPUR has not placed a statement in the Voter's Handbook for any other issue over the past 15 years. We feel that Proposition D is so vital for San Francisco's future that we are making this appeal for your support.

Vote "YES" on Proposition D.

SPUR—The San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Reform Initiative, will give San Francisco citizens the HIGH PERFORMANCE GOVERNMENT necessary to meet the many challenges of the future. Proposition D corrects the outdated and inflexible requirements originally written in San Francisco's City Charter in 1931. It will eliminate the problems which prevent San Francisco's personnel system from operating with efficiency the City's voters and taxpayers deserve:

Proposition D insures City jobs will be filled from current lists of the most qualified employees.

Proposition D prevents ungrounded appeals from delaying for years the appointment or promotion of qualified employees.

Proposition D eliminates the repetitive tasks currently monopolizing the Civil Service Commission meetings and directs the Commission to serve as an appellate body to protect the City's good employees.

Proposition D centralizes the day-to-day operation of the civil service system and makes the Director of Personnel responsible to the Mayor.

Proposition D simplifies the budgetary process by making the Mayor the City's chief labor negotiator, responsible for setting working conditions within the City's financial capacity.

Proposition D is the result of years of painstaking review by the most experienced, able and respected management experts in San Francisco. It is a plan intended to move City government out of the 1930s and equip San Francisco to enter the twenty-first century without being burdened by the red tape of the past.

After ten years of commitment to improving our City, the Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee is convinced adoption of Proposition D is one of the most important issues facing the voters. CHANGE IS LONG OVERDUE. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by,
The Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee

David Anacher
Jerome Anderson
Richard Blum
Charles Chapman
Arthur Cooke, Jr.
Benton Dial
James Edgar
Ruben Garcia

Robert Hayden
Walter Houdley
John Jacobs
Michael McGill
Ellen Newman
Roy Nordman
Frank Tatum

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PERSONNEL MANAGERS SAY YES ON PROPOSITION D

As the personnel managers for City Departments, we are charged with the responsibility of managing the City’s personnel system. The activities include examinations, hiring, training, discipline, union-management relations, affirmative action and compensation. No one knows better than we the frustrations experienced in attempting to monitor an unbelievable sequence of overlapping bureaucratic activities in attempting to get the job done.

Proposition D will bring our personnel system into line with most other public personnel systems. The improved system will create the potential for being more responsive to the needs of operating departments. It will improve labor relations by transferring this function to the executive branch of government where it belongs.

Proposition D will streamline certain routine procedures resulting in a reduction of cost and time. Under the current system delays are experienced due to lengthy appeals during which time the departments’ objectives are delayed.

Proposition D will create an atmosphere of increased accountability for department managers in the areas of affirmative action, discipline and job performance.

Proposition D has been endorsed by the San Francisco Council of Human Resource Managers, the association of over one hundred personnel managers in City government.

Proposition D strengthens merit system principles. Civil Service commissioners will have more time to enforce and protect these principles rather than being bogged down in the day-to-day activities of administration.

Proposition D will help bring about improved methods and practices in personnel administration and should result in a more competent and effective workforce which the citizens of San Francisco have a right to expect.

Alvin W. Schaaf
Personnel Director
Recreation and Park Department
Marsha Ramirez
Personnel Officer
San Francisco Port
Edward M. Gazzano
Personnel Director
Department of Health
James Horan
Senior Personnel Officer
Department of Social Services
James Unicini
Personnel Director
San Francisco International Airport

Andrea R. Gourdine
Manager, Bureau of Personnel & Training
Public Utilities Commission
Mori Naguchi
Senior Department Personnel Officer
Mary Smith
Senior Personnel Officer
Laguna Honda Hospital
Thele Poore
Senior Personnel Officer
San Francisco General Hospital
John Burke
Personnel Director
Controller’s Office

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will assist the Department of Public Works by streamlining the Civil Service process.

- The proposition still calls for checks and balances in that the Commission will continue to hear appeals on discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest. The Commission will act as a watchdog while leaving the general administration to the Personnel Director.

The initiative will make for an improved system for employees, management and the citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Donald Birrer
Director of Public Works

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Passage of this amendment will update our civil service system. These changes will make it comparable to other merit system agencies. Some of these changes are

(A) removal of administrative details from the charter which inhibit timely and effective personnel actions.

The following subjects will be placed in personnel regulations:

- Protests of written questions and answers
- Protests of tentative employment lists
- Promotional examinations
- Examinations for employees on military leave
- Certification of eligibles — Rule of three
- Duration of employment lists
- Temporary employee appointments
- Allows continuous updating of employment lists.
- Allows equitable treatment of job candidates with same test score.
- Realignment of responsibilities: the Civil Service Commission dealing primarily with compliance and adjudication activities (continued)
Civil Service

while the Personnel Department administers the day-to-day operation of the merit system.

Equally important the amendment retains important merit system provisions dealing with:

- Employee salary setting procedures
- Positions subject to merit system examinations
- Public hearing and meet and confer requirements
- Penalties for examination fraud
- Seniority, meritorious service and applicable educational credits for promotional examinations in the Police/Fire De-


dpartments
- Termination of unsatisfactory employees
- Disciplinary suspensions
- Conflict of interest
- Creation of positions

Proposition “D” merits a ‘YES’ vote.

John J. Walsh
General Manager Personnel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Initiative, is a long-overdue reform to streamline antiquated hiring practices in San Francisco’s fifty-year-old charter. Proposition D will ensure that the best and brightest job candidates are chosen to serve our city, thus promoting excellence in job performance and helping to eliminate incompetence. This initiative builds management accountability in the city system, while giving the Civil Service Commission the independence to protect the rights of women and minorities.

A Better, More Efficient System at Less Cost

Proposition D consolidates personnel functions, including hiring, under a new Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. The Director has final authority over content of examinations given city job applicants, so more flexibility is possible in finding truly qualified candidates.

Proposition D redefines the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit systems appeals board and policy-setting body. The merit principles are spelled out in the Proposition. This allows the Commission to protect the rights of women and minorities at no cost to the public.

More Fair to Everyone

Proposition D greatly improves the city charter. Well-qualified job candidates have a better chance to be hired and well-qualified job holders have a better chance to be promoted. The public is rewarded with the better job performance, efficiency and friendliness one expects from good government employees. All of these improvements are at no additional cost to the taxpayer.

Submitted by
James W. Haas

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service System, as presently constituted, (vintage 1932), is uncivil, and there is nothing “systematic” about it! It’s pure, unadulterated municipal lunacy and chaos! Remarkably, BOTH Management and Labor despise it. It certainly is NOT producing the best qualified persons to fill City jobs!

Let’s follow Mayor Feinstein’s recommendations. If this operation doesn’t dramatically improve, there are always FUTURE ELECTIONS where additional, more Draconian changes can be considered by the voters.

As matters now stand, it is far better to light a candle than just sit and curse the darkness! Any changes will be an improvement! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

For more than a half-century, San Francisco Mayors have abided by the employee examination, hiring and promotion policies administered by a strong and independent Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D is a deceptive and dangerous scheme that would give future Mayors and top-level bureaucrats the power to ignore competence and reward political loyalty.

Proposition D would take key Civil Service employment rules out of the City Charter and make them subject to wheeling and dealing by City Hall politicians.

There’s an old saying — “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.”

Civil Service has worked well for more than 50 years. Proposition D is unnecessary, ineffective and even counter-productive. It’s not just deceptive, it’s dangerous.

Joseph L. Alioto
Former Mayor of San Francisco

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Time and time again, different groups have put various propositions on the ballot to weaken our Civil Service System and reintroduce political patronage into City employment practices. And every time the voters have wisely rejected these schemes, no matter how cleverly they have been disguised. Proposition D is just another power grab by bureaucrats at the top in City Hall.

We’ve said NO! loud and clear in the past. Let’s say NO one more time.

Submitted by:
TAXPAYERS FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT
Thomas Scanlon
City Treasurer, Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "D"!!!!

During the eight years while a member of the Board of Supervisors, I fought hard to reform the Civil Service Commission and to bring working conditions and city workers’ pay equitable to both workers and taxpayers. I fought to insure an independent Civil Service Commission that would remain just that—indepen dent and free from political influence and political patronage of particularly the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

I am truly saddened by the Mayor’s insistence in bringing this disastrous Proposition “D” before the voters. Some of the Supervisors rejected this misguided measure for what it is; an unwise consolidation of authority to hire, fire and promote city workers by the Mayor and newly created personnel officer.

My efforts to bring pay equity to both taxpayers and city workers were continually squashed by then Supervisor Feinstein and Supervisor Molinari. Finally, in 1975, shortly after a disastrous city strike, I was able to place on the ballot, for voter approval, a measure that almost eliminates the power of the Mayor and Supervisors to manipulate the pay of city workers. This measure was overwhelmingly passed by the voters that year and we have not had any labor unrest since that date.

Vote No on “D”!
“D” stands for disaster. It will undo many of these reforms. Also, right now, the City is almost broke, thanks to the manipulation of Mayor Feinstein and her chief ally Supervisor Molinari.

If “D” passes the cost of operating our city government will increase in the next 24 months by not less than $60,000,000.

Contrary to the provisions of Proposition 13, property taxes would be increased, thus forcing up rents.

Vote No on “D”.

Don’t weaken our Civil Service Commission, whereby least deserving city employees could be promoted because of connection or clout.

Vote No on “D”.

We now almost have more problems than we can handle. We don’t want our city turned into another Chicago, where for nearly half a century a corrupt political system flourished under Mayor Richard Daley.

John Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We join San Franciscans for Fair Employment in opposing the Civil Service Initiative, Proposition D.

This measure will severely hamper the well-being of the San Francisco Fire and Police Departments. These departments are two of the finest in the Country and have consistently protected life and property in a professional manner. They must continue that tradition with a civil service system based on MERIT and not political patronage.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Andrew C. Casper
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Keith P. Calden
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

William F. Murray
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Thomas J. Cahill
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired

Donald M. Scott
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Our present Civil Service system was designed to keep corruption out of government. It has generally served that purpose well. This proposition would dismantle that system and in my opinion open the doors to nepotism, favoritism, patronage and corruption. Better a city government that is bureaucratic than one that is corrupt. Vote NO on D.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is an attack on the merit system and an attempt to return patronage to the Mayor’s office by eliminating the authority of the Civil Service Commission and its built in checks and balances.

The present Civil Service system is not perfect, but corrections can be made within the Charter without destroying a system that has worked for over 50 years and has been free from fraud and corruption.

This proposition will do nothing to improve the caliber of police performance and could have the opposite effect. I urge you to vote NO on PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by
The San Francisco Police Supervisors and Investigators Association

Don Goad, Captain SFPD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D could be a dangerous first step toward weakening the independent, impartial administration of our City government.

Proposition D would transfer power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor. The Director’s decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline and certification would be final. The Commission would have no right to hear examinations or disciplinary appeals.

With the transfer of duties and responsibilities from the Commission to the Mayor’s appointed Personnel Director, the Mayor would have control over personnel functions. Currently, commissioners have independent status and can be dismissed for cause. The Personnel Director could be dismissed at will.

The Merit System could be replaced by a patronage system. Proposition D could open the door to rules permitting the Personnel Director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his or her position on the list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Proposition D is NOT a reform package. The checks and balances for efficient City government would be lopsided, with too much power in the hands of unknown future Mayors.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
John L. Molinari, President
Harry G. Britt
Richard Hongisto
Willie B. Kennedy
Wendy Nelder
Nancy Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Beware of PROPOSITION D!

Powerful special interest groups are attempting to remove key City employees from the independent and impartial Civil Service system in the name of "reform".

They want instead to make these employees answerable directly to future Mayors and politically-appointed Personnel Directors and department heads.

PROPOSITION D got on the ballot because the Chamber of Commerce and such companies as Pacific Bell and PG&E paid a professional southern California campaign firm, $70,000 to collect signatures.

They're trying to destroy the merit system and replace it with an old-fashioned patronage system.

Department heads will be able to ignore examination scores and reward loyalty rather than competence in promotions and hiring.

Don't let the Chamber of Commerce, big business and their allies in the City bureaucracy dictate who's hired, fired and promoted among public employees.

PROPOSITION D is not just deceptive, it's dangerous! Vote NO on PROPOSITION D!

Libby Denebeim
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Tim Woldred
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Ron Haberman
Vice-Chairman, Democratic Central Committee
Jim Wurck
Democratic Central Committee
Roberto Esteves
President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Rick Pacuraru
President, Harvey Milk Lesbian Gay Democratic Club
Walter L. Johnson
Exec. Sec'y, S. F. Labor Council
Michael Bernick
Linda Post
Sal Roselli
Deborah Stein
John Mehring
Pat Norman
Nancy Walker
Gwen Craig
Harry Brita
Louise Minnick
Carole Migden
Agar Jaacks
Jack Morrison

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D places too much power in the hands of ONE. Proposition D will provide for a personnel director to be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. The Mayor now appoints five members of the Civil Service Commission who also serve at her pleasure.

You work for years to climb the civil service ladder and then somebody comes along with an idea to cut you off at the pockets.

Proposition D will lock in all the employees employed in the Mayor’s office and will control the appointments of any new staff by the next Mayor elect in 1987 and years thereafter.

Like controlling your estate from the grave.

Vote NO on D.

Marguerite Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service Merit System has served our City well, giving San Franciscans an equal opportunity. It has helped us obtain employment and earn promotions based on objective examinations.

The Civil Service Merit system replaced the old patronage system that rewarded political loyalty more than competence.

Now the supporters of PROPOSITION D want to create a new Personnel Director, accountable only to the Mayor, and give department heads the absolute power to decide who works for the City and who gets promoted.

If PROPOSITION D passes, equal opportunity would give way to opportunity based on membership in the bureaucratic “establishment”.

Keep our Civil Service Merit System strong and free from the political abuses of the past.

Vote NO on D!

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly
Ben Tom
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Joanne Miller
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
A. Richard Cerbatos
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Sondia Wilson
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, President
S. F. Community College Governing Board
Julie Tong
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Alan S. Wong
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Henry Der
Albert Chang
Rudy Muraz
Robert “Bob” Morales
Yori Wada

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Can you imagine studying for a civil service examination, being rated at the top of the eligible list and never receiving the promotion? That’s exactly what Proposition “D” will do should the electorate adopt this amendment.

The civil service merit system has defects, but to totally eliminate the system and replace it with a patronage system where promotions are based on who you know, rather than what you know is scandalous.

Civil service was put into place to prevent scandal and the “favor seeking” individual from getting a paid position because he/she happened to support the right elected official.

Proposition “D” will allow one person, chosen by the Mayor, to decide who will be promoted, hired and fired. This is awesome power for one single individual to have at any level of government.

Our current Mayor may choose a fair person for this position, but will future Mayors be as careful? As each new Mayor assumes office, the civil service system will again change. The potential to favor one individual or group over others is great.

Proposition “D” has a great potential to diminish the quality of services we now provide to our citizens, as the future of how people are hired and promoted in the San Francisco Police Department is completely unknown.

It’s true our promotional system is fraught with delays and delays frustrate us all, but Proposition “D” is not the answer. Proposition “D” will only add to our existing problems. Several years ago, our citizens elected a Charter Commission to streamline city government and make civil service work more efficiently. The voters eventually rejected those proposals. The checks and balances that make our government stable were no longer present. It simply went too far.

Proposition “D” goes even further. It brings about a system of patronage and should be defeated lest we want to engage in “free-wheeling and dealing” of civil service jobs and promotions.

We urge a strong No vote against Proposition “D”!

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS’ ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry, President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The purpose of the Civil Service Commission is to ensure that the merit system would be the only criteria in any examination process.

If Proposition D passes, all authority concerning examinations would be taken from the Civil Service Commission and given to a Personnel Director, who is appointed by the Mayor. This Personnel Director would have the authority to hire and fire at his discretion, with no appeal available. This proposition is contrary to everything the Fire Department and all City employees have strived for over the years.

The Civil Service Commission in its present form was instituted to prevent any possibility of a patronage system, where one person has complete control.

This proposition would do nothing to improve your Fire Department. If you are satisfied with the work and make up of the San Francisco Fire Department in its present form, "Vote No On Proposition D". You will be doing a service for the San Francisco Fire Department, and the people of San Francisco.

Submitted by the San Francisco Fire Chiefs' Association
John Flaherty, Battalion Chief SFFD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is bad government and bad politics, changing our independent civil service system into a system dominated by the Mayor:

. By shortening the six year terms of Civil Service Commission to conform to the Mayor's four year term of office.
. By transferring most of the Commission's powers to a Personnel Director who serves solely at the Mayor's pleasure.

Keep politics out of employment services. Vote NO on Proposition D!

Alice B. Toklas, Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Roberto Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D fails to offer enough new and improved procedures to cure the current defects in the civil service system. Charter sections and civil service rules are repealed without specific known replacements.

Proposition D transfers power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created personnel director appointed by, and to serve at the pleasure of, the Mayor. The director's decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline, and certification would be final. The commission would have no right to hear examination or disciplinary appeals.

There are hidden costs with Proposition D because the new Personnel Administration Department will employ a personnel director, and other employees "as may be necessary to carry out (its) functions and duties."

The Merit System could be replaced by an old style Patronage System. Proposition D could open the door to rules which permit the personnel director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his/her position on the civil service testing list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Police and Fire Commissions would lose functions as a result of the personnel director's new power. The director's unlawful employment discrimination policy would be binding upon department administrators. The director's procedure for employee dispute resolution must be used by all department heads and appointing officers.

Proposition D is not the answer. The checks and balances for efficient city government would be lopsided.

I urge a no vote on Proposition D.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, 17th Assembly District
Sala Burton
Congresswoman
Art Agnos
16th Assembly District
Milton Marks
State Senator

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Balboa Reservoir Development Ban

**PROPOSITION E**

Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The Public Utilities Commission declared Balboa Reservoir South (located across Phelan Avenue from San Francisco City College) surplus in 1984 and made the site available for low, moderate and market rate housing. In July 1985, a City-community advisory committee chose a developer to build 203 single-family homes on the 13 acre site. Construction has not yet begun.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition E would prohibit granting new building permits and would revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site (Assessor’s Block 3180, Lot 1) between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want to prohibit granting any new building permits and you want to revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you want to continue to allow building permits to be granted for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

---

**Controller’s Statement on “E”**

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

**How “E” Got on Ballot**

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for a three-year ban on development of the Balboa Reservoir site had qualified for the June ballot.

Sidney Kass and Jesse David Wall, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 12,430 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 10,012 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

---

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 77
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Having been responsible for providing leadership at City College from 1947 to 1977, we cannot stand by and see this site converted to housing. We must speak out. Such a move would preclude forever the logical and much needed campus expansion to what was once our West Campus. We left that site reluctantly to make way for water storage. If it is no longer required for that purpose, let us return it to City College.

Thousands of San Franciscans—high school graduates, dropouts, veterans, re-entering women—representing all of the city's diverse ethnic groups, have been prepared for transfer to four-year colleges, profitable careers, and have had their lives enriched at the City College of San Francisco. Without City College's open door and easy access, many would have been deprived of these opportunities.

Its 56 acre campus originally housed 3,000 students. Now it serves over 23,000. This campus, compared to other community colleges, can be best described as cramped, inadequate, and second rate. The condition of the campus is to be contrasted with the excellence of its programs—which are recognized as among the best in the nation.

Lou Batmale
Chancellor 1970-1977
Louis G. Conlan
President 1947-1970

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 'E'

We question:
1. Why no EIR was required when the proposed development could have a substantial impact.
2. Whether the future needs of City College for classrooms, housing, and parking have been considered.
3. What the impact on taxpayers is with below market land sale and construction financing by bonds.

This moratorium will permit adequate study of these issues.
Vote YES on Proposition 'E'.

Bruce Bonacker, President
Board of Directors, Glen Park Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let a developer make a mint on land across from the most overcrowded college in the Bay Area! Parking is already an impossibility for residents near City College...adding 200 homes to this land would make the situation much worse.

It's simple: a college which can't find room for more students at a time when more people are returning to education doesn't serve the community.

This land is being sold at much less than its true value. The development wouldn't do much to ease the City's housing crunch, but it would undercut the future of City College and the peace of mind of the neighborhood.

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

You'd probably be upset. We certainly are. Please help us protect our neighborhood. Please vote YES on proposition E.

Westwood Park Residents:
Edna Tooker
Minnie Dorwin
Eugene Eden
Donna Nicoletti
Robert Armstrong
Pauline Armstrong
Joel Martinez
Richard & Lila Patterson
David Bean
H. Bozzone
William Burke
Richard Robel
Clyde Theria
Donna Manus
Esma Manus

Sunnyside Residents:
Ellen Wall
Melissa Voluntad
David Wall
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don’t let the greedy developers take this potentially picturesque open space.
A yes vote means you want more time to consider its future use. All we ask is time to think and plan.

John Barbagelata
Former member, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Suppose there was a publicly owned open space across the street from the main U.C. Berkeley Campus.
Can you imagine for one moment that it would be passed into private ownership?
Vote Yes on E for Equality and Excellence in Education

City College Students:
William Lew, Student
Tim McGuire, Student Council Member
Joseph Goldstein, Student Council Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

In 1952, the “Experts” said we needed reservoirs. They felt so strongly that they condemned the City College West Campus, destroyed the buildings, and constructed the reservoirs—all at taxpayer’s expense.
Now, in 1986 with more demand for water, the “Experts” say the reservoir is no longer needed. What is the concerned taxpayer to believe?
When in doubt, the city should hold on to the expensive things already paid for.

Stop the reservoir giveaway. Vote YES on E.

Taxpayers for Preserving the Reservoir.
Richard Patterson
Dorise Murphy
Lucille Carson
Daniel Gutierrez
Franz Witte
Bernhard Scholand
Ruth Hanson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This is a Planning issue
We have been accused of trying to stop housing for poor people. Not true. In the first place, the price levels are certainly middle income and above, but our main objection is that this badly done plan is damaging to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as to the over-crowded community college across the street.

WHAT WE WANT
Even our critics point out that we originally SUGGESTED housing for that site, but they don’t talk about what else we suggested. We want two levels of parking under a City College Li-

brary, Bookstore, and Auditorium, with housing on top. Furthermore, let the housing be TRULY affordable—for students and seniors. We are trying to stop the bureaucrats’ subsidized middle income housing project because it makes our dream impossible.
We ask for three years to give the neighborhood and the college a chance to produce a better plan.
SNaP (Sensible Neighborhood Planning Committee)

Helen Crizer, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council, representing 17 neighborhood associations in the area of the surplus reservoir property in question has voted to endorse the three-year stop of private construction on the old West Campus of City College.
Dr. Louis Batmale, Chancellor of City College from 1970-1977.

has persuaded us that City College needs the lands.

Juanita Raven, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Be a sport.
Give City College a vote of support.
City has 23,000 students and badly needs a library. The only place to put it is in the reservoir site. City College has walked closely with San Francisco for five decades. The reservoir site has always been understood to be reserved for City College.
Until now when someone wants it for housing. Housing is important, but it can be anywhere in town. But a City College library can only be located at the College.
Vote yes to support a book—and a reader.
Reading, studying, writing and research make up our town also.
It is hard to understand criticism of City for wanting to keep this area for a library. Sure, housing sites are at a premium—but even more so a library site for City which is one of the largest schools in the Nation.
Some people blast City for wanting a library because of the need for housing. Housing is needed. But some of those very same people want a big battleship stationed here that will bring in 15,000 new family members.
The Educational and cultural growth of San Francisco mandates living space for the City College library.
If this measure gets a no vote, it means there will be no site for a Library. This is the last chance. Vote YES to help out a book—and a reader.
State financing, when approved, will construct this building. It is the top building priority at City College.
A YES vote here means there will be time to think about the use of the site. During that three year period, cooler heads may realize this is the only site for a Library. If the housing goes in there will be no library there.
Vote yes for a book, for a good school and a better City.

John Riordan, Board of Governors
San Francisco Community College District

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Sunnyside Neighborhood Association is not against housing, but we are trying to stop a hasty and short-sighted plan. We are asking for this moratorium to get time for a better plan that will answer a variety of needs and benefit the entire city as well as our community.
This is a planning issue.
The release of the reservoir property as surplus by the water department came as a surprise to our neighborhood. The June 1984 "Residence Element" of the city's Master Plan did not even list the land as surplus. By 1985 major decisions were being made for use of the land without adequate neighborhood input.

There were some meetings attended by a few people carefully selected for their zealous pro-housing views or potential financial gain. The resulting plan has gone out of control. Now it benefits only the developer and the lucky few who will get houses on free land.

Proposition E is not an attack on housing.
Please help us save our neighborhood against poor planning by voting YES on Proposition E.

Joe Mahoney, President
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Miraloma Improvement Club urges a YES vote on Proposition E.

Frank Mastro, President
Arnell Rodrigues

Maggie Kroll
Dorothy Evers

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION E

All the talk in the world can't change the fact that City College has fewer acres of land relative to its student population than any college in the Bay Area.
Enrollment at City College is INCREASING, as is the enrollment of the San Francisco public schools from which City College draws most of its students. It is obvious that City College needs and deserves the reservoir land. The three year moratorium will gave time to produce a better plan which will have in-

put by faculty, students and alumni who know the college's needs and want to support it.

Sid Kass
Susie Langdon Kass
Phil Kass
City College Student
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The homeowners of Westwood Park, a neighborhood adjacent to the Balboa Reservoir, support the ballot initiative calling for a 3 year development moratorium. We believe that the City and City College should take additional time to determine their needs and how they might be met by using the Reservoir. In the event that City College does not need this property, we support its development as open space or as single family detached housing.

Westwood Park Association
Don C. Swander
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Let's not aggravate the traffic problem around City College before we first develop solutions for the existing problems. A three-year moratorium only buys our neighborhood and elected officials time to find solutions; it doesn't say no to housing. A YES vote is a vote for prudent development. A YES vote helps to preserve the family character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ken Hoegger
Realtor and community Activist

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As representatives of the students of City College, we understand first-hand, the intense need to reserve a site for future school expansion.

Preservation of the Balboa Reservoir, a site directly adjacent to the campus, is particularly crucial. The facilities that CCSF requires, such as a library and an auditorium, are essential to the main structure of the campus. Unlike classrooms, it would be unreasonable to build an auditorium or a library on an off-campus site, since these facilities are integral to the main function of the school.

In short, opposition to the moratorium based on the notion that alternate sites could be secured, is misleading. Once a site near the college is taken, any hope of expansion would be eliminated.

Associated Student Council of City College
Jack Lee, Vice President of Associated Counsel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Local 2121 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, representing City College faculty, urges a yes vote on Proposition E.

While this project provides short-term employment for a few, we are more concerned about the thousands of students who would benefit from planning and development that would better serve the community and the college.

Yes on E for continued excellence in community college education.

Anita Martinez, President
San Francisco Community College District
American Federation of Teachers

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is twice as crowded as any community college in northern California. It needs a much larger library, bookstore and auditorium, and more parking.

The college has always expected to use the empty SOUTH reservoir for educational needs. That land is finally surplus. Neither the college Governing Board nor the Chancellor attended the Mayor's planning sessions for the property and the faculty was not informed. When the 12.3 acre site was offered to a developer for $36,900 for subsidized housing, the Chancellor said, "We are at a crossroad and the correct path is for the Board of Supervisors, with the Mayor's support, to deed this surplus land to City College so that the college may continue to serve the city effectively for the next 50 years as it has for the past half century." The Mayor refused. Now only Board member John Riordan supports the correct path.

The Water Department says it may need the NORTH reservoir now used for student parking. If that crisis occurs, the Chancellor says, "We'll deal with the situation then." How, if the south reservoir is gone?

(continued)
When land is available other community colleges finance large projects through alliances with civic, athletic and cultural organizations, and through property sales. New methods for public funding are being developed.

The faculty would like three years of careful study to unravel misunderstandings and poor management, and to find the best way to be a good neighbor.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College needs land now for desperately needed facilities, one of which is a library. City College has an enrollment of 23,000 students but our library has seating for 450. There are other possible locations for new housing, but City College can't be moved. Give us an opportunity to plan a development for the community and the college.

Annie M. Young
City College Library Faculty and Staff

Donald Cunningham
Anne Dowd
Beverly Eigner
David Lofing
Alice Morris
Kevin Nakagawa
Thomas Nebbia
Donald Spears
City College Faculty for Responsible Reservoir

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty and staff members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Darlene Alloto
Mary Allen
Mary Amster
Tom Angeloff
Robert Balestreri
Don Bateni
Diana Bernstein
Joe Berry
Anna Bruton
Thomas Bredel
James Bristol
Richard Brunget
Laurent Bruessel
Philip Brown
Barbara Cabral
John Callen
John Caris
Frank Cerrato
Rosemary Clark
Perry Close
Kurt Common
Walter Colomb
George Crippen
Patricia Davis
Guy DePrimo
Edward Dierauft
Sharon Edwards
Larry Ernst
Mary Ervin
Kiey Fong
William Finke
Terry Greenfield
Robert Griffin
Michael Guthrie
Mary Hanna
YenKuang Ho
Peter Hach
Ronald Hocheved
Myra Holden
Katherine Hadlum
Michael Halbert
Edward Hunt
Frank Ingersoll
Elaine Johnson
Wendy Kainhnan
Jo Kennedy
Mercedes Kow
Rosalind Kwok
Don LaFerry
James Lallan
Steve Levinson
Sue Light
Gary Ling
Amelia Lippi
Dave Lurbert
Leon Luzy
Dasmone Macalou
Marion McManus
Patricia Madigan
Michael Malachowski
Mary Mari
Maria Mariani
Sylvia Marshall
Valerie Mechan
Jose Mejia
Margit Michelmayr
Deanne Milan
Cindy Moody
Thomas Munro
David Mybure
Deborah Nagle
Glenn Nance
Herbert Neylor
William Neff
Dennis Pionkowski
Francine Podenksky
Theresa Poydessus
Solomon Raju
Mary Riordon
Forbroy Sexton
Marvin Schimmerer
Fred Schneider
Earl Sibbren
Andy Seal
Ken Shen
Robert Struckman
MoSheul Tum
Edward Taylor
Pierre Thirty
Barbara Thomas
Clare Thompson
Willie Thompson
Mary Thurber
Robert Tricaro
James Trinane
Joanne Timminia
George VonBeezay
Cherie Wetzel
Austin White
Joan Wilson
Rosalie Wolf
Christina Yee

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Water Department has begun a resource study of water use, due for completion in two or three years. The study may well indicate that one or both reservoirs will be needed. The American Water Works Association states that reservoirs should be used in pairs. This is particularly important because it is the only reservoir at an elevation of 305 feet.

The Mayor twisted the arm of the Water Department to declare one of these reservoirs surplus before the water resource study is completed. Don’t let her get away with this kind of political manipulation.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Kurt Common
Ken Crizer
Ed Dierauf
Herb Naylor
CCSF Engineering Professors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The South Balboa Basin has been unused since college leased buildings, including a large auditorium, were torn down on that site thirty years ago. We hope that three years of thorough planning would explore the possibility of returning a part of that property to the college for the development of a multi-purpose medium-sized auditorium which could be shared with community groups.

Robert Bozina
Mack Crooks
Bob Davis
Helen Dillworth
Frant Enotso
Richard Esterman
Richard Fenner
Lawrence Ferrara
Ted Fleming
Peggy Gorham
William Grothkopp
David Hardiman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition E. This moratorium is necessary because there are too many worthy uses for this land to make a hasty and potentially very costly decision. Only through careful planning can the limited land available for development be best used.

Nicolas Alexander
Paul Hewitt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, as Physical Education Instructors, have always been committed to a diversified program for our students and community. The reservoir space is a natural land resource for a Multi Educational and Cultural Center.

Your YES vote on E will allow us the freedom to explore ways that this property could most constructively benefit all.

Gail Barton
Curtis Decker
Brad Duggan
Takako Higashi
JoAnn Halin
Daniel Hayes

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, full-time faculty of the Computer and Information Science Department of City College, urge a YES vote to postpone the decision until additional planning and surveys can be conducted. The current proposal would negatively impact the College’s enrollment.

William Beaver
Ronald Cerruti, Chairman
Kirk Gilson
Howard Granger
Frank Holden
Michael Kelly

ARGUMENTS printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

A YES vote on Proposition E helps STOP a scheme to GIVE AWAY $12,300,000 worth of City land for $1,800,000 (or less) to a Redwood City real estate developer.

A YES vote will SAVE taxpayers $550,000 per year. The housing project will produce $240,000 in taxes, but supplying City services will cost $790,000 per year.

The Controller's cost estimate does NOT account for the $12,300,000 land value, since land sale below value is NOT technically a cost of government. The Controller also is NOT permitted to assume that the housing project will be constructed, since construction has NOT yet been ordered by the Board of Supervisors.

The plan does NOT restrict housing sales to moderate-income first-time buyers. The plan only restricts use of tax-subsidized funds. Any person favored by the developer or politicians can buy these dwellings and get the benefits of the public land giveaway.

The houses are made "affordable" by giving away the land far below market value, by City-backed low interest, and by cutting construction corners.

The real beneficiaries of the subsidized housing project are the financiers (NOT the project dwellers). Bondholders receive 9.6% average tax-free interest, which is equivalent to 24.6% taxable interest at 61% maximum tax. The developer and bond establishment receive $5,340,000; this is $26,300 (or 22.40%) for each $117,400 unit.

The City loses $51,700 worth of land GIVEN AWAY for each unit.

Vote YES on Proposition E for good fiscal management.

William Marquardt
Financial Analyst, SNaP

Helen Crizer, Treasurer, SNaP

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is by far the most crowded community college in the Bay Area. With 22,600 students on a 56 acre campus, it is more than twice as crowded as any of the others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of College</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Campus (acres)</th>
<th>Area/1000 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City College of SF</td>
<td>22,624</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laney College, Oakland</td>
<td>9,805</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot College, Hayward</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa College</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of San Mateo</td>
<td>13,820</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>11.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Marin</td>
<td>6,663</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given these facts, why does the Governing Board not try to get the old West Campus back? Why don't they support this moratorium to delay the land grab?

The Governing Board is under political pressure from City Hall. They have been threatened with the loss of the north reservoir parking lot and funding for special projects. Forgive them. Vote Yes on E.

Friends of City College
David Newton
Glen Simpson
Jack Baker
Thomas Velasquez
Tillie McCullough

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The student population at City College is increasing. This semester's enrollment is up 1,265 students over last semester.

The enrollment in the San Francisco public schools has been increasing by 1,218 per year for the last three years. City College draws most of its enrollment from public schools in San Francisco.

Obviously, City College will have a larger enrollment in the future years, and will be in desperate need of space if we do not give it back its old West Campus.

Please reserve this public land for the college.
Please vote YES on E.

Barbara Holman

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON E

In 1981, I launched a six-point program to expand San Francisco’s housing supply and the voters had approved a City policy to add 20,000 new housing units within five years. This Proposition would destroy a major portion of the effort to build affordable, single-family housing in our city.

The Balboa Reservoir Site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now a site for development of 203 new single-family homes, most with three bedrooms and two baths. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed as other homes built under the City’s program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom could not afford homeownership. It is believed that these new homes will sell rapidly.

The Balboa Reservoir site is one of the few sites large enough to accommodate a substantial number of new homes. Please do not let a few people stop a major opportunity for new housing. Vote no on Prop E.

Not only would Proposition E halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site, but the 9.8% fixed-rate, 30-year mortgage money set aside for the housing would also be lost.

Nothing constructive is accomplished by this measure—it does not provide additional land or facilities for City College. As a matter of fact, City College has neither plans nor money to use the property. Further, the Community College Board of Directors, the governing body for City College, has voted overwhelmingly to oppose the initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No on E.”

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the site of the unused Balboa Reservoir and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost.

These homes are desperately needed for San Franciscans who can’t afford to buy in the city where the average house is selling for over $160,000. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

The homes would be built on land that belongs to the City. Over two years ago, it was declared surplus and available for housing. It is not part of City College, and City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

We urge you to vote no on Proposition E if you want more affordable housing for San Franciscans.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

In 1980 San Franciscans voted overwhelmingly (63% yes to 37% no) to construct 20,000 housing units. Good progress is underway towards achieving the voter goal. A 1986 report by Mayor Dianne Feinstein states, “In the last five years 3,559 new housing units completed with another 3,000 by 1988 and 20,000 more in 10 to 15 years”. Most of this housing will be built in underutilized commercial districts; not in existing residential neighborhoods.

The 203 affordable owner occupied single family units slated for the southern portion of Balboa Reservoir are part of the 1988 total. Our progress in addressing the City’s housing shortage will be curtailed if this ill-advised initiative is approved. SUPPORT OWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Housing production is essential to check rising prices and to maintain our social, economic, and ethnic population diversity. AS A SAN FRANCISCO VOTER, YOU CAN BE PART OF OUR HOUSING PROGRESS BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Do not be misled. The Community College Governing Board opposes this initiative. The district does not have any future building plans for this housing site.

WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT THE CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY HOUSING BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt construction of affordable housing at Balboa Reservoir site. This surplus public property empty for 30 years was declared surplus by the City in 1984. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders. The housing is desperately needed. San Franciscans need affordable housing.

Proposition E would halt construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. We need more housing in San Francisco, not less. Please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.

Doris M. Ward, Member
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

A critical issue facing San Francisco today is the lack of housing middle class San Franciscans can afford.

That is why I have joined these neighborhood associations to support the Balboa Reservoir neighborhood housing proposal. Those participating in the development of the proposal includes:

- O.M.I. Community Association
- Dorado Terrace Association
- Outer Mission-Ingleside
- Political Action Committee
- Greater Ingelside Community
- Mount Davidson Manor
- Ocean Avenue Merchants Association
- Ingleside Terrace Association
- The San Francisco Open Space Committee
- City College of San Francisco

From early in 1985 I worked closely with these neighborhood groups in the discussions between city government and community leaders concerning the development plans for this desperately needed new housing at the unused Balboa reservoir site.

**THESE ARE THE REASONS YOU SHOULD VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.**

1. The neighborhood housing proposal is the result of months of hard work by the largest coalition of neighborhood associations ever to join together to plan a housing development in San Francisco.

2. The housing at the Balboa Reservoir site was designed with the involvement of the coalition of neighborhood associations to enhance the surrounding community.

3. The governing Board of the Community College District has made clear that they have no plans for the site and no ownership rights to it. City College does not oppose the construction of this development and opposes this initiative.

4. Self-proclaimed “Friends” of City College want to stop the proposal in order to preserve the site for future faculty parking. A clique of City College staffers involved in a neighborhood association pose as community opposition to this development even though a representative from this organization, the Sunnyside Neighborhood Association, had helped plan and support the proposal.

5. By masquerading as concerned neighbors these self-appointed “friends” of City College hope to prevent the construction of 204 critically needed units of housing and pull off one of the biggest land grabs in San Francisco’s history.

DON’T BE FOOLED. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Residence Element of the Comprehensive Plan of the City and County of San Francisco assesses the City’s housing needs and lays out specific steps to meet those needs. This document was adopted by the City Planning Commission in 1984 after extensive public review at neighborhood meetings and public hearings, and consideration of the detailed Environmental Impact Report.

The first objective of the Housing Element is “to provide new Housing for all income groups” in locations appropriate for residential development. To meet this goal, development of housing is to be aggressively pursued and encouraged on surplus, underused and vacant public land.

Proposition E would halt construction of affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site. This public property, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City in 1984. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

If you want more affordable housing in San Francisco vote no on Proposition E.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Susan J. Bierman, City Planning Commissioner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on E.

Proposition E deprives San Franciscans of one of their last real chances to become homeowners at an affordable price. At the South Balboa Reservoir we have City-owned land on which 203 units of three-bedroom, two-bath homes can be built at low prices which average San Franciscans can afford to pay. These homes need to be built now, not in three years. In three years the low interest rates on mortgages and the bond financing will be gone. Two hundred families will have lost the opportunity to become homeowners, and the City will have lost the opportunity to ease the tight market in rental housing.

Nor does this ill-conceived initiative help City College in any way. City College does not need this land. Speculation that the College may at some future date find a use for the land is not founded on fact. The College may never be able to build on the reservoir. Their enrollment has dropped by over 4000 students in the last few years.

This initiative is designed to confuse you. It will make our housing shortage worse for three long years. If you support affordable housing in our City, Vote NO on Proposition E.

Bill Maher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Balboa Reservoir site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now planned for development of 203 new single family homes. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed — other homes built under this program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom would not otherwise be able to afford home ownership.

San Francisco has the most expensive housing in the nation where last year the average home sold for over $160,000. Housing is difficult to produce because the obstacles are great — little land on which to build, high construction costs and uncertain interest rates.

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost. The initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional land or facilities for City College. The Community College Board, the governing body of City College, in fact recently voted to oppose this initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No” on Proposition E.

John L. Molinari

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

In 1980, the voters of the City and County of San Francisco approved a measure making it City policy to add 20,000 new units of housing within five years. In 1984 in an effort to satisfy this objective, the Board of Supervisors adopted a policy encouraging the expansion of the City’s housing supply. Making surplus City-owned land, such as the site at Balboa Reservoir, available for affordable housing was an important part of that policy. A proposal to build 203 homes on the unused Balboa Reservoir site was advanced to help implement the pro-housing policy.

Approval of Proposition E would HALT construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.

The Balboa Reservoir homes would be built on land currently belonging to the City and County of San Francisco. The property IS NOT part of the City College, and City College has neither plans or money to buy the property and convert it for City College use.

The only debatable issue is the future of affordable housing on the Balboa Reservoir site.

As we are all aware, San Francisco has the most expensive homes in the United States. The average cost of a home is $152,000. Not many can afford such prices. However, the housing proposed for the Balboa Reservoir will give many more citizens the opportunity to become homeowners. The homes to be built will be sold to first-time buyers at prices ranging from $83,000 to $145,000.

Other homes built in San Francisco under the direction of similar affordable housing programs have been snapped up quickly by San Franciscans. Without the program, most would not have been able to purchase the home and become homeowners.

Again, if you desire to preserve the construction of more affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site, vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Willie B. Kennedy
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Additional single family housing is undeniably San Francisco's most acute social need.

When some vacant surplus City land (12 acres) finally becomes available for 203 additional new private homes there will always be some selfish individuals who are in favor of new housing "just so long as it is not built across the street from me!"

This unused, vacant City reservoir land hasn't generated a dime of taxes for over thirty years! Let's add 203 NEW home-owner taxpayers to the City's rolls as quickly as possible.

Stop these self-serving no-growth obstructionists! Please vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Prop E would halt affordable housing construction at the Balboa Reservoir site. Many gay people need affordable housing, too, and we join with other community groups urging you to vote NO on Prop E.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Robert Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E, if approved, would block the construction of 203 badly needed single-family homes on the south portion of the Balboa Reservoir in San Francisco. Sixty percent of these homes would be available for purchase by moderate and middle income families at purchase prices between $80,000 and $120,000. They would be constructed on surplus public land and financed by the sale of mortgage revenue bonds to enable the developer to sell the homes at below market prices.

A neighborhood group headed by two city college faculty members is responsible for placing Proposition E on the ballot. The group contends that the land which is intended to be used for the project should be made available instead to City College for the construction of new teaching facilities even though enrollment at City College is declining and the City College Board has voted 6 to 1 to oppose the initiative.

Like many other areas of the country, San Francisco suffers from a shortage of housing. Purchase prices here are among the highest in the nation. The use of surplus public lands and revenue bond financing provide a means for making single family homes available to a broad spectrum of families at affordable prices.

The Balboa Reservoir project is supported by the leaders of 8 neighborhood groups in the area surrounding the location of the proposed project and by a majority of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, as well as by Mayor Dianne Feinstein. We urge you to encourage the construction of this type of housing in San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition E.

San Francisco Board of Realtors
William L. Jansen, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

SAVE OUR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS!
BERNAL HEIGHTS SAYS, "VOTE NO ON PROP E!"
We are residents of Bernal Heights in San Francisco. We've worked hard to build affordable family and senior citizen homes in our neighborhood. We need more affordable housing in our City to survive. The real issue in Prop E is affordable family housing — a "yes" vote prevents the construction of 203 family homes. That's crazy!
Join us in preserving what's best in our City.
Vote "no" on Prop E!

Sylvia M. Yee, Bernal Heights Community Foundation Board of Directors***
Frank Hutchins, BHCF Board*
Mary Lou Berriotte, BHCF Board*
Lola Havener, BHCF Board*
Elizabeth Egger, BHCF Board*
Sister Janet Simons, BHCF Board*
Stephen Antonaras, BHCF Board*
Lorenzo R. Dill, BHCF Board*
Barbara Bagot, BHCF Board*
Margaret C. Randolph, Northwest Bernal Block Club*
Maureen Lamb, NWBBC*
Tim Molinare, BHCF Planning & Dev't Committee*
Buck Bagot, BHCF P & D Committee*
**Organization for identification purposes only.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco Needs Affordable Housing—
Vote No on Proposition E

Everyone agrees that San Francisco needs affordable housing. The questions are how and where that affordable housing can be built.

The Balboa Reservoir housing development, to be built on the site of a reservoir built thirty years ago and unused since that time, answers those important questions for more than 200 San Francisco first-time homebuying families by providing:
- 203 new affordable three-bedroom, single family homes
- 9.8% fixed-rate financing
- A mix of 30% low-income, 30% moderate-income and 40% market-rate first time buyers
- A convenient site that has been declared “surplus” by the City and “available for development of affordable housing”

The Balboa Reservoir housing development is a small but significant step in the effort to generate affordable housing in our City.

Thousands of San Franciscans from every community, neighborhood group and viewpoint agree that the Balboa Reservoir development is good for San Francisco. Virtually every elected official, including the Governing Board of City College also agree.

All these San Franciscans ask you to say “yes” to affordable housing and “NO” to Proposition E.

San Francisco Coalition for Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar, Executive Director

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The viable plan for affordable single family housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site is being threatened by Proposition E. If Proposition E passes, 203 single family homes will be lost to the citizenry of San Francisco at a time when they are greatly needed.

The facts about the proposed housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site argue strongly against Proposition E. All 203 homes will be for first time home buyers. One-third of the homes will be available to households earning $27,000. Another third of the homes will be available to households earning $36,000. Adequate parking will be provided within the development itself, thus answering any concerns that traffic in the area will be congested.

City College has no need or plan to use South Balboa Reser-

voir for its facilities. City College’s priority is to develop its existing campus. South Balboa Reservoir should therefore be used for one of the City’s greatest needs: increased and affordable housing which is available to lower and middle income families.

As homeowners who live in the vicinity of South Balboa Reservoir, we welcome its planned use for single family housing and feel it will become an integral and contributing part of the community. We therefore urge you to vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Submitted by:
Stephen Graham, Chairman of the Housing Sub-committee of the Citizen’s Committee for Community Development
Roderick A. McLeod, Vice-Chairman of the Citizen’s Committee on Community Development

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing is a group of neighbors which consists of many of the renters of Westwood Park and Sunnyside neighborhoods as well as owners and renters of Ingleside which are the closest neighbors to the Balboa Reservoir along with some of the students and teachers of City College.

We strongly support the Balboa Reservoir for housing. We believe that the Balboa Reservoir is an ideal spot for housing.

Our neighborhood wants homes in the South Balboa Reservoir.
Vote No On Prop. E.

Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughey
Submitted by Patricia Vaughey

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

As Merchants as well as residents of Ocean Avenue, Greater Ingleside and San Francisco, we support the Development of the Balboa Reservoir as housing.

A Traffic Survey has stated that there will be minimal impact on the existing patterns of traffic by this development.

Additional City College Parking is being considered on another location off I-280 to keep the college congestion away from the neighborhood’s streets.

City College has 44 more acres in which to expand and existing buildings at City College have viable means to expand.
We believe that housing on the Balboa Reservoir is the most viable solution to develop a vacant piece of property that is directly adjacent to our stores on a Transpreferential Street.

Affordable housing is in great need in San Francisco and as much needed here as anywhere. We want to help provide this need. Vote No on Prop. E.

Ocean Avenue Merchants Assoc.
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughay
Submitted by Patricia Vaughay

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction on much-needed affordable, single-family housing at the long vacant south Balboa Reservoir site. This proposition would also block a major housing development that would bring jobs into an area of the city that has little industry or private business.

Sale prices for these units are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the San Francisco housing market, where the average home is selling for $160,000. Construction of these homes will help all young, first-time home buyers and will require only 5% down, instead of the 20% down payment on houses bought with conventional home mortgages.

This plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by nine nearby neighborhood organizations. If Proposition E is approved and this project is blocked, more young adults will purchase their first home in Vallejo or some other outlying area, further draining San Francisco of the young families that every growing community needs.

San Francisco residents will gain apprenticeships, jobs, contracts and subcontracts from this development.

This plan calls for 2 and 3 bedroom, family-sized houses, with space for another bedroom which can be finished when needed.

Each house will have 2½ parking spaces in front and would not cause parking problems in the area. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

City College of San Francisco has no plans to buy the property, has no money for institutional expansion, nor any mention of this land in any master plan. Some supporters of this proposition are motivated by racist notions and have said they fear that this development will become another "Geneva Towers." This type of thinking is similar to support for apartheid practiced in South Africa and must be defeated by progressive San Francisco voters. Property values will increase, instead of a decrease as a result of this project.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition E.

Larry Ukil Johnson-Reed — President, O.M.I. Pilgrim Community Center Inc.
Maria Campbell-Casey — Program Director, Bay Area Engineering Societies Committee for Manpower Training, Inc.
Clara Mills-Bradford — Program Director, O.M.I. Senior Center
John C. Jackson
Linda Rose-Gipson
Jon Still — Secretary, Young Adult Committee
Kenneth Butler

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided — 2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote "No" on Proposition E.

Adequate Housing Alliance — Mitchell Omerberg, Director
Bay Area Urban League — Gregory Best, Field Representative
Bernal Heights Community Foundation — Andre Lennell Daye
Community Educational Services — Dorothy Chen, Executive Director
Japanese Community Youth Council St. Francis Square Apartments, Inc. —
Sandra Mayor-Jenkins, Secretary
Minority Contractors Association of Northern California — James
Hauptbock, Secretary, Board of Directors
National Community Congress — Dr. Eddie C. Welban
Parkmerced Residents Organization, Inc. — Ricardo A. Callejo, Esq.
Potrero Hill Neighborhood House — Enola Maxwell
San Francisco Building Trades Council — Stan Smith
San Francisco Housing & Tenants Council — Joseph Lacey
San Francisco Tenants Union — Jim Japoe
Rev. Anus C. Brown — Local Pastor & Community Servant
Greg Day — Chairman, Citizens Committee on Community Development
Polly V. Marshall — Commissioner, San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
Regina A. Sneed
Jim Wachob — San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Michael E. Willis, AIA — Fleming Corporation

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided—2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Greater Ingleside Political Club—Frank Noto, Treasurer
Housing Conservation and Development Corporation—Lonnie Lawson, Board of Directors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided—2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Bayview Baptist Minister Fellowship—Rev. N. R. Mills, President
Bread of Life Missionary Baptist Church—Rev. S. A. Bailey
Cosmopolitan Baptist Church—Rev. A. Ray Gentle
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Raymond M. Howard Sr.
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Carole Nelson
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Cornellus F. O'Reilly
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Paul G. Theiss
Old St. Mary's Housing Committee—Charles Gale, Chairman
St. Peter's Housing Committee—Tessa Rouxwor

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE... DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: With certain exceptions, City officers, including elected officials and commission members, may represent clients before City boards and commissions other than their own, and be paid for their services. State legislators may represent clients before City boards and commissions, and be paid for their services. Any person may contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would prohibit City officers from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay. This proposition would prohibit State legislators from appearing before City boards, commissions and departments on behalf of clients for pay. City officers would be prohibited from discussing with these officers and legislators matters that the City is deciding. Proposition F would also prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit City officers and State legislators from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to allow City officers and State legislators to represent clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to allow any person to contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

Controller's Statement on "F"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

The text of Proposition F appears on page 77

How "F" Got on Ballot

On February 26 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for limitations on compensated advocacy and campaign contributions had qualified for the June ballot.

Quentin Kopp, Marth Gillham and Cheryl Arenson, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 9,400 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,986 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The purpose of Proposition F is to cut campaign contributions by large contributors (and thus reduce campaign spending) and eliminate undue influence by officeholders retained as paid lobbyists for projects requiring City approval.

Let’s take a minute to analyze the untrue arguments against Proposition F.

- The opponents claim that Proposition F will force half the City’s Commissioners to resign. In fact, Proposition F does not force any Commissioners to resign. It simply says they can’t be a paid lobbyist and a City Commissioner at the same time. Does a commissioner value making money by lobbying more than public service?
- Some have also alleged that Proposition F will prevent duly-elected union leaders from serving as City Commissioners. No it won’t. Proposition F prohibits “compensated advocacy”—that means lobbyists hired by an organization, not members of the organization itself. Proposition F does not apply to salaried employees of labor unions, corporations, or non-profit agencies. Moreover, Section 8.105 of the Charter precludes it specifically from applying to any member serving as a representative of any profession, trade, business, union or association on any board or commission which requires membership of representatives of specific professions, trades, businesses, unions or associations.
- Another untrue argument against Proposition F is that it prohibits City officials only from discussing pending issues with other City officers or State Legislators who are also acting as paid lobbyists in a matter and doesn’t stop those officeholding lobbyists from writing City officials about their clients’ objectives. That’s not so. Proposition F applies to all such lobbying, written or oral. (The dictionary defines “discuss” as “to examine by means of speech or writing.”)
- End government decision-making by “insiders” and reduce the influence of money on local campaigns.

VOTE YES ON F.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
San Franciscans for Good Government

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

In all our years of observing San Francisco City government, we have found one maxim to be true time after time: a good idea gets copied, especially among politicians.

For no sooner did Quentin Kopp promise to bring Proposition F to the voters than did Mayor Feinstein come up with an informal, administrative version of her own. Fine, you say (and the Mayor says), then why vote Yes on Proposition F?

1) The Mayor’s remedy of asking City Commissioners who also act as lobbyists before City agencies to resign is nothing more than a hand slap, and is good only as long as she is mayor.

It’s not binding on future mayors and could be changed without any vote of the Board of Supervisors, let alone the people of San Francisco. Proposition F prohibits this kind of conflict-of-interest, and it will be the law, no matter who is mayor.

2) The Mayor’s action did nothing to state legislators who can also act as lobbyists before City Boards and Commissions, nor did her action stop the law or business partners of City Commissioners from picking up the slack in big-money lobbying. Proposition F will stop these practices in their tracks.

3) What about the other half of Proposition F, which reduced the campaign contribution limit to $500 so that all San Franciscans can enjoy equal access to City officials, not just the ones with the big bucks? The Mayor can’t do anything about this, and she hasn’t. Only a Yes vote on Proposition F will reduce the weight of big money and ensure our full voice in City elections and City government.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. If it’s important enough for the Mayor to copy part of it administratively, it’s important enough to do the job right and make it a law.

John J. Barbagelata
Harry Aleo
June Cahn
Dorothy Partridge

Robert Arenson
Rudolph Lohnes
Janet Wentworth

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The worst and most persistent problem in American politics is that politicians and political races can be “bought”. Reducing the size of campaign contributions will be a step forward in reducing the role of money in elections. Vote yes for more honest government.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

RESTORE to the people their rightful and equal power as individual voters by reducing the monetary clout and influence of private interests who make the laws and the policies as City officials and Commissioners or State legislators.

TELL the special interests that their money and influence can no longer interfere with representative government.

TELL the special interests that the voters will no longer tolerate the influence-buying which comes with large campaign contributions.

TELL the special interests that this measure will encourage highly talented citizens to serve San Francisco honestly and responsibly.

VOTE YES ON F.

Cheryl Arenson
Anne Renfrew
David Pacheco

Tom Hayes
Dorothy Vaksich

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

"Government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

These noble words from Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, cast in bronze at the entrance to City Hall, seem to have escaped the attention of some City officials who pass by them every day. For in San Francisco City government, Lincoln's simple formula for representative government would read quite differently: "Government of the powerful, by the lobbyists, and for the wealthy."

Government of, by, and for the privileged few is bad government. Government of, by, and for all the people is good government. It's as simple as that—as simple as Lincoln first put it.

Proposition F, the Good Government Initiative, will help San Franciscans maintain control of their government and will prevent undue influence by City officeholders.

To reduce undue influence, Proposition F outlaws the practice of City Commissioners and State Legislators representing special interests for pay before City Commissions and Boards. City Commissions should render their decisions deliberately and impartially, not be swayed by the political clout of the lobbyists appearing before them, or by any political favors those lobbyist/politicians might promise. "I'll scratch your back if you scratch my back" bargains do not belong in government. And until such backroom bargains are made illegal, City government will not belong to the rest of us either.

Proposition F also reduces the maximum amount that anyone can give to a local candidate from $1,000 to $500. If large contributors and other special interests can't give as much money, they can't buy as much influence with elected officials. And under the new contribution limit, the less campaign spending and the more City government will be responsive to all San Franciscans.

You can "buy back" City government from the privileged and powerful with the most precious political commodities: your vote.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Mary Lohnes
Peter Fatooh
Judith Thorson

Babette Drefke
Daniel Jordan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F, an initiative of the people, is needed to protect the voters and the integrity of the legislative process from being corrupted by the power of money and influence. It prevents City officials and State Legislators from lobbying the City on behalf of high-powered special interests. It also lowers the campaign contribution limit from $1,000 to $500, thus reducing the influence of those same special interests over our elections and elected officials.

The bogus argument that the Mayor won't be able to find qualified people to serve on City commissions if Proposition F is adopted ignores the plain fact that there are 700,000 people in San Francisco, a pool of civic-minded citizens more than large enough to accommodate the 250 commission appointments available in our City government. For example, there are plenty of architects to fill the one architectural appointment on the Art Commission, just as there are plenty of non-lobbyist business people and lawyers available to serve on other commissions.

Thousands of San Franciscans, not just the "insiders", are ready, willing, and able to serve the public.

Proposition F deserves your vote. Restore integrity to City government. Restore the confidence of the citizens of San Francisco in that government: Let's have no more Wilkes Bashford situations.

VOTE YES ON F.

Oscar Sutro
Martha Gillham
Marguerite Warrent

Leonel Monterey
Tony Kilroy

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE "NO" ON F

This proposition disguises itself as "good government" but, in reality, would drive good people out of government. It is socrudely drawn—so sweeping in its implications—that it wouldbar from government almost anyone with even a remote business orcommunity tie to government.

It would purge from City commissions anyone who "directlyor indirectly" receives compensation from any "interests" withanissue before any City agency. Effectively, this would discrimi-nate against employees from community and neighborhoodgroups, civil rights organizations, non-profit corporations,labor unions, merchant and business groups, as well as archi-tects, lawyers and other professionals.

Actually, there currently are no commissioners who rep-resent any clients before any City agency. All who are appointedin my administration sign a statement saying they will not advo-cate for any paying client before any official body of the City

while they are commissioners. This proposition simply is notnecessary.

Proposition F also would lower the limit for any individualcampaign contribution from $1000 to $500. Although this sounds good, it would permit a wealthy person with variousbusinesses and numerous family members to contribute manythousands of dollars through different sources. This wouldencourage "hidden" contributions. We must strive for disclo-sure of contributions, not a system which drives contributionsunderground. Candidates must be able to raise funds enough toput their message before the voters. Reducing the contributionlimit can be a tactic to discourage persons from challengingincumbents.

Vote no on Proposition F.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition F purports to achieve a noble objective: The removal of "influence peddling" from City Hall. In fact, Propo-sition F is so poorly-crafted, it may have exactly the oppositeeffect on City government. It is not a "good government" initia-tive. It is bad legislation.

Proposition F provides no definitions and no standards for thepublic to judge whether City officials comply with its restric-tions. Its uncertainties will be chaotic and lead to endless,need-less lawsuits.

A measure similar to Proposition F was rejected by the Boardof Supervisors because no public hearings were ever held on thelegislation. If the public had had a chance to comment on this in-

itiative, it might not have the critical shortcomings, deficienciesand uncertainties that now warrant its rejection by responsibleSan Franciscans.

In the coming months, the Board will review good govern-ment measures that are comprehensive, effective and, most im-portant, certain. Proposition F is a misguided disaster.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

This should properly have been titled the "SINK WILLIE BROWN ORDINANCE"! The "meat of the cocoanut" is in Section 4.

Supervisor Kopp's intentions are good, however this sloppilydrafted and incomprehensible measure succeeds in "burningdown the barn" to eliminate a couple of rats!

Under this proposal, to avoid any potential INDIRECT con-flict of interest, (which is undefined!), one would have to be a destitute, unemployed welfare recipient to qualify for service onany City Board or Commission! The Mayor has already solvedthis "hired advocacy" problem with the "conflict of interest" af-fidavits she demands IN ADVANCE from any prospective

appointee.

Quentin's proposed $500.00 campaign contribution limit is an"inside joke" and he, of all people, knows it! It merely obliges aheavy contributor to have his wife, children, business associ-ates, or friends send in SEPARATE $500.00 checks if he wants to contribute more than $500.00 to a politician's campaign.

These proposals require additional City employees for en-forcement and wind up doing far more harm than good. Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr., President
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Union members and labor officials have legitimate reasons for meeting with City officers. It is unfair and wrong to lump them in the same category as special interest lobbyists, yet that’s exactly what Proposition F does. Working people deserve representation on City boards and commissions. VOTE NO!

Walter Johnson
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council
LeRoy King
James Elliot
Keith Eckman
Reva Olson

Jeff Greendorfer
Stan Smith
Larry Griffin
Steve Babcock
Terrence Ryan
Jack Beggs
Tony Marovich

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

If you want to ban business owners and executives from serving on City boards and commissions, then vote for Proposition F.

If you think board members of non-profit corporations and employees of community agencies have nothing to contribute to City government, then vote for Proposition F.

If you believe union members and labor officials should not have a voice at City Hall, then vote for Proposition F.

But if you share our belief that these individuals have legitimate concerns and expertise that is valuable in running major City departments, then join us in voting NO on Proposition F.

Proposition F is a simplistic, sloppily-drafted, meat axe approach to a problem already resolved by Mayor Feinstein’s ban on commissioners lobbying on behalf of private clients.

Proposition F is not good government and it is not reform. Proposition F is bad legislation. VOTE NO.

Hon. Amy Meyer
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Walter Jebe
Hon. Bruce Lilienthal
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Jean Kuriun
Hon. Thomas Horn
Hon. Henry Berman
Hon. Robert McCarthy
Hon. Richard Guggenheim
Hon. Tod Rosenblatt
Hon. Patrick McGrew
Hon. Kirk Miller
Hon. Melvin Lee
Hon. Jerry Berg
Hon. Bonnie Gibson
Hon. Mary Noel Pepys
Hon. Mark Buell
Hon. Tim Carrico
Hon. Jo Hanson
Hon. Kevin Malone
John Sanger
Tom Moore
Donald Didier
Jim Wachob
Anne Daley
Linda Post
Lynne Williams
Todd Dickinson
Peter Hanson
Herbert Karlan
William Scorrits
Van Hart
Iris Flutten
Noam Rand
John Schmidt
James Mock
Thomas Karwski
Wendy Goldberg
Joseph Schwartz
Belle Lazarus
Antonio Barrios
Bruce Barrett
Charles Howell
Walter McGuire
Sharon Duval
Joyce Mauriello

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

We’re sympathetic to the need for political reform. But it’s a complicated problem, and Proposition F just isn’t the way to go.

Frankly, we can’t tell who is and isn’t affected by this measure. While a handful of people sometimes might abuse their positions, that’s no reason to question the integrity of so many solid citizens who give tirelessly to public service. Proposition F is simply the wrong approach. Please join us in voting NO.

William E. McDonnell
Frances May McAteer
N. A. Sapunar
Caroline and Michael Figoni

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Concerned about elected officials spending $400,000 to run for supervisor and $1 million on a mayor’s race? Then vote NO on Proposition F.

That’s right. NO.

Proposition F isn’t going to do anything about campaign spending. Prop F simply limits the size of contributions, reducing the current limit from $1,000 to $500. Supervisors can and will continue spending outrageous sums on their re-election campaigns. With Proposition F they’ll just spend twice as much time raising money from twice as many sources, and that makes special interests even more powerful. They can always find ways around campaign limits.

We need campaign spending reform, but Proposition F doesn’t provide it. Please join us in voting No on F.

District 8 Democratic Club
Stephen L. Taber
Ruth Granavis
Alan Raznick
Miriam Blaustein

Linda Chapman
Dave Carson
James Fitz
Debra Barnes
Lew Serbin
Debra Stein

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

When campaign contributions are limited, political freedom suffers. Your right to free speech includes not only your right to express your views, but also your right to support as much as you want, any candidate who speaks for you.

Minority viewpoints depend heavily on the contribution of a few dedicated supporters to get your message out. To limit your financial support of your beliefs is to silence your political voice.

Only incumbents, who have many opportunities for free media exposure benefit from this assault on free speech. The dangers of a campaign contribution limit far outweigh any possible benefit from this proposition. Defeat Proposition F!

San Francisco Libertarian Party
Michael R. Fowler, Secretary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

You may think Prop F only applies to big-time lawyers and a few legislators who represent developers. Think again!

Prop F would prohibit many community leaders from public service. If it passes, board members and employees of community and charitable organizations could be banned from serving on City boards and commissions.

We appreciate the public need for a government free of “influencing peddling.” But restrictions on “compensated advocacy” ought to be clearly and carefully crafted to protect the voices of community leaders who argue on behalf of the public interest, not private special interests.

Vote No.

Hon. Juanita Del Carlo
Mission Hiring Hall

Bob Ross
Publisher, Bay Area Reporter

Hon. Jeffrey Ken Mori
Japanese Community Youth Council, Inc.

Bill O'Callahan
American Red Cross

Hon. George Sancin
Horizons Unlimited

Hon. Jean Rita Alviar
Mission Education Project

Hon. Greg Day
Folsom Street Tuna Hall

Hon. Naomi Gray
Hon. James Foster

Carol Wing
Marlena Marseille

Lee Woods
Jo Daly

Dennis Collins
Hon. H. Welton Flynn

(organizations listed only for purposes of identification.)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will have no effect on developers' lawyers. None.
It won't make any difference to state legislators either.
Don't kid yourself. This is not "reform" and it isn't "good government." Proposition F will allow the special interests and influence peddlers to continue exercising influence over our elected officials. It has so many loopholes, lobbying will actively continue, untouched, in the back rooms of City Hall.

And developers will always find ways around campaign contribution limits. As Common Cause has noted, Prop F simply makes tracing their dollars more difficult for the public.

Real reform would directly attack the source of huge contributions—the developers and other special interests that employ the lobbyists to peddle their influence.

VOTE NO.

Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
David Looman
Michael Mason

Rich Waller
Susan Klugerman
Rene Cazenave
Margie O'Driscoll

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION G
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has adopted an ordinance prohibiting the City, with certain exceptions, from purchasing goods or services from companies doing business with South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a declaration of policy that says the City must try to avoid doing business with companies that significantly profit from or help maintain the Apartheid system in South Africa. It calls on other public bodies and private groups to adopt similar policies. It directs the Board of Supervisors to identify the companies which have the greatest ties to Apartheid so that the public can also boycott those companies.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to avoid doing business with companies that help maintain Apartheid, and you want a public boycott of those companies.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to adopt this policy.

Controller's Statement on "G"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"The proposed Declaration of Policy be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

How "G" Got on Ballot

On November 6, 1985 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for the City to boycott businesses with significant ties to South Africa had qualified for the June ballot.

Ario Hale Smith, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,546 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on October 11.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,941 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

POLLs CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:
It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

A member and labor officials have legitimate reasons for working with City officers. It is unfair and wrong to lump them in the same category as special interest lobbyists, yet that's exactly what Proposition F does. Working people deserve representation on City boards and commissions. VOTE NO!

Walter Johnson  
Secretary-Treasurer  
San Francisco Labor Council  
LeRoy King  
James Elliot  
Keith Eickman  
Reesa Olson  
Jeff Greendorfer  
Stan Smith  
Larry Griffin  
Steve Rabissa  
Terrence Ryan  
Jack Beggs  
Tony Marovich

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

If you want to ban business owners and executives from serving on City boards and commissions, then vote for Proposition F. If you think board members of non-profit corporations and employees of community agencies have nothing to contribute to government, then vote for Proposition F. If you believe union members and labor officials should not be heard at City Hall, then vote for Proposition F.

Hon. Amy Meyer  
Hon. Susan Bierman  
Hon. Walter Jebe  
Hon. Bruce Lilienthal  
Hon. Doris Kahn  
Hon. Yoshihiko Nakashima  
Hon. Jean Kordan  
Hon. Thomas Horn  
Hon. Henry Berman  
Hon. Robert McCarthy  
Hon. Richard Guggenhime  
Hon. Toby Rosenblat  
Hon. Patrick McGrew  
Hon. Kirk Miller  
Hon. Melvin Lee  
Hon. Jerry Berg  
Hon. Bonnie Gibson  
Hon. Mary Noel Peps  
Hon. Mark Buehl  
Hon. Tim Carrico  
Hon. Jo Hanson  
Hon. Kevin Malone  
John Sanger  
Tom Moore  
Donald Dister  
Jim Wachob  
Anne Daley  
Linda Post  
Lynne Williams  
Todd Dickinson  
Peter Hanson  
Herbert Kurlan  
William Scorsitis  
Van Hart  
Iris Fueielen  
Noam Rand  
John Schmidt  
James Mack  
Thomas Karwaki  
Wendy Goldberg  
Joseph Schwartz  
Belle Lazarus  
Antonio Barrillos  
Bruce Barrett  
Charles Howell  
Walter McGuire  
Sharon Davai  
Joyce Mauriello

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

We are sympathetic to the need for political reform. But it's a complicated problem, and Proposition F just isn't the way to go. Frankly, we can't tell who is and isn't affected by this measure. A handful of people sometimes might abuse their position, but that's no reason to question the integrity of so many solid citizens who give tirelessly to public service. Proposition F is simply the wrong approach. Please join us in voting NO.

William E. McDonnell  
Frances May McAteer  
N. A. Sapunar  
Caroline and Michael Figno  
Martin D. Murphy  
Eugene C. Payne III  
Suzanne B. McCarthy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

We are concerned about elected officials spending $400,000 to run a supervisor and $1 million on a mayor's race? Then vote NO on Proposition F.

Proposition F isn't going to do anything about campaign spending. Prop F simply limits the size of contributions, reduces the current limit from $1,000 to $500. Supervisors can and continue spending outrageous sums on their re-election campaigns. With Proposition F they'll just spend twice as much raising money from twice as many sources, and that makes special interests even more powerful. They can always find ways around campaign limits.

We need campaign spending reform, but Proposition F doesn't provide it. Please join us in voting NO on F.

District 8 Democratic Club
Stephen L. Taber  
Ruth Gravonas  
Alan Buznick  
Miriam Blaustein  
Linda Chapman  
Dale Carlson  
James Firth  
Debra Barnes  
Lew Sebin  
Debra Stein

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

When campaign contributions are limited, political freedom suffers. Your right to free speech includes not only your right to express your views, but also your right to support as much as you want, any candidate who speaks for you.

Minority viewpoints depend heavily on the contribution of a few dedicated supporters to get your message out. To limit your financial support of your beliefs is to silence your political voice.

Only incumbents, who have many opportunities for free media exposure benefit from this assault on free speech. The dangers of a campaign contribution limit far outweigh any possible benefit from this proposition. **Defeat Proposition F**

San Francisco Libertarian Party
Michael R. Fowler, Secretary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

You may think Prop F only applies to big-time lawyers and a few legislators who represent developers. Think again!

Prop F would prohibit many community leaders from public service. If it passes, board members and employees of community and charitable organizations could be **banned** from serving on City boards and commissions.

We appreciate the public need for a government free of "influencing peddling." But restrictions on "compensated advocacy" ought to be clearly and carefully crafted to protect the voices of community leaders who argue on behalf of the public interest, not private special interests.

Vote No.

Hon. Jennita Del Carlo
Mission Hiring Hall

Bob Ross
Publisher, Bay Area Reporter

Hon. Jeffrey Ken Mori
Japanese Community Youth Council, Inc.
Bill O'Callahan
American Red Cross
Hon. George Sunic
Horizons Unlimited
Hon. Jean Rika Alviar
Mission Education Project
Hon. Greg Day
Pek Street Town Hall
Hon. Naomi Gray
Hon. James Foster
Carol Wong
Marilyn Marsee
Lee Woods
Jo Daly
Dennis Collins
Hon. H. Welton Flynn
(Organizations listed only for purposes of identification.)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will have **no effect** on developers' lawyers. None.

It won't make any difference to state legislators either.

Don't kid yourself. This is not "reform" and it isn't "good government." Proposition F will allow the special interests and influence peddlers to continue exercising influence over our elected officials. It has so many loopholes, lobbying will actively continue, untouched, in the back rooms of City Hall.

And developers will always find ways around campaign contribution limits. As Common Cause has noted, Prop F simply makes tracing their dollars more difficult for the public.

Real reform would directly attack the source of huge contributions—the developers and other special interests that employ the lobbyists to peddle their influence.

**VOTE NO.**

Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
David Looman
Michael Mason

Rich Waller
Susan Khurgarian
Rene Cazeneave
Margie O'Driscoll

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
South Africa Boycott

PROPOSITION G

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?

YES 300

NO 301

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has adopted an ordinance prohibiting the City, with certain exceptions, from purchasing goods or services from companies doing business with South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a declaration of policy that says the City must try to avoid doing business with companies that significantly profit from or help maintain the Apartheid system in South Africa. It calls on other public bodies and private groups to adopt similar policies. It directs the Board of Supervisors to identify the companies which have the greatest ties to Apartheid so that the public can also boycott those companies.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to avoid doing business with companies that help maintain Apartheid, and you want a public boycott of those companies.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

“The proposed Declaration of Policy be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.

How “G” Got on Ballot

On November 6, 1985 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for the City to boycott businesses with significant ties to South Africa had qualified for the June ballot.

Arlo Hale Smith, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,546 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on October 11.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,941 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:

It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This measure calls for a public boycott of companies that aid apartheid.

Any claim of "conflict" between Proposition G and existing anti-apartheid legislation is imaginary: It is the legislative intent of supporters of this measure that it can be construed as a directive for making existing law tougher.

Personal attacks have no legitimate place in a ballot measure campaign. As proponent of this measure, I repudiate all such tactics.

Vote NO on apartheid. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Arlo Hale Smith

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Boycotts are grassroots politics. They've helped the farm workers, they've helped win integration, and they can help end the legal racism called "Apartheid".

A Gallup poll found 77% of South Africa's black majority favoring international economic boycotts to force the Apartheid regime to accept reform peacefully.

After the Boycott Initiative made the ballot, the San Francisco Supervisors unanimously passed a similar city purchasing policy. The issue that remains is whether to call on the general public to join in, boycotting companies identified by the Supervisors as the worst offenders in each industry.

The companies that would be targeted consider profits to be the "bottom line". Economic pressure is all they understand.

The AFL-CIO, NAACP, and NOW have called a boycott of Shell Oil because of its profiteering from South Africa's oppressive economic conditions. Proposition G supports that and would put the same pressure on other industries as well.

This proposition is supported by the elected county central committee of the Democratic Party, the Peace-and-Freedom Party and the Humanist Party, and by leading attorneys, such as Terry Francois, Terence Hallinan, Tony Serra, Lewis Hope Lee, Marc Van Der Hout, Abby Ginsberg and Terence Redmond.

If South Africa were a democracy, its majority would long ago have voted to end Apartheid. We need to vote Yes—because they can't.

Atty. Arlo Hale Smith; Democratic Party County Central Committee
Paul Kangas, Peace and Freedom Party
Lois Salisbury, Public Advocates*
Dr. Kevin Danaher, Food First*
Jesse James, Mission Rebels
Terry Collins, Community Activist
Sony Geber, Election Action
Robert McCall, Hotel & Restaurant Employees
Executive Board Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Attorneys speak out against Apartheid:
South African police can arrest anyone without charge. They can hold you incommunicado—no contacts with family, lawyers or press.

They regularly censor news, books, music. They have banned Christmas caroling, funerals and other peaceful gatherings. Groups which criticize the government are forbidden to hold meetings.

Blacks are subject to legal segregation; their property and employment rights are greatly restricted; often, they are simply murdered.

As attorneys, we help people who have legal rights that are being violated. But what can we do for those who have no legal rights?

Boycotts and other economic sanctions are the only way to make the Apartheid government accept reform peacefully.

In the Court of World Public Opinion, Apartheid has been convicted of crimes against humanity. By imposing a sentence of economic isolation, we can end Apartheid.

Vote Yes—take a stand for justice.

Terence Hallinan
Arlo Hale Smith
Terry Francois
Karen Anderson Ryer
Robert R. Bryan

Ann Menasche
Rachel Ginsburg
Leo Paoli
Gabriel Gesmer
Ora Proskovnik

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is a moderate, responsible but effective proposal to bring economic pressure on the South African government to establish constitutional rights for all of its citizens. Vote Yes.

Terence Faulkner, Republican
Mike Garza, Republican

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

All decent Americans abhor apartheid. However, boycotting U.S. investment in South Africa is counterproductive; it only penalizes the actual victims of apartheid. U.S. international firms have acted as progressive agents for change through the Sullivan principles. Their investments have improved the social and economic condition of the labor force. It is improper to penalize their positive contributions.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

We are individuals and organizations working actively to end the racist system of apartheid in South Africa. And we are voting NO on Proposition G. Why?
(1) Because Proposition G will weaken San Francisco's present divestment law. This law requires companies doing business with the city to sign affidavits that they will make no new contracts with South Africa. Proposition G has no such provision.
(2) Proposition G provides no mechanism or funding to carry out its declared purpose of "boycotting" South Africa. Proposition G will not stop South African products from entering the Port of San Francisco.
Vote against this useless, confusing, and deceptive initiative.

Preserve the stronger divestment law San Francisco already has. Vote NO on Proposition G!

Yvonne Golden
Geraldine Johnson
Dr. Julienne Malveaux
AFT 221 Anti-Apartheid Committee
Artists Against Apartheid
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Coalition of Conscience
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club Executive Committee
ILWU 10 and SEIU 250 Southern Africa Liberation Support Committees
National Conference of Black Lawyers
San Francisco Anti-Apartheid Committee
Southern Africa Freedom Committee/All Peoples Congress

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?
Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.
The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.
The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.
Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1983 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!
AIDS Research

PROPOSITION H
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?

YES 303  NO 304

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Several city and private agencies conduct various programs related to AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a declaration of policy that says San Francisco should support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council, consisting of a Committee on Education and a Fund-Raising Committee. The Research Committee would make recommendations on the most useful AIDS research projects and try to prevent duplication of efforts. The Education Committee would inform the public about the latest research and about ways to prevent AIDS. The Fund-Raising Committee would seek donations and grants for AIDS research and education projects.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

Controller's Statement on "H"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

"The proposed Declaration of Policy for an AIDS research and education council and the formation of advisory committees of civic leaders would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, additional expenditure of public funds for AIDS research may result, the amount of which cannot be determined."

How "H" Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for AIDS research had qualified for the June ballot.

Stony Gebert, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 10,540 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on December 6, 1984.

A check of each signature on the petition showed that 7,564 of the signatures were valid. This is more than 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We need a council to expose and address major AIDS issues without the impasse of present medical/political bias.

As taxpayers, we are subsidizing a treadmill of continual AIDS casualties. There are major oversights where AIDS is concerned. Only recently was it learned that CDC statistics suggest 79% of early AIDS cases appear drug-related. We hear AIDS is 100% fatal. Perhaps that is because death may also be drug-related in the way of immuno-suppressive antibiotic and radiation overloads to already compromised immunity systems. Prevailing medicine is both tunnel-visioned and high-profit motivated. Also well-funded. This solution may be part of the problem. Some physicians are beginning to feel where AIDS is concerned many current practices are ethically, medically bankrupt.

Remissions occur. Largely through immunity-enhancing, holistic medicine. Significantly, only 1% of AIDS cases occur among people at risk in the Asian community. Perhaps this is due to less drug abuse or use of an unfunded, ignored resource: herbology as part of diet. More options: homeopathy, acupuncture, etc.

If, as anticipated, upwards of 40% of those testing positive come down with AIDS, we may become overburdened. To ignore all of the above becomes part of the problem. Vote Yes on Propositon H.

Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Rich McKirkeby, Former Orderly,
Marketing Associate, Pacific Bell
Joseph P. Clady, AIDS Hospice, Shanti Counselor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There is great need for research and education about AIDS and related conditions.

We need to attack the disease, not its victims.

Knowledge is the only vaccine available today.

Vote Yes.

John Lorenzini, President,
People With AIDS Alliance
Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Jan Beck, Steven Russell, Eugene Ewins, ARC/AIDS Vigil

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There are many possible treatments for AIDS and related conditions which are not being examined by the federal government, especially therapies based on natural substances and processes.

Vote Yes for an AIDS Research Council open to all viewpoints.

Scott Gregory, M.D.
Paul Kangas

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A tape recording (Talking Book) of the San Francisco Voter Information pamphlet is available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar’s Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

---

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name_________________________________________________________

Address________________________________________ Apt. #________

Telephone No. (required)______________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:
I want to work in the following area(s): ___________________________

Second choice locations (if any)________________________________

Signature____________________________________________________
PROPOSITION I

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway? YES 307 NO 308

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the Freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a policy statement asking whether or not the Embarcadero Freeway should be torn down.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City’s policy to remain as it is, and you want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to change the City’s policy, and you do not want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway demolished, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by at least $10.2 million in local funds. Potential private sector financing and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “I” Got on Ballot

On March 3 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy placing the question of demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway before the voters had qualified for the June ballot.

Richard Hongisto, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 11,119 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,720 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land now under the Broadway ramps is put back on the tax rolls, with low-rise buildings limited by restrictive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when united with Proposition J, recognizes these facts:

1) The Embarcadero Freeway is what is left of a never-completed elevated freeway that would have ringed the City through North Beach and Marina neighborhoods to the Golden Gate Bridge.

2) Today this massive freeway, which separates us from our waterfront, would never be built.

3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.

4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf will be preserved.

5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked for this new system.

6) Only that portion of the Embarcadero Freeway east and north of the Main and Beale Street ramps—basically the portion directly on the waterfront—will be removed to make way for the new system. The removal cost, approximately $10 million to be paid for with privately-generated new revenues, is a relatively small part of the overall new system.

As for Proposition J, vote "YES, let's tear down the Embarcadero Freeway." Then turn to Proposition J and support the plan for a beautiful waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Removing the Embarcadero Freeway will allow San Francisco to:

- Create a six-lane, tree-lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero.
- Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway.
- Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula.
- Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero.
- Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.
- Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won't benefit San Francisco. Don't let outsiders determine our future. Vote YES on I.

Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Jack Holley
Roger Boyer
A. Lee Knight
Robert Bradford
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Donald A. Crosby, AIA
Rai Y. Okamoto
Robert Meyers
Ralph Hurtado
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Douglas G. Wright
Anita Sanchez

Chuck Forester
Fritz Arko
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones
Randall Rossi
Karl Linfield
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
Jon Twitchell
Jane Winslow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON I

This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY—VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds—without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city's fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT—VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also take years to rebuild. Estimates range up to 15 years.

ABSENT VOTER BALLOT APPLICATION

Application must be received by the registrar of voters no later than 5/27/86.

Election Date June 3, 1986

PLEASE PRINT REGISTERED NAME:

FIRST NAME MIDDLE NAME LAST NAME RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX NUMBER)

MAIL COMPLETED FORM TO:

Registrar of Voters Room 155 City Hall San Francisco, CA 94102

NUMBER AND STREET—DESIGNATE N, S, E, W CITY ZIP

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT (DO NOT PRINT) DATE (AREA CODE) DAYTIME TELEPHONE

I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.

(AREA CODE) RESIDENCE TELEPHONE

THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT PROPER SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE) STREET OR BOX

CITY STATE ZIP

DATE OF BIRTH

OFFICIAL USE ONLY


Signature and Registration Verified as Correct:

Date Deputy Registrar

Travel within the city would be slowed down at all hours. Vote no to the destruction of the freeway.

ions to only 37 intersections. Congestion increases up to 75% and Golden Gate Bridge person hours of travel will be 75% lower. The freeway is allowed to close that the times have up to Montgomery Street! Endowed taxpayers, we urge a

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled. Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land back on the tax rolls, waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when
these facts:
1) The Embarcadero completed elevated free through North Beach an
Gate Bridge.
2) Today this massive

FROM:

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACIÓN?)

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK— VOTE YES ON I

This is our chance to clear up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY— VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds— without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city’s fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT—VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to $15.7 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown, Fisherman's Wharf and the financial district would be reduced.

Travel within the city would be slowed down at all hours. Vote no to the destruction of the freeway.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:

- Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
- Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
- If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
  - By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
  - Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
  - MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
  - Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Judith Tornese

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Tear it down? The concept is preposterous! There are 70,000 cars a day whizzing by on this high speed downtown elevated waterfront freeway! Where will they all go?

Aside from the outrageous demolition costs involved, (some engineers estimate $40,000,000 of taxpayer money!), eyeball observation, logic, and just plain “common sense” dictates that ground level “total gridlock” will result if this expensive freeway is now destroyed.

Nostalgic individuals must realize that the times have changed. We can't bring the Bay back up to Montgomery Street! On behalf of San Francisco's overburdened taxpayers, we urge a NO vote!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled.
Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?

YES 310
NO 311

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a policy statement that says that the City would replace the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt a policy statement which says that the Embarcadero Freeway would be torn down if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt a policy statement to replace the Embarcadero Freeway under these conditions.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway replaced with a tree-lined six lane boulevard and other traffic and transit improvements, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by approximately $27.5 million. This includes a one-time freeway demolition cost of $10.2 million plus $17.3 million required to match potential federally-funded transit improvements. Potential financing by the State and private sector and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “J” Got on Ballot

On March 5 a declaration of policy regarding the future of the Embarcadero Freeway was delivered to the Registrar from the Mayor and several supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows the Mayor or four or more supervisors to submit a declaration of policy to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

In addition to Mayor Feinstein, the March 5 document was signed by Supervisors Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker, Molinari, Kennedy and Nelder.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans now have a chance to remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with an at-grade, six-lane parkway, which will open our waterfront and restore views blocked for years by this large freeway.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for traffic and transit improvements:

• New, shorter freeway ramps connecting directly with The Embarcadero;
• A tree-lined, at-grade, 6-lane Embarcadero Boulevard, with a new waterfront Muni line, a jogging and bicycle path from Fisherman’s Wharf to Mission Bay;
• Extension of Muni Metro south to the Caltrain station at 4th and Townsend;
• New ramps connecting I-280 with The Embarcadero;
• Changes in traffic flow and improvements to existing freeway ramps.

Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman’s Wharf will be preserved and enhanced.

The Board of Supervisors has specified that the Embarcadero Freeway will be torn down only if preliminary engineering during the next two years confirms — as traffic and environmental studies already have — that removal of the freeway will not result in more problems than it solves.

San Francisco became eligible for $88 million in federal highway funds for this new system when the Supervisors approved the plan in 1980. The $10.2 million cost of freeway demolition itself can be paid from revenues from low-rise development of the parcels now under the Broadway ramps and the increased values of nearby properties. Strict waterfront zoning limits the size of any development.

Traffic and environmental studies by the California Department of Transportation since 1980 clearly indicate that the new waterfront transportation system will be vastly superior to the existing situation, and that traffic congestion levels will not be notably different with the elevated structure removed.

Vote Yes on J and let’s remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with a parkway and transit system — once again let us see our waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J gives the voters a chance to be heard on an important and timely issue. This issue is the replacement of a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway as one element of a comprehensive package of transportation improvements in the Waterfront area.

Last fall, the Board of Supervisors adopted for further study a set of traffic and transit improvements for the Waterfront. These improvements include:

• a new landscaped surface-level boulevard
• replacement of the Clay/Washington and Broadway on and off ramps with new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom
• removal of the unused stub of I-280 and construction of new ramps connecting the new waterfront boulevard to Route I-280
• a new light rail transit line linking Fort Mason with the Caltrain Depot
• extension of the Muni Metro to the train depot, improving the Peninsula Commute Service

A YES vote on Proposition J does not allocate funds for these projects. It does allow for further design and engineering studies, including cost analysis, assessment of impacts on traffic, and other matters. The studies will then be presented to the Supervisors so that they can make an informed decision on the plan. If the studies prove positive, San Francisco will be able to transform its Waterfront for the benefit of all.

Proposition J will insure that the City will not proceed with the removal of any of the Freeway until all the studies are completed and all potential consequences are assessed. This is the responsible approach. Vote YES on J.

SPUR
League of Women Voters
Embarcadero Citizens Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SAN FRANCISCO’S NEIGHBORHOODS ASK YOU TO VOTE YES ON J.

REDUCE TRAFFIC CONGESTION — YES ON J!

Traffic backed up by the Embarcadero Roadway slows travel and creates congestion in North Beach and other nearby neighborhoods. J will speed traffic flow.

IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION — YES ON J!

Proposition J will provide regular streetcar service along the Embarcadero and extend Muni Metro service to the south, ultimately extending to Bayview-Hunters Point.

PROMOTE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY — YES ON J!

If Proposition J does not pass, San Francisco could lose $88 million in federal funds for traffic improvements.

(continued)
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

RESTORE THE WATERFRONT — YES ON J!

San Francisco's waterfront could become a focal point for the city, graced by a grand promenade, instead of the dismal, deteriorating eyesore it is now.

San Francisco's neighborhoods join together to ask your support for an improved Embarcadero. We guarantee the freeway will not be removed unless it is replaced by facilities that will assure a smoother, more efficient traffic flow. YES ON J!

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Robert Bradford
Rash Gravani
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Anita Sanchez

Nancy Katz
Robert Katz
Beverly Mills
North Beach Neighborhoods
John Behanna
Herbert D. Novitz
Jerry Hartado
Gregory E. Jones
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors
Dale A. Carlin
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Ralph Hartado
Hon. Susan Berman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Chuck Forester
David M. Hartley
Donald P. Black
Mrs. Bland Platt
Richard Reinhardt
James W. Haas
James Ream
Jill M. Jones
Peter J. Locke
Marjorie G. Stern
John B. Lowry
Lawrence Finlini
Nancy Peters
Steven Tuber

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SUPPORT PUBLIC TRANSIT — VOTE YES ON J.
SAVE SAN FRANCISCO FROM GRIDLOCK — VOTE YES ON J.

The revitalization of the Northeastern Waterfront...as included in San Francisco's Master Plan and transit plans, as overwhelmingly approved by the Board of Supervisors and as urged by Mayor Feinstein...will allow almost $90 million in unused federal highway funds to be used for vital downtown and waterfront transit and street improvements which will be a key to reducing needless auto congestion in San Francisco.

PROPOSITION J SUPPORTS IMPORTANT TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS TO THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT. It will:
—extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific/CalTrain depot
—create a new rail line (possibly using historic streetcars) to connect the entire waterfront from Mission Bay to the Ferry Building to Fisherman's Wharf and Fort Mason
—set the stage for a possible streetcar line along Third Street
Since the city of San Francisco adopted the Transit First policy in the early 1970's, transit investments in the Muni Metro,

in new electric trolley an articulated bus service, and in BART and Golden Gate Transit, have saved downtown San Francisco from gridlock!

IF you are concerned about the future of transit in San Francisco, IF you are concerned about reducing needless auto congestion, THEN we urge you to join Mayor Feinstein and the majority of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in voting Yes on Proposition J.

Norman Rolfe
San Francisco Muni Coalition
California Transit League
Jack Wholey
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Regina Sneed
Tony Kilroy
Hon. Jack Morrison
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Bay Area Gramshill Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Hon. Amy Meyer, Recreation and Park Commissioner
Alan Lubliner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A SOUND BUSINESS PROPOSITION — YES ON J!

Common sense and good business demand we make the most of our resources. San Francisco's waterfront is an economic and civic asset unrivaled anywhere — yet much of it is cut off by an ugly, noisy, elevated roadway. The traffic improvements called for by Proposition J will benefit workers, tourists, property owners, neighborhoods...and business.

—Traffic flow and transit will move quickly on a realigned, reorganized Embarcadero Roadway, allowing easier, more pleasant access to waterfront businesses.

—An improved and beautified Embarcadero will create new commercial opportunities and increase the value of existing property and businesses.

—New jobs and an expanded tax base will generate increased revenue for the city as several lots now covered by freeway ramps return to productive private ownership. Though limited to low rise development (40 to 65 feet), tax revenues from development will more than make up the city's share of the project.

—Other projects in the area, such as upgrading piers 1½, 3, and 5 as well as the Ferry Building and existing facilities like the YMCA will benefit from the proposed improvements.

—Traffic studies show overall access to the downtown will be improved by Proposition J. Federal money has been set aside for this proposal and cannot be used for other projects in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON THIS CAREFULLY PLANNED PROJECT TO REVITALIZE OUR WATERFRONT!

Robert Meyers
Dennis J. Potts
Kenneth R. Litch
M. Arthur Gessler, Jr., PPA
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Gehart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones
Randall Rossi
Karl A. Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
Jon Twitchell
Petra Arkos
Michael J. O'Sha

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J OFFERS RESIDENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO A ONCE IN A LIFETIME OPPORTUNITY TO RECAPTURE THEIR WATERFRONT.

Converting the Embarcadero into a tree-lined boulevard and building a new streetcar line will make the waterfront more pedestrian and transit oriented, that is, more people oriented. A freeway structure that is a source of objectionable noise and casts a pall over a large part of the waterfront will be removed. The waterfront will be opened up to sunlight and fresh air and made more inviting and cheerful to those who wish to walk on one of the world’s outstanding waterfronts. Air pollution that is now retained by the existing elevated structure will be dissipated.

The transit orientation of the new waterfront will encourage energy conservation. Proposition J will:

— Create a six-lane, tree-lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero
— Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway
— Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula

— Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero
— Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line
— Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won’t benefit San Francisco. Don’t let outsiders determine our future.

VOTE YES ON J FOR A BETTER SAN FRANCISCO.

Sierra Club
Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage
Willinks Mccrea*
Bob Cramer*
Rebecca Evans*
Richard Livingston*
Marilyn Clements*
Jennie Lev*
Jeffrey Henne*
Jane Wisslow*
Roger Boyer
A. Lee Knight
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Patrick S. Hobin
Monica Halloran
Walter K. Morris
Lisa Klawun
Jeffrey Heiler
Bob Isaacs
George T. Rockrise, FAIA
Jon Twitchell
Marc Kaszy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J GIVES US A CHANCE TO CORRECT A COLOSSAL MISTAKE!

The Embarcadero Freeway should never have been built. The original plan was to build a freeway from bridge to bridge, destroying the Northern Waterfront, Fisherman’s Wharf, Fort Mason, and Marina Green in the process. When the people of San Francisco saw what was happening, they stopped it in mid-air—literally.

Walk under it. Hear the noise. Feel the gloom. See how it cuts out light.

It’s time to remove this mistake.

The new waterfront plan will give us a tree-lined boulevard, a new streetcar line, and a Muni Metro extension to the Southern Pacific/Cultrain depot. It will give us a transit and pedestrian oriented waterfront that will give us pride and pleasure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J!

San Francisco Tomorrow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, with a membership of 1700 working architects in San Francisco, urges a “YES” vote on Proposition J. In 1968 the citizens of San Francisco stopped highway planners from ringing our waterfront with freeways. Today voters have another opportunity to return the waterfront to our citizens. Removal of the Embarcadero Freeway is one part of a carefully researched transit plan for San Francisco. This proposition supplies an unique opportunity to carry out a broad range of transportation improvements that will have many positive effects on the City of San Francisco.

Removal of the freeway will:

1. Return the waterfront to the people by removing this barrier to access and view.
2. Facilitate needed MUNI improvements.
3. Encourage development of the Embarcadero as a grand civic boulevard unifying the City of San Francisco.

The members of the American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition I and “YES” on Proposition J.

Donald Kennedy, FAIA
President
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans love their City, the ambiance, the Bay, waterfront, the views, the healthy neighborhoods. Freeway builders did their damnest to destroy the City and divide our neighborhoods.

Now we can remove that damned spot, the concrete dinosaur, the hideous barrier that destroys our scenic views, the fence that keeps us from the Bay, the concealer of the Ferry Building. Correct a mistake.

VOTE YES ON J.

Miriam Blaustein
Charlene Clark
Marie Cleasby
Zach Cowan
Dick Grosboll
Rick Hauptman
Tony Kilroy
Jean Korzon
Ira Karlander
Jack Morrison
Andy Nash
Norman Rolfe

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

NO ON PROPOSITION J.

"J" is for JOKE—a cruel joke on us. What will J really do? Add traffic to every street east of Gough. Delay the construction of waterfront streetcar service. Cost millions in local dollars needed to improve MUNI. Create a ground-level freeway on the waterfront as big as Van Ness, with more cars.

I'm a private citizen who's concerned about traffic and what it's doing to our City. If you are too, vote NO on Proposition J.

Steve Colman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:

- Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
- Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
- If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that:
  - By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%.
  - If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
  - Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
  - MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
  - Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Blair C. Pascoe

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION A

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by boldface type.

3.202 Office of Risk Management
There is established under the chief administrative officer an office of risk management which shall review, analyze and report to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the finance committee of the board of supervisors the practices of the several departments, boards and commissions of the city and county regarding loss prevention and risk management, including the insurance requirements of the city and county.
The office shall also establish and assist in the implementation of planning and operational guidelines regarding risk management and loss prevention for each department, board or commission. The chief administrative officer may appoint, at his or her pleasure, or contract with, a qualified individual or organization for the operation of the office. The qualifications of the individual or organization operating the office shall include relevant education, training and experience in insurance and risk management.

3.401 City Attorney
(a) The city attorney shall be an elective officer. He shall furnish an official bond in the sum of ten thousand dollars ($10,000). He shall appoint, and at his pleasure may remove, all assistants and employees of his office. He shall devote his entire time and attention to the duties of his office. He must, at the time of his election, be an elector of the city and county, qualified to practice in all the courts of the state, and he must have been so qualified for at least 10 years next preceding his election.

The city attorney must represent the city and county in all actions and proceedings in which it may be legally interested, or, for or against the city and county, or, any officer of the city and county in any action or proceeding, when directed so to do by the supervisors, except where a cause of action exists in favor of the city and county against said officer. Whenever any cause of action exists in favor of the city and county, the city attorney shall commence the same when within his knowledge or when directed so to do by the supervisors. He shall give his advice or opinion in writing to any officer, board or commission of the city and county when requested. Except as otherwise provided in this charter, he shall not settle or dismiss any litigation for or against the city and county, unless, upon his written recommendation, he is ordered so to do by ordinance.

The city attorney shall prepare, or approve as to form, all ordinances before they are enacted by the supervisors. He shall approve, by endorsement in writing, the form of all official or other bonds required by this charter or by ordinance before the same are submitted to the proper commission, board or office for final approval, and no such bonds shall be finally approved without such approval as to form by the city attorney. Except as otherwise in this charter provided, the city attorney shall be present at all meetings of the board of supervisors, and shall have right to approve the draft or form of all contracts before the same are accepted on behalf of the city and county. He shall examine and approve the title of all real property to be acquired by the city and county.

He shall keep on file in his office copies of all written communications and opinions, also all papers, briefs, and transcripts used in matters wherein he appears; and books of record and registers of all actions or proceedings in his charge in which the city and county or any officer or board thereof, is a party or is interested.

(b) The duties of the city attorney in connection with the bureau of delinquent revenue collection shall be transferred to the county auditor by the city attorney for said bureau who shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

(c) There is established in the office of the city attorney a bureau of claims investigation and administration which shall have the responsibility of investigating, evaluating and processing for the several boards, commissions and departments all claims for money or damages made upon the city and county pursuant to section 7.703 of this charter or the general law of the State of California. Claim investigation functions of the police department in existence on June 4, 1986, shall continue as an adjunct to the bureau established under this section. Claims functions of the public utilities commission shall remain under that commission unless transferred to the bureau of claims investigation and administration by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the bureau shall also have the power to investigate events and occurrences giving rise to potential civil liability against the city and county and adjust and settle demands, within dollar limits to be established by ordinance, prior to their presentation as claims. There shall be established by ordinance a revolving fund to satisfy such demands adjusted prior to their presentation as claims. The bureau shall be responsible for the investigation of all claims and the analysis of city policies and practices upon which the bureau shall report and advise the several departments.

The city attorney shall appoint a chief of the bureau who shall serve at his or her pleasure. The chief of the bureau may appoint, subject to confirmation by the city attorney, investigators who shall serve at the pleasure of the chief; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of civil claims investigator or any equivalent classification on the date of approval of this amendment by the electorate shall continue to have civil service status to said position under the civil service provisions of this charter.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

- NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by boldface type; deletions are indicated by horizontal strikethrough.

7.100 Materials, Supplies and Equipment
The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreements for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract. All purchases in excess of one thousand dollars ($1,000) shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases and a permanent record of all such quotations shall be kept. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) for materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify therein that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of materials, supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two or more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned and may advertise for
bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own manufacture, and the purchase of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the department head concerned.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall direct the rejection of all articles which may be below standards, specifications or samples furnished. He shall not approve any bill or voucher for articles not in conformity with specifications, or which are at variance with any contract.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall also have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment purchased and in use in all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.

7.03 Requisition, Contract and Payment

All purchase orders and contracts shall be based on written requisitions, or, for materials, or supplies in common use in the various departments, on the purchaser's record of requirements by the department. Purchases made from contracts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) may be approved by the chief administrative officer. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall approve all bids and vouchers for materials, supplies, equipment, and contractual services before the controller shall draw and approve warrants therefor. All contracts for the purchase of materials, supplies and equipment shall be made after inviting sealed bids by publication. All sealed bids received shall be kept on file. When an award of contract is made, notice that the same has been made shall be given by one publication, and any interested person may examine the bids and records in the purchaser's office.

The purchaser of supplies shall have rules and regulations, approved by the chief administrative officer and the controller, designate and authorize appropriate personnel within the purchasing department to exercise the purchaser's signature powers for purchase orders and contracts ap- proved as provided in this charter.

7.20 Public Works and Purchasing Contracts

The construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements, and the purchasing of supplies, materials and equipment, when the expenditure involved in each case shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), shall be done by contract, except as otherwise provided by this charter. It shall constitute official misconduct to split or divide any public work or improvement or purchase into two or more units for the purpose of evading the contract provisions of this section. In an emergency, provided an actual emergency is declared by the board of supervisors to exist, and when authorized by resolution of said board, any public work or improvement may be executed in the most expeditious manner. Notwithstanding any other provision in this section or this chapter contained, upon the approval of the chief administrative officer declaring the work to be emergency in character, there may be expended by the department of public works the sum not to exceed five hundred dollars ($500) for new construction of any type in or upon unimproved or unacceptable streets.

Any public work or improvement estimated to cost less than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) may be performed under contract or written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county. Any public work or improvement executed by the city, other than routine repair work, shall be authorized by the chief administrative officer when the cost exceeds fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or by the heads of departments not under the chief administrative officer, only after detailed estimates have been prepared and submitted by the heads of departments concerned. There shall be separate accounting for each work or improvement so executed, which accounting shall include all direct, indirect and supervisory elements of cost chargeable to such work or improvement, and each cost accounting shall be reported to the chief administrative officer, or to the mayor when such work shall have been performed by departments not under the chief administrative officer. All such accounts shall be reported to the controller. Any public work or improvement costing less than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) and not purchased by the city and county labor, materials, and supplies shall, if not performed under contract, be covered by written order or agreement which shall be based on not less than three bids, notice of which shall be given by three days' posting. Records of such bids shall be kept by the department.

7.09 Public Works Contract Procedure by Ordinance

Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter and, in particular, the provisions of section 7.20, the board of supervisors shall have the power to enter into contracts for public works or improvements and to employ the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county, consistent, save as to monetary limits, with the manner provided for in section 7.20 and section 7.100.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.

7.210 Public Works Contract Procedure by Ordinance

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D, Continued from page 25

point two commissioners to terms of one year each, one commissioner to a term of two years, one commissioner to a term of three years and one commissioner to a term of four years. Thereafter, the terms of the commissioners shall be for four years from the commencement thereof. Not less than one-fourth of the members of said commission shall be of the same sex, and one member shall have prior experience representing labor and one member shall have prior experience representing management.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am appointed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of one hundred dollars ($100).

—Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of considering and adopting examination questions shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public, except in such cases as may impose undue hardships on the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission, after the regular daily working hours of 8am to 5pm. Such person or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commissioner, but no final decision is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

In accordance with section 3590, the commission shall have the power and it shall be its duty to appoint an executive assistant to be the administrative head of the affairs under its control who shall serve at its pleasure; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of assistant secretary to the civil service commission on the effective date of this section as amended shall continue to have civil service status in the position of executive assistant under the civil service provisions of this charter.

3.661 General Powers and Duties

—Civil service commission shall be the employment and personnel department of the city and county and shall determine appointments on the basis of merit and fitness, as shown by appropriate tests.

The commission shall classify and, from time to time, may reclassify, in accordance with duties and responsibilities of the employment, and training and experience required, all places of employment in the departments and offices of the city and county not specifically excepted by this charter from the civil service provisions thereof, or which may be created hereafter by general law and not specifically excepted from said civil service provisions. The commission shall likewise classify all other places of employment in the city and county service specifically excepted from the civil service provisions of this charter, but which, by the provisions of section 4401 thereof, are made subject to classification for salary standardization purposes on the basis of classification of the employment, and training and experience required.

The civil service commission shall be the judge of such classification.

—The commission shall also, in accordance with duties and responsibilities, allocate, and from time to time may re-allocate, the positions to the various classes of the classification. The allocation or re-allocation of a position shall not adversely affect the civil service rights of an occupant regularly holding such position. No person shall hold a position outside of the classification to which he has been appointed, provided that every employee of any department or office shall discharge any of the duties pertaining to such department or office to which his chief may temporarily assign him.

—The class titles and class numbers assigned to positions by the commission shall be used in all records, reports, statements and communications, including the compensation schedule, annual budget and salary ordinance, payroll, and appropriation ordinances.

—The commission shall adopt rules to carry out the civil service provisions of this charter and, except as otherwise provided in this charter, such rules shall govern applications, examinations, eligibility, duration of eligible lists, certification of eligibles, appointments, promotions, transfers, resignations, lay-offs or reduction in force, both permanent and temporary, due to lack of work or funds, retraining, or completion of work; the filling of positions, temporary, seasonal, and permanent; classification, approval of payroll, and such other matters as are not in conflict with this charter. The commission may, upon one or more notices, make changes in the rules, which change shall then be printed and be in force; provided that no such changes in rules shall affect a case pending before the commission.

—The commission may certify eligibles and payrolls and conduct examinations under the rules of this commission.

—The commission shall have power to institute and prosecute legal proceedings for violations of any of the civil service provisions of this charter.

—The civil service commission shall establish an inspection service for the purpose of investigating the conduct and action of appointees in all positions and of securing records of services for promotion and other purposes. All departments shall cooperate with the commission in making its investigations and anyone refusing to cooperate or its agents shall be subject to suspension.

—Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the civil service commission shall, by rules establish procedures to review and resolve allegations of misconduct of personnel, including race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. The determination reached under civil service commission procedures shall be final and shall forthwith be enforced by every employee and officer.

3.661 General Powers and Duties

(a) The civil service commission may hear appeals from an action of the personnel director with respect to:

1. Allegations of discrimination. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the civil service commission regarding allegations of discrimination shall forthwith be enforced by every office and employee.

2. Allegations of fraud; and

3. Allegations of conflict of interest, pursuant to section 8.105.

(b) No action by the personnel director which is the subject of any appeal shall be stayed during the appeal process except by the unanimous vote of the civil service commission.

(c) The commission shall be notified of the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal of personnel regulations and may comment on such proposals. The adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing fraud or allegations of discrimination shall be subject to ratification by the commission. In addition, the adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfers, resignations and terminations shall be subject to ratification by the commission.

The commission shall ratify or reject any such regulation within 60 days of receipt. The commission's failure to act shall be deemed approval.

3.662 Department of Personnel Administration

There is hereby established a department of personnel administration which shall consist of a personnel director and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the civil service commission and whose job function is placed under the department of personnel administration shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job function had not, by amendment to this charter, been placed under the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration.

The department of personnel administration shall have the power to conduct a personnel appointment for the city and county and shall provide a means to recruit, select, certify, appoint, train, evaluate, promote career development, classify positions, administer salaries, administer employee discipline, discharge and other related personnel activities in order to maintain an effective and responsive work force.

3.663 Personnel Director

(a) A personnel director shall be appointed and serve at the pleasure of the mayor; provided, however, that the personnel director shall be selected from candidates nominated by any civil service commission and confirmed by vote of the board of supervisors. The nominee of the mayor may be appointed acting personnel director pending confirmation. The person so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am appointed acting personnel director pending confirmation. The person so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am appointed acting personnel director pending confirmation. In any hearing conducted by the civil service commission or any hearing officer of the commission or the hearing officer shall have the power to subpoena and require the attendance of witnesses and the production of records as provided in section 3.701.

(b) The personnel director shall conduct appropriate examinations for employment, establish eligible lists based on their results and provide for certification of eligibles. The action of the personnel director on examination matters including,
but not limited to, announcements, minimum qualifications, classes of applicants, components, construction, weighting, content, type, list length, duration and certification shall be final.

(c) The personnel director shall adopt personnel regulations which, except as otherwise provided in this civil service commission's by-laws, shall govern the personnel matters within the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration and the exercise of the authority granted in this section, including, but not limited to, recruitment; applications; examinations; eligibilities; duration of eligible lists; certification of eligibles; permanent, temporary and provisional appointments; regular and temporary performance evaluations; promotions; transfers; resignations; layoffs or reduction in force due to lack of work or lack of funds, reorganization, retraining or completion of work; and classification. No personnel regulations shall be adopted, amended or repealed without a prior public hearing upon at least two weeks public notice by the personnel director and after meet and confer sessions with recognized employee organizations as required by state law. All civil service commission rules relevant to the foregoing as well as the provisions of former sections 8.322, 8.323, 8.326, 8.328, 8.329, 8.330, 8.331, 8.332, 8.340 of this charter shall become effective and be registered on the effective date of this charter amendment.

(d) The personnel director shall conduct the salary surveys for the civil service commission as set forth elsewhere in this charter.

(e) The personnel director by personnel regulations shall establish procedures for review and resolution of discrimination and harassment complaints based on race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the personnel director shall forthwith be enforced by every employee and officer, unless the decision is appealed to the civil service commission in accordance with personnel regulations.

(f) The personnel director shall investigate all employee complaints concerning job related conduct of City and County employees and shall provide for the discipline of the employee in accordance with the provisions of this charter.

(g) The personnel director by personnel regulations shall promote effective and efficient management through personnel programs that encourage high productivity and exemplary performance.

(h) The personnel director by personnel regulations shall provide for procedures for resolution of employee disputes which shall be consistent with other provisions of this charter and shall be utilized by all department heads and appointing officers upon the expiration of the existing term of any otherwise binding agreements.

(i) Consistent with the foregoing and other applicable provisions of this charter, the personnel director shall delegate to the various appointing officers appropriate personnel responsibilities, including but not limited to appropriate disciplinary procedures, and consult with appointing officers with respect to personnel regulations affecting their operations.

(j) Personal services contracts shall be reviewed and approved by the personnel director in accordance with the provisions of appropriate personnel regulations. Personal services contracts reasonably expected to involve payment by the city and county of more than twenty-five thousand dollars per annum shall be also reviewed and approved by the Commission. Failure of the Commission to act within thirty days of submission of the contract by the personnel director shall be deemed to constitute approval by the commission.

(k) The personnel director shall establish a system of job classification. The provisions of section 8.200 shall govern whenever new classifications are created or existing positions are reclassified. The personnel director shall be the judge of such classifications is required, a provisional basis.

(l) From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the department of personnel administration shall determine whether a position within a classification is, "in character", temporary or permanent. Appointments may be made on a permanent, temporary or, where continuing appointment is required, a provisional basis.

(m) Excepting sections 8.350, 8.360, 8.361, 8.365, 8.107, all the but the second to the last paragraph of section 8.341, section 8.346, the last sentence of section 8.400, all but the last three words in the first sentence of the third paragraph of section 8.401, sections 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.406, 8.407 and this section, wherever the words "civil service commission" or "commission" appear in the personnel provisions of this charter, they shall be replaced by the words "department of personnel administration", "department", "personnel director" or "director" as the context permits, the word "rule" or "rules" shall be replaced by the word "regulation", the words "general management" shall be replaced by the words "general manager", personnel and "secretary of the civil service commission" shall be replaced by the words "personnel director" and the words "section 3.661" shall be replaced by the words "section 3.662" or "section 3.663", as appropriate.

The clerk of the board of supervisors, after consultation with the city attorney, is hereby directed to conform the language of the charter as herein amended when next the charter is submitted for republication.

8.322: Protest of Written Questions and Answers

—After the written portion of a civil service examination has been held, the questions used and the answers thereto shall be available for review by the participants. This review period shall not apply to questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written test. During the review period, participants shall have an opportunity to protest questions or other items on the examination which, in their opinion, are improper. After all protest items have been acted on and after the official rating key has been adopted and the identification sheets have been opened, further changes in the rating key shall not be made.

8.323: Protest of Tentative List of Eligibles

—Following the completion of any examination, a tentative list of eligibles shall be posted for the inspection of the public and any candidates having been placed on the tentative list shall be notified of their placement. The protest period shall be for a minimum of thirty (30) working days, for the entrance examinations or five (5) working days for the promotional examination. During this period, a fee for the inspection of the papers of each eligible shall be charged by the personnel director. The amount of such fee shall be established by ordinance of the board of supervisors. The fee shall be withheld for eligibles who wish to inspect their own papers. Inspection of papers shall include all documents supporting the eligibles rank and score except neither the identity of the examiner giving any mark or grade in any continuous or standardized examination nor any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written test shall be provided. Only participants in the examination may review the questions used in the examination. If no protests are received during the protest period, the eligible list is automatically adopted. If protests are received during the protest period, the investigation and action of the general manager, personnel shall be expedited so that final adoption of the eligible list is not delayed beyond sixty (60) days after the date of posting. Eligibles who, as a result of their ranking, would receive a notice of appointment regardless of the outcome of the protest(s) may be offered employment from adopted lists pending the resolution of any protests filed and amendment to the adopted eligible list. 8.326: Promotions in General

—Except as specifically provided for in section 8.327, the Civil Service Commission shall provide for examinations on an entrance, promotional or combination entrance and promotional basis. Consideration shall be given to permanent employees in separate promotional examinations and in promotional examinations which are combined with entrance examinations for city and county service when the passing mark has been attained and may include evaluation of work performance and other credits. When an examination is issued for a class on both a promotional and entrance basis, there shall be one resulting list of eligibles which shall include all successful candidates both promotional and entrance in order of relative performance.

—Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this or any other provision of this charter, an employee who has been certified from a regularly adopted eligible list to a non-permanent position in a civil service examination for a city or county position, and who is a participant in any other regularly adopted promotional examination on the same terms and conditions as a person holding a permanent appointment to a position in that same classification, subject to a demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the civil service commission. The provisions of this article shall not be amended, except that only applicable to promotional examinations announced after its effective date.
8.328: Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave

—Employees under permanent civil service appointment who, because of absence on duty authorized military-leave after June 27, 1950, did not participate in a promotional examination held after June 27, 1950, and during time of war as defined in this section, are not eligible for any additional promotional examination under the provisions of this section, such employee who desires to participate therein must make application in writing to the civil service commission with thirty (30) days after the expiration of his military leave, or within thirty days after the effective date of this amendment. Failure to file such written request to participate in a promotional examination as herein provided shall be deemed a waiver of all rights of the employee to participate in such similar promotional examination.

—The civil service commission shall arrange to hold such similar promotional examination within a reasonable period after receipt of such request to participate in any such similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section which have indicated their desire to participate, or have waived their right to participate, as herein provided.

—The civil service commission shall be the sole judge of the adequacy of such similar promotional examination. If the employee obtains in such similar promotional examination a score rating equal to or
more than the minimum passing mark established by the civil service commission for inclusion on the list of eligibles resulting from the original promotional examination, his name shall thereafter be entered on the eligible list resulting from the original promotional examination.

5. Any person, when appointed to a permanent position as a consequence of his having been included on an eligible list for a term of years and having reached such age as to qualify him for promotion to a higher position, shall be considered as a permanent employee of the city, and shall not be removed from the eligible list hereof for the reason of reaching the age of retirement for permanent employees.

6. The civil service commission shall adopt rules to carry out the provisions of this section and to govern the administration of limited tenure appointments.

7. The civil service commission may, however, provide for the suspension of the provisions of this section so that the list of eligibles shall remain in effect for a period not less than two or more than four years after the adoption of such list.

8.331 Limited Tenure Appointments.

8.332 Certification of Eligibles; Rule of Three.

8.333 Duration of Lists of Eligibles.

8.334 Temporary and Emergency Appointments.

8.335 Certification of Eligibles; Rule of Three.

8.336 Temporary and Emergency Appointments.
governmental jurisdictions and private employment for like work and like service, based upon job classifications as provided in section 3669.3662 of this charter and shall make its findings, based on facts and data collected, as to what are the generally prevailing basic pay rates for each benchmark class of employment solely in the manner hereinafter provided. A certified report shall be filed within ninety days after an occupational grouping selected as the class for which a representative sample of data will be collected.

Basic pay rate data for public and private employment shall be collected solely from the Bay Area counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, San Francisco and Santa Clara; provided, however, that the civil service commission personnel director determines there is insufficient data from Bay Area public jurisdictions the commission personnel director shall survey major public agencies in the state employing such class, major public agencies to be defined as those employing more than 3,000 persons.

The commission personnel director shall collect basic pay rate data for like work and like service from Bay Area public jurisdictions as follows:

(a) The counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara.

(b) The most populous cities in these five Bay Area counties based on the latest federal decennial census.

(c) Agencies of the state and federal governments and from school districts and other special districts in the six Bay Area counties as determined by the civil service commission personnel director. The commission personnel director shall collect private basic pay rate data from recognized governmental Bay Area salary and wage surveys of private employers in the city and county of San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. The data collected shall be limited to both rates of pay and salaries actually being paid by public and private employers for like work and like service.

The term "prevailing rates of wages" for employers governed by charter section 8.401 and this section shall be defined as the range rates developed from the weighted average of the midpoint of the basic pay rate, excluding salaries paid by public employees and the median of the pay rates for private employment to be determined as follows:

(1) Multiply the medians from the private and the midpoints from public employments data base by the number of employees in the given classification from each data base;
(2) Add the products of (1);
(3) Divide the sums in (2) by the total number of employees surveyed for that classification; and
(4) Extend this figure by 10 percent to establish the maximum of the range and reduce this figure by 10 percent to establish the minimum.

When a survey is conducted the board of supervisors shall fix basic pay rates as close as reasonably possible to prevailing rates, provided, however, that the board of supervisors shall not set the maximum rate of pay for any class in excess of the maximum prevailing rate for that class; provided further, however, that no employee shall have his basic pay rate reduced to conform to prevailing rates except as provided for in section 8.406. For those classifications of employment in which the practice is customary, the schedules of compensation shall provide for, not less than three intermediate, and maxima salary steps and for a method of advancing an employee's rate of pay from minimum to intermediate to maximum with due regard for seniority of service.

The term "basic pay rate" as used in this section is hereby defined as applying only to the basic rate of wages, with included range scales, and does not include any other benefits of employment or working condition benefits.

It is the declared intent of the qualified electors of the city and county that neither the board of supervisors nor the mayor have any power to provide any benefits of employment except those enumerated already provided for in the charter. Any addition, deletion or modification of benefits of employment enumerated in the charter shall be submitted, as a charter amendment, to the qualified electors of the city and county. The qualified electors expressly state that they understand that benefits of employment are sometimes referred to as "fringe benefits." The qualified electors expressly reserve the right to either grant or deny such benefits except those conditions of employment commonly referred to as "working conditions." Any reference to "working conditions" shall mean those compensations which must necessarily be provided in order for the employee to perform his job description duties efficiently and safely, and shall include but not be limited to such working conditions and benefits as are typically included in the administrative provisions of the salary standardization ordinance and the salary ordinance.

The board of supervisors may, in its at its discretion, modify the above defined benefits for employees covered under this section and section 8.401 of this charter only in accordance with the following provisions:

(a) The civil service commission personnel director must determine, certify and recommend to the board of supervisors mayor that the working condition benefits enumerated above are necessary for the efficient and safe performance of the employee's duties as enumerated in his job description.

(b) The working condition benefit, as recommended by the civil service commission personnel director, is substantially comparable for like work and like service to that provided for the job classification and is provided to not less than 50 percent of the employees of the class in the jurisdiction covered by the salary survey.

9.108 Initiative, Referendum, and Recall

(a) The registered voters shall have power to propose by petition, and to adopt or to reject at the polls, any ordinance, act or other measure which is within the power conferred upon the board of supervisors to make any law or local or special law, except as otherwise provided by any other board, commission or officer to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinance, act, charter amendment or other measure may be so proposed by filing with the registrar a petition setting forth said measure in full, signed by registered voters of the city and county as in number as the percentages hereinbefore required of the entire vote for candidates for the office of mayor cast at the last preceding regular municipal election.

Any declaration of policy may be submitted to the voters in the manner provided for the submission of ordinances; and when approved by a majority of the qualified voters voting on said declaration, such declaration shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to enact an ordinance or ordinances to carry such policies or principles into effect, subject to the referendum provisions of this charter.

Any ordinance which the supervisors are empowered to pass may be submitted to the voters by a majority of the qualified voters voting on said ordinance, said ordinance to be held not less than thirty days from the date of the call. Any such ordinance may be proposed by one-third of the supervisors, or by the mayor, and when so proposed shall be submitted to the voters at the next succeeding general election. No ordinance passed by the supervisors granting any public utility franchise
or privilege, shall go into effect until the expiration of sixty days from the date it becomes final. At the end of such sixty days such ordinance shall be in force and effect, unless within such period there shall be filed with the registrar a petition signed by registered voters equal in number to five percent of the entire vote cast for mayor at the last preceding general municipal election, requesting that such ordinance be submitted to the electors. In case such petition is filed, such ordinance shall not go into effect until approved by a majority of the voters voting thereon at a general or special election.

If, before the time any other ordinance involving legislative matters becomes effective, there shall be filed with the board of supervisors a petition signed by qualified electors of the city and county equal in number to at least ten per cent of the entire vote cast for all candidates for mayor at the last preceding general municipal election at which a mayor was elected, protesting against the passage of such ordinance the same shall be suspended from going into operation, and it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to reconsider such ordinance, and if the same be not entirely repealed, said board shall submit the ordinance to the vote of said electors either at the next general municipal election or at a special election to be called for that purpose, and such ordinance shall not go into effect or become operative unless and until a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon shall vote in favor thereof. The provisions of section 9.109 and 9.110 of the charter shall apply to and govern the verification and certification of such petitions.

Annual budget and appropriation ordinances, supplemental appropriation ordinances, the annual salary ordinance, or ordinances amending the same, the ordinances levying taxes, any ordinance appropriating money from the emergency reserve fund, ordinances authorizing the city attorney to compromise litigation, and ordinances necessary to enable the mayor to carry out any of the powers vested in him in the habitual emergency as defined in section 3.100 of the charter, ordinances enacted pursuant to section 8.410 of the charter, as well as ordinances relative to purely administrative matters, shall not be subject to referendum.

Any elective official, the chief administrative officer, the controller or any member of the board of education or public utilities commission may be recalled by the electors. The procedure to effect such recall shall be as follows: A petition demanding the recall from office of the person sought to be recalled shall be filed with the registrar. Said petition shall contain a statement of the grounds on which the recall is sought. Any insufficiency of form or substance in such statement shall in no way affect the validity of the election and proceedings held thereunder. No recall petition shall be filed against any officer until he has held his office for at least six months.

(b) In the event the representative of the board of supervisors of mayor and the representatives of recognized employee organizations do not reach an agreement through the meet-and-confer process on matters contained in the annual salary standardization ordinance by March 15 of any year, the mayor shall recommend and the board shall adopt or reject a schedule of compensation which reflects current prevailing rates for the classifications covered by Section 8.401 of this Charter. The last good faith offer presented by the mayor or his or her representative.

In any year when an agreement on matters contained in the salary standardization ordinance has not been achieved, the civil service commission or personnel director, upon receipt of a written demand from a recognized employee organization made upon the mayor and the personnel director shall prepare, prior to April 1, a schedule of compensation and administrative provisions which reflect additional rates that would be payable, and working conditions, based upon the last demands made by the recognized employee organization(s) which participated in the meet-and-confer process.

Said schedule shall be transmitted to the registrar of voters for submission to the electors of the city and county at a general election or a special election called for the purpose, and said special election shall be held no less than sixty (60) days from the date of the call. No such schedule shall be withdrawn after it has been received by the registrar of voters. At said election, the ballot shall contain the following two alternatives:

(1) Approval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

(2) Disapproval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

If a majority of the valid votes cast in the election favor paying the additional rates set forth in the schedule of compensation based upon the last demands of the recognized employee organizations which engaged in the meet-and-confer process, it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to amend the salary standardization ordinance to reflect said increased
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TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION E

NOTE: All sections are new.

Be it ordained by the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. This ordinance may be called the "City College Public Lands Preservation Ordinance."

Section 2. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall disapprove or deny, WITH NO EXEMPTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS, any building permit application for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands located across Phelan Avenue from the presently occupied campus of City College and consisting of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted, between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

Section 3. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall revoke or rescind, WITH NO EXEMPTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS, any building permit application previously granted for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, which consist of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

Section 4. The term "building permit" includes building permits, site permits and any other permits for the performance of construction work.

Section 5. Any person violating the terms of this ordinance shall be subject to the penalties set forth in San Francisco Charter Section 8.165. Such penalties shall include, but not be limited to, imprisonment in the city jail.

Section 7. If any provision of this ordinance, or any application to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, it is the expressed intent of the people of the City and County of San Francisco that the remainder of the ordinance, or the application of such provision, or any other provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION F

NOTE: All sections are new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The People of the City and County of San Francisco desire and are entitled to a local government whose officers do not engage in, assist or promote compensated advocacy on behalf of private interests before City and County commissions and boards while also serving as City and County officers.

Section 2. No officer of the City and County may, during the term of office, engage in compensated advocacy before any City and County board or commission, or any member of the board or commission or its staff, in order to represent any private interest, for which representation the officer receives, directly or indirectly, any compensation, reward or gift.

Section 3. Officers of the City and County shall not discuss matters pending before their commission or department with other City and County officers or state legislators when those other officers or state legislators are acting as compensated advocates for a private interest.

Section 4. No member of the California State Legislature shall appear before any City and County board, department or commission as a compensated advocate representing a private interest.

Section 5. In the financing of city and county campaigns: (a) No person other than a candidate shall make, and no campaign treasurer shall solicit or accept, any contribution which will cause the total amount contributed by such person with respect to a single election in support of or opposition to such candidate, including contributions to political committees supporting or opposing such candidate, to exceed $500.00. (b) If any person is found guilty of violating the terms of this section, each campaign treasurer who receives or aids or all of the contribution or contributions which constitute the violation shall pay promptly, from available campaign funds, if any, the amount received from such person in excess of the amount permitted
rates and the same shall be in lieu of said annual compensation, and notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, said rates shall become effective and be payable as if adopted prior to April 1, of any year.

The provisions of sections 3.100 and 3.100-1, relating to the emergency powers of the mayor, shall not be applicable to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

11.105 Effective Date of Amendments
The effective date of the amendments, additions and deletions to the civil service provisions of the charter shall be ninety (90) days after the acceptance and filing thereof with the Secretary of State.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION G

We the people of San Francisco declare this to be our policy:

1) IT IS IMPROPER TO PROFIT FROM OR PROVIDE SUPPORT TO THE RACIST POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SYSTEM IN SOUTH AFRICA, KNOWN AS APARtheid.

Therefore it is necessary to sever commercial ties to South Africa, until people of all races obtain equal rights in that country, including equal voting rights.

2) COMPANIES HAVING SUBSTANTIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH APARtheid MUST BE CONSIDERED UNFIT.

(a) The Board of Supervisors must determine which companies doing or seeking business with the City have the greatest ties to Apartheid. Companies that have a significant involvement in profiting from or maintaining the Apartheid system, may, on that basis, be deemed "irresponsible bidders."

In purchasing goods and services and awarding other contracts, the city must give priority to avoiding such companies; the degree of the preference must be in proportion to the company's complicity with Apartheid, according to the following criteria:

— how much business the company does in or with South Africa;
— how much the company profits from that business;
— how much support the company provides the Apartheid government in taxes, loans, payments or other funding;
— the nature of the company's South Africa business;
— the degree of the company's cooperation with South African political censorship or secrecy agreements;
— the degree to which the company provides the South African government with the technology, materials and other means to maintain and enforce Apartheid.

(b) City funds must not be deposited or invested with any bank or other company which does business in or with, or makes loans to, South Africa.

(c) If any exception to the above policies is found to be necessary or appropriate, the responsible official must promptly and publicly report it to the Board of Supervisors, clearly describing the exception and the reasons for it.

(d) The term "city" includes all agencies, departments, officials, employees, units and subunits of the city and county of San Francisco, and all funds administered by or on behalf of the city or county.

(3) WE CALL ON ALL OTHER PUBLIC BODIES AND PRIVATE OR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS TO ADOPT SIMILAR POLICIES.

(4) WE CALL A GENERAL PUBLIC BOYCOTT, FOCUSING ON THOSE COMPANIES HAVING THE GREATEST TIES TO APARtheid.

The Board of Supervisors must determine and announce which company or companies are the worst offenders within each major industry, so that the public can focus its boycott on those companies.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION H

SUMMARY: THIS INITIATIVE STATES THAT THE AIDS EPIDEMIC IS A MAJOR PUBLIC HEALTH PROBLEM OF CONCERN TO EVERYONE, REQUIRING INCREASED SUPPORT FOR RELATED MEDICAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION. IT CALLS FOR A COUNCIL FOR AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION OR SIMILAR UNITED EFFORT TO STOP AIDS.

We the people of San Francisco hereby adopt the following policy:

The AIDS epidemic has rapidly become a major public health problem, costly both in human lives and in general community resources.

The first steps in dealing with such a crisis are:

— the scientific research needed to discover and understand the nature, causes, co-factors, prevention, diagnosis and treatment of the disease, and
— the education of the public about the lessons of that research;

A proper program of research and education pays for itself in the long run;

Prompt action is urgent, because of the rapidly growing number of persons affected, increasing not only the suffering but also the difficulty of eradicating the disease;

The leadership and support of such an effort is everyone's responsibility;

While San Francisco's role in the overall effort against AIDS has been viewed as a positive example to other areas, the continued rapid increase in the spread of the disease means that we cannot afford to rest on our laurels or leave further responsibility to others.

THEREFORE: BE IT RESOLVED:

We call on all appropriate government bodies as well as medical, professional, charitable and community organizations and concerned individuals to join together in an all-out effort to stop AIDS;

We call for support to an organized united effort along the lines of an AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION COUNCIL, including, in some form:

— A COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, to provide informed evaluations as to priorities among research projects and proposals, recommending those which are most cost-effective and most likely to produce early results useful in the prevention or treatment of the disease, to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts or neglect of promising approaches, and to provide the council with complete and up-to-date information regarding comparative results of experimental treatments, prevention programs and other existing research;

— A FUND-RAISING COMMITTEE, to solicit donations, lobby for grants, organize benefits and other fund-raising projects spreading the financial burden by appealing to many sources;

We ask the council and committees to be responsive and accessible to public input, to include representation of all interested groups, to consider all viewpoints, and to be capable of prompt action;

We ask appropriate city officials to determine whether a suitable form of such a council already exists; if it does, we wish the city to support it actively; if not, we wish the city to seek to encourage its formation by such means as may appear proper.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION I

SUMMARY: This initiative asks "Shall we tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?" The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated portion of Route 480 known as the Embarcadero Freeway. This initiative declaration of policy will give the voters the opportunity to establish the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco regarding the proposed teardown of the Embarcadero Freeway.

Shall the City replace a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if such replacement would open up the Waterfront to its citizens, improve the tax base, and create a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic?
FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER
JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: The Bill of Rights guarantees that
every person accused of a crime shall have the effective as-
sistance of counsel. Whether an individual is rich or poor, that
person is entitled to a competent and dedicated attorney.
In San Francisco it is the duty of the Public Defender to up-
hold this sacred right. In every case, we provide the client with
the best defense under the law.
In the last 7 years, my outstanding staff has done this work
with the highest degree of professionalism. In the next 4 years,
that same strong, professional, independent and ethical represen-
tation will continue.

J eff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John D. Bards, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Ying Brown, 830 40th Ave., Housewife
Sala Burton, 8 Shatt Blvd., Representative In Congress, 5th District
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
George Christopher, 170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Clerk
Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Artist/Community Organizer
Brian Getz, 55 22nd Ave., Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson, Sheriff of San Francisco
Thomas E. Horn, 250 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Maggie Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., International Vice President, ILGWU
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for Children & Youth
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070 26th Ave., Executive Assistant to Sala Burton M.C.
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Community Health Director
Linda Ann Post, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative
Jim Rivas, 430 Steiner St., Political Consultant
Julie Tung, 788 18th Ave., Member, SF Community College District
Governing Board
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel W. Walker, 562 Campbell Ave., President — Local 250-A Transport
Workers Union of America
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilmaritas Ave., Minister
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor
C. R. Zanca, 1966 Pacific Ave., Auto Repair Proprietor

FOR ASSESSOR
SAM DUCA

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I was elected your Assessor in
1978 and re-elected in 1982. My years in the Assessor’s Office
were spent in a professional appraisial capacity personnel and
administration. I have two university degrees, the coveted MAI
designation, and am the recipient of a special Congressional Ad-
visory Board award from the United States Congress. I have
served in an advisory capacity, both nationally and international-
ly, in property tax administration and will continue to serve
the taxpayers of the City and County of San Francisco in dealing
with Article XIIIa of the State Constitution. My community in-
volvement includes participation in cultural, civic business
organizations.

Sam Duca

The sponsors for Sam Duca are:
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
Eugene E. Friend, 2900 Lake St., Investor
Nancy Pelosi, 40 Presidio Ter., Housewife and volunteer in politics
Walter H. Shorestein, 740 El Camino del Mar., Chairman, Milton Meyer &
Co.
Stanley Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Emma W. Louie, 1257 Jackson St., Housewife
Alfred S. Wilsey, 2590 Jackson St., Ch. of Exec. Comm. of Diversified
Holding Co.
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arthur H. Coleman, II Hinkley Way, Physician
Gerson Bakar, 2310 Hyde St., Investor
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management
Jane McEwan Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired
Joseph C. Orongo, Sr., 866 Paxson Ave., Publicity Dept. — S.F. Giants
James A. Scatena, 101 St. Elmo Way, Chairman of the Board, Scatena York Co.
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher
Frances May McAtee, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Recreation & Park Commissioner
Frederick F. Campagnoli, 2609 Larkin St., Attorney
Betty Brooks, 1736 26th St., Field Representative
Jesse Teruel Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Businessman
Cyril I. Magnin, 994 California St., Merchant
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John H. Swanson, 145 Lake Merced Hill South, Bowling Alley Owner
Frances G. Goldman, 745 El Camino Del Mar, Child Guidance
Irma M. Bernardo, 2822 24th Ave., Housewife
Leo J. Murphy, 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Charles M. Cunningham, 475 Connecticut St., Self Employed
Lawrence V. Eppinette, 815 Fell St., Conf. Secretary
Mary M. O’Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Volunteer & Homemaker
Elizabeth R. Duca, 16 Wawona St., Homemaker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Application for Absentee Ballot
is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

Name
---------------------------
Residence Address
-----------------------------------------
Mailing Address
-----------------------------------------
Signature

If the person to whom this pamphlet is addressed no longer resides at this address, please draw a diagonal slash (/) through the address label and drop the pamphlet in the mailbox.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods. Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:
The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible. This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
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Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 5, 1986.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
• are a U.S. Citizen,
• are at least 18 years of age on election day,
• are a resident of California, and
• are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, such as this one, you can only choose among the candidates of your party.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Senator, State Assemblymember, County Central Committee, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your polling place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 3, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in”. If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

Q—Can a worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
• Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
• mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—An application form is not necessary. You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
• your home address,
• the address where you want the ballot mailed,
• then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail by absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 3, 1986.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

STEP 1

IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

Note: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de voto y obtenga otra.

USING BOTH HANDS INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de voto completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

নীচের হাতে দুটি খালিতে এবং ডান কার্ড সম্পূর্ণরূপে প্রজ্বলিত টোটিকায় রেখে দিন।

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

確認二孔插入時，票尾之二孔，接
合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de voto y perfora con él la tarjeta de voto en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

第三步

請把圖釘之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入
打孔投票。

STEP 4

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

第四步

投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封
袋內，票尾凸出在外。

在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO ÚNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SI" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borraduras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

請用附在投票紀錄冊上的打孔針在選票上打孔；千萬不要用鋼筆或鉛筆。

選民須知：

投票必須選舉的任何其他候選人，請在選票上箭頭所指之候選人名打孔。如果有兩個或以上候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上箭頭所指之所有候選人中，選擇您要投票的候選人打孔，但不要經過要選舉的候選人數。

投票合乎非候選的候選人，請在非候選候選人選票信封所提供的預定空間上貼上該候選人所選選的職位和姓氏。

投票任何選舉，請在選票上箭頭所指 "YES" 或 "NO" 字樣打孔。

選票若有鈕或無點或 modifications，選票作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔錯了，無論是正選了；或錯誤了，弄翻了非候選候選人的選票信封，應把該選票退出選票區的選選員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

請在下頁開始投票

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>office</th>
<th>candidate</th>
<th>vote_count</th>
<th>special_note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>WILLIAM H.R. “BILL” CLARK Electrical Engineer/Contractor</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEORGE “DUKE” DEUKMEJIAN Governor, State of California</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>MIKE CURB</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.L. “BILL” RICHARDSON Businessman/State Senator</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>BRUCE NESTANDE Orange County Supervisor</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RALPH E. WINKLER Retired Major, USAF</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MICHAEL CYRUS Market Analyst</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>DON A. SEBASTIANI</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARZ GARCIA</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILLIAM CAMPBELL</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAN STANFORD</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>No Candidate has filed</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>DUNCAN M. JAMES</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRUCE GLEASON</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAWRENCE J. STRAW, JR.</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td>A. JOHN SHIMMON</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLAUDE W. PARRISH</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: WRITE-IN: To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT W. NAYLOR</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED ZSCHAU</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL ALLEN</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM H. PEMBERTON</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH WILLIAM KNOWLAND</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTHUR B. &quot;ART&quot; LAFFER</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE C. MONTGOMERY</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELDREDGE CLEVER</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN W. SPRING</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOBBI FIEDLER</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED DAVIS</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE HERSHEYENSOHN</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-INO) To vote for a candidate not on the ballot, write the name and office title on the long side of your ballot.
## United States Representative

**MIKE GARZA**

*WRITE-IN*: To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 161

## State Senator

**RUSSELL GRAY**

*Independent Businessman*, *Hombre de Negocios Independiente*

168

**ROBERT SILVESTRI**

*Party Central Committeeman*, *Miembro del Comité Central del Partido*

170

*WRITE-IN*: To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 172

## Member of the State Assembly

**MAX WOODS**

*Cable Car Gripman*, *Fijador de Tranvías con Cables*

177

*WRITE-IN*: To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 179
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Vote for no more than 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HARRIET ROSS</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE M. O'NEILL</td>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN H. NICHOLS</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANLEY F. BRAMWELL</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTOPHER LANCE BOWMAN</td>
<td>State Senate Staffer</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTORIA THOMPSON</td>
<td>Industrial Firm President</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX WOODS</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM N. POST, II</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE GARZA</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN ENG</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIAN L. MAVROGEORGE</td>
<td>Data Processing Professional Processor</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTORIA SHEEHAN</td>
<td>Automotive Company Manager</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID SIGAL</td>
<td>World Trade Broker</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM SPINOSA</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DANIEL NUSBAUM</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEANNE BAIRD</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>SAM DUCA</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $850,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>COMMUNITY PARKLANDS ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for acquiring, developing, improving, rehabilitating, or restoring urgently needed local and regional parks, beaches, recreational areas and facilities, and historical resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>WATER CONSERVATION AND WATER QUALITY BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $150,000,000 to provide funds for water conservation, groundwater recharge and drainage water management, and clarifies language in the Clean Water Bond Law of 1984.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>DEPOSIT OF PUBLIC MONEYS IN CREDIT UNIONS. Authorizes Legislature to provide for deposit of public moneys in any credit union. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect. Legislation already approved implementing measure could result in greater interest income to state and local governments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. Provides exception to property tax limit when acquisition or improvement of real property approved by two-thirds of voters. Fiscal Impact: By itself, measure has no fiscal effect. No increase can occur in local property tax rate unless bond issue is approved by two-thirds vote. State costs for tax relief programs could increase. State income tax revenues could decline as taxpayers deduct greater amounts for property tax payments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>ALLOCATION OF VEHICLE LICENSE FEE TAXES TO COUNTIES AND CITIES. Requires allocation of Vehicle License Fee taxes to local governments. Fiscal Impact: Measure would have no direct fiscal effect. Prevents Legislature from changing the law to take vehicle license fees away from counties and cities. Measure would not prevent state reducing other forms of aid to local governments or changing existing formula for dividing vehicle license fee revenues between counties and cities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

236 SI 贷成
237 NO 反对

ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1956. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $500,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en la compra de granjas y casas para los veteranos de California.

239 SI 贷成
240 NO 反对

ACTA DE TERRENOS DE PARQUES DE LA COMUNIDAD DE 1956. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición, desarrollo, mejoramiento, rehabilitación o la restauración urgentemente necesitada por parques, playas, bares e instalaciones de recreación, y los recursos históricos locales y regionales.

242 SI 贷成
243 NO 反对

LEY DE BONOS PARA LA CONSERVACION DE AGUA Y CONTROL DE LA CALIDAD DEL AQUA DE 1956. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $500,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la conservación del agua, reabastecimiento de agua subterránea, manejo integral del agua de drenaje, y cloración del lenguaje en la Ley de Bonos para Agua Limpia de 1954.

246 SI 贷成
247 NO 反对

DEPÓSITO DE FONDOS PÚBLICOS EN COOPERATIVAS DE CRÉDITO. Autoriza a la Legislatura para que disponga el depósito de fondos públicos en cualquier cooperativa de crédito.

249 SI 贷成
250 NO 反对

FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD: Dispone exenciones a los límites de impuestos a la propiedad en el caso de acondicionamiento o mejoramiento de la propiedad inmueble y que sea adquirida por dos terceras partes de los vendedores. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. La legislación ya aprobada que pone en efecto la medida podría resultar en mayor ingreso de intereses para los gobiernos locales y estatales.

254 SI 贷成
255 NO 反对

ASIGNACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS POR PAGOS DE LICENCIA DE VEHÍCULOS A LOS CONDADOS Y CIUDADES. Regula la asignación a los gobiernos locales de los impuestos recaudados en pagos por licencia de vehículos. Impacto Fiscal: La medida no tendría ningún impacto fiscal directo. Implica que la Legislatura puede cambiar la ley para tomar los fondos provenientes de licencias de vehículos de las ciudades y condados. La medida no evitará que el estado pueda recaudar otros tipos de impuestos.

258 SI 贷成
259 NO 反对

SISTEMAS DE JUBILACIÓN DE LOS LEGISLADORES Y JUECES. Limita las pensiones de jubilación para aquellas personas que se afilien al Sistema de Jubilación de los Legisladores y Jueces después del 1 de enero de 1957. Impact Fiscal: Ahora menores para el estado en años futuros si lo la tasa de inflación excede el aumento en los salarios que se pagan a los que actualmente ocupan cargos.

261 SI 贷成
262 NO 反对

PUBLICIDAD DE CODIFICACIÓN Y DECEMPLEJO. Impone una tasa de $500,000,000 para el servicio de publicidad y la eliminación de desempleo.

264 SI 贷成
265 NO 反对

REGULACIÓN DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE ESCUELAS. Establece un fondo de bonos para la construcción de escuelas.

268 SI 贷成
269 NO 反对

INSPECCIÓN DE ESTUDIANTES DE GRADUACIÓN Y JUECES. Impone una tasa de $500,000,000 para el servicio de inspección de estudiantes de graduación y jueces.

272 SI 贷成
273 NO 反对

REGULACIÓN DE BONOS PARA LA ENERGÍA ELECTRICA. Establece un fondo de bonos para la energía eléctrica.

276 SI 贷成
277 NO 反对

REGULACIÓN DE BONOS PARA LA ENERGÍA ELÉCTRICA. Establece un fondo de bonos para la energía eléctrica de $500,000,000 para el servicio de energía eléctrica.

280 SI 贷成
281 NO 反对

REGULACIÓN DE BONOS PARA LA ENERGÍA ELÉCTRICA. Establece un fondo de bonos para la energía eléctrica de $500,000,000 para el servicio de energía eléctrica.
### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>NONPARTISAN OFFICES. Prohibits a political party or party central committee from endorsing, supporting, or opposing a candidate for nonpartisan office. Fiscal Impact: No direct state or local government fiscal impact.</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. DISASTERS. Base-year value of property damaged or destroyed by disaster transferable to comparable replacement property in same county. Fiscal Impact: Local property tax revenues would decrease by an unknown amount. County assessor and tax collectors would have nonsignificant higher administrative costs. State would replace revenues lost by school and community college districts. State income tax revenues could increase due to lower property tax deductions on replacement properties. These state costs and revenues cannot be estimated.</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>MULTIPLE DEFENDANTS TORT DAMAGE LIABILITY. Plaintiff's non-economic damage recovery limited to defendant's liability based on defendant's percentage of fault. Fiscal Impact: Substantial savings to state and local governments. Savings could be several millions of dollars in a year, varying significantly from year to year.</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>COUNTY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county correctional facilities and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of four hundred ninety-five million dollars ($495,000,000).</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSITION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgements against the City?</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>PROPOSITION C HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THE BALLOT BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

262 SÍ Acepto
263 NO Rechazo

IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE DESASTROSA. El valor en el año base de propiedad inmueble dañada o destruida por un desastre puede ser transferido a propiedad inmueble de reemplazo comparable en el mismo condado. Impacto Fiscal: Los recursos provenientes de impuestos locales a la propiedad disminuirán en una cantidad desconocida. Los taxadores y revisadores de impuestos del condado tendrán insuficientes costos administrativos más altos. El estudio reemplazaría los réditos que las distintas escuelas y colegios de educación superior dejarán de percibir. Los réditos del impuesto estatal a la renta pueden aumentar debido a menores deducciones en el impuesto a la propiedad en las propiedades de reemplazo. Estos costos y réditos estatales no pueden ser calculados.

RESPONSABILIDAD CIVIL DE MÚLTIPLES PARTE DEMANDADAS EN JUICIOS DE AGRARIOS INDEMNIZABLES. Limita la indemnización que puede recibir el demandante por daños no económicos a la responsabilidad del demandado basándose en el porcentaje de la culpabilidad del demandado. Impacto Fiscal: Ahorro sustantivo para los gobiernos estatal y local. Los afectados podrán ser algunos millones de dólares al año, que variarán significativamente de año en año.

ACTA DE BONOS P.A.R.A. DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA INSTALACIONES CORRECCIONALES DE CONDADO DE 1986. Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelación, y reemplazo de instalaciones correccionales de los condados y la ejecución del mantenimiento diferido en las mismas en conformidad con una emisión de bonos por cuantiosos noventa y cinco millones de dólares ($95,000,000).

PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONTADO

278 SÍ Acepto
279 NO Rechazo

"¿Debería la ciudad establecer una oficina de administración del riesgo y un despacho de investigación y administración de demandas para reducir el riesgo de pleitos y sentencias contra la ciudad?"

281 SÍ Acepto
282 NO Rechazo

"¿Debería autorizar al Comisario a firmar contratos por menos de $50,000 sin la aprobación del jefe administrativo y a permitir que sus agentes firmen contratos en su lugar?"

OFFICIALMENTE ELIMINADA

正式撤消
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?</td>
<td>YES 288</td>
<td>NO 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?</td>
<td>YES 292</td>
<td>NO 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?</td>
<td>YES 296</td>
<td>NO 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?</td>
<td>YES 300</td>
<td>NO 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?</td>
<td>YES 303</td>
<td>NO 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?</td>
<td>YES 307</td>
<td>NO 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?</td>
<td>YES 310</td>
<td>NO 311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

288 SI 贷成
289 NO 反对

“¿Debería la Ciudad transferir la administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil a un departamento de administración de personal que tenga poder para cambiar los nombramientos de los empleados del sistema en la Carta Constitucional?”

292 SI 贷成
293 NO 反对

“¿Debería la Ciudad prohíbir el uso de los predios de la Avenida Ocean y Pueblo en los próximos tres años?”

296 SI 贷成
297 NO 反对

“¿Debería la Ciudad prohibir la construcción de edificios para el uso de la familia en las Avenidas Balboa y Ocean en los próximos tres años?”

300 SI 贷成

“¿Debería ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el objeto de los empleados que tengan mayor vinculación con la administración de la ciudad?”

VOTER SELECTION CARD

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42 236 237</td>
<td>278 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 239 240</td>
<td>281 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 242 243</td>
<td>283 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 246 247</td>
<td>285 286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 249 250</td>
<td>287 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 254 255</td>
<td>289 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 258 259</td>
<td>291 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 262 263</td>
<td>293 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 266 267</td>
<td>295 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 270 271</td>
<td>297 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 273 274</td>
<td>299 300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR CANDIDATE SELECTION

九洲人民促进组法律顾问伊卡

九洲人民促进组法律顾问伊卡

九洲人民促进组法律顾问伊卡

九洲人民促进组法律顾问伊卡

九洲人民促进组法律顾问伊卡
### Measures Submitted to Vote of Voters

#### PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 3, 1986

### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

#### D
Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?  
- **Yes:** 288  
- **No:** 289

#### E
Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?  
- **Yes:** 292  
- **No:** 293

#### F
Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $300?  
- **Yes:** 296  
- **No:** 297

#### G
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?  
- **Yes:** 300

#### H
Shall it be the policy of the public and private organizations to elect Council?  
- **Yes:**
- **No:**

#### I
Shall it be the policy of the public Freeway?  
- **Yes:**
- **No:**

#### J
Shall it be the policy of the public Freeway, if it would in traffic?  
- **Yes:**
- **No:**

### VOTER SELECTION CARD

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>County Central Committee*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>5.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td>6.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate (6)</td>
<td>7.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>8.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate</td>
<td>9.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td>10.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. Public Inst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to your sample ballot for the number of County Central Committee members to be elected. The number varies with each district.

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR PROPOSITIONS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Código</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
<th>Mexico</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>&quot;Deberá la Ciudad transferir la administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil a un departamento de administración de personal que tenga poder para cambiar las normas del servicio civil que al presente constan en la Corte Constitucional?&quot;</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>亡</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

**BALLOT** — An official list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT** — If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL** — See Absentee Ballot, above.

**POLLING PLACE** — The place where you go to vote.

**PROPOSITION** — This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

**MEASURE** — Another name for proposition.

**CHALLENGE** — Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

**SUPERVISORS** — Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

**CHARTER AMENDMENT** — The charter is the basic set of laws for the city government. A charter amendment changes one of those basic laws. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

**ORDINANCE** — A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

**DECLARATION OF POLICY** — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, the supervisors must carry out the policy, to the extent legally possible.

**INITIATIVE** — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

**PETITION** — A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

**PERMIT (noun)** — A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building. Proposition E concerns the issuance of a permit.

**COMPENSATED ADVOCACY** — Compensated means being paid for doing something; Advocacy means speaking or writing on behalf of someone else. Proposition F concerns the issue of compensated advocacy.

**RISK MANAGEMENT** — This field covers two areas: (1) deciding on when it is better to buy insurance and when it is better to be self insured or uninsured, then shopping for the insurance; (2) identifying hazardous conditions on one's property and seeing that they are corrected so that liability and damage claims will be avoided. Proposition A concerns risk management.

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.
PROPOSITION A

Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgments against the City?

YES 278

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Consultants hired by the Chief Administrative Officer are available to City departments that have questions about “risk management”, such as how to keep damage claims to a minimum and how to find the best insurance rates. In some cases, the departments use these consultants. In other cases, the departments make their own decisions. When damage claims are filed, some are handled by the City Attorney’s Office and some are handled by City departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would amend the City Charter to create an Office of Risk Management, under the Chief Administrative Officer. The office would set risk management guidelines for all City departments, boards and commissions. Proposition A would also establish a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration in the City Attorney’s Office. The bureau would be responsible for investigating, evaluating and processing all damage claims made against the City, except those claims made against the Public Utilities Commission and the Police Department. The bureau would also have the power to investigate potential suits against the City and to make settlements within dollar limits to be set by ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer and a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want damage claims and risk management decisions to continue to be handled the way they are now.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

“Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not affect the cost of government. However as a result of its potential future application and the exemption of certain employees from the civil service provisions of the Charter, costs may be affected in an amount presently indeterminate.”

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 10 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted “No.”
VOTE YES ON A

Last fiscal year, over 6,400 claims and law suits were filed against the City, costing us more than $10 million in settlements. I believe that it is time to change the way we handle our claims, secure insurance, prevent risks and settle legitimate claims against the City.

Last summer, we appointed a task force of citizens, under San Francisco Bar President Jerry Falk, to make recommendations on how to streamline our procedures and save money at the same time. The present system is very slow, costly, and inefficient.

Currently, all claims are investigated by the department involved. The City Attorney cannot act on any claim until the department is ready. This results in delay and duplication of effort and increased costs. A centralized and accountable Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney would be more efficient, cost-effective, and professional. It would enable the City to settle many claims quickly, before litigation is begun, saving the City the costs of defending itself in court and lowering the average cost of settling a case.

This can be accomplished without creating new jobs by simply moving into one office the city positions presently scattered throughout the government.

Vote "Yes" on A. Reduce the cost of City government.

Adoption of this measure would also formally establish responsibility for Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer, where it has been unofficially since 1978. With this strengthened authority, the Risk Management Office would be responsible for the gathering of claims data on a City-wide basis, the creation of incentives for both reducing the possibility for injuries and damage and the number of claims for each department, the coordination of insurance purchasing and specific suggestions to avoid and reduce risk.

This amendment is presented with the recommendation of the Mayor’s Task Force on Claims and Judgments, the Chief Administrative Officer, City Attorney, the President of the San Francisco Bar Association, and the President of the Lawyers’ Club of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Each year the City spends almost $10 million to settle damage claims. It is estimated that the overall costs to the City for all risk-related activities exceeds $125 million a year. It is time for action to be taken to reduce these huge expenditures. This charter amendment is designed to do just that.

Claims Investigation and Adjustment

Right now, the City claims investigation process is decentralized and largely unorganized. Each department investigates its own claims. Investigators may or may not be specially trained for their duties. There is no uniformity of investigation procedure or claims reporting. In only a few departments do investigators contact injured parties within days of an accident in order to settle the claim quickly and economically.

This amendment will create a claims investigation and adjustment bureau in the Office of the City Attorney. Claims investigation and adjustment activities will be centralized, economized and made much more efficient. The new bureau will be able to respond immediately to accidents and claims, providing quick compensation to deserving persons while at the same time producing a prompt, professional investigation. This reform is greatly needed.

Risk Management

Presently, there is no overall plan for the management of the City’s risk exposure: insurance purchasing, avoidance of industrial accidents, gathering data on accident patterns, etc. Again, risk management as a function is fragmented among the various City departments. As a consequence, departments cannot develop the necessary expertise to manage themselves to reduce risk-related costs.

This measure will establish a risk manager under the Chief Administrative Officer. For the first time, overall City planning will be possible in order to control risk. Departments will be told what activities are producing injuries or damage and advised on corrective measures. Private industry has been utilizing risk managers of this type for years. It is time that the City did the same.

This amendment will reduce the cost of government and insure a more efficient delivery of City services to all San Franciscans. We urge you to give it your unqualified support.

Board of Supervisors

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
This charter amendment was proposed by a citizens’ task force appointed by Mayor Feinstein. Its mission was to propose ways of reducing the number and financial costs of claims and lawsuits against the City.

The amendment has two principal features. The first is to centralize within the City Attorney’s office the investigation of claims filed against city departments. This will allow for improved training and supervision of the investigators, who presently are scattered throughout city government. The result will be more efficient, cost-effective and professional investigation of claims. By improving the quality of claims investigation, the City can identify those claims which have merit and attempt to reach early—and less costly—settlements. Meritless claims will be denied with greater confidence that if suit is filed it can be defended successfully.

The second major feature of the amendment will establish a Risk Management office under the Chief Administrative Officer. Risk management is a concept widely used in private business. Risk managers are professionals skilled in reducing the overall cost of claims. The Risk Manager would be responsible for coordinating the City’s insurance program, data collection, and correcting problems within the City which lead to claims. The Risk Manager would review those claims which have been filed against the City. Where it appears that an unsafe condition or practice has led to a claim, the Risk Manager would suggest to the affected department that corrective measures be taken. Reports to the Mayor and to the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors of the recommended corrections and the actions taken would ensure that the various departments will be responsive.

The City cannot eliminate claims and lawsuits against it. But it can limit its exposure by managing the claims process more effectively. This measure will reduce injuries and reduce claims, and that is good for everyone.

Jerome B. Falk, Jr.
Chair, Mayor’s Task Force on Claims and Judgments Against the City

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, May 31, 1986

12 Noon  State Senate, Assembly, Congress and State Propositions
1:00      Proposition A—Risk Management & Claims
1:15      Proposition B—Purchaser & Contracts
1:30      Proposition D—Civil Service
2:15      Proposition E—Balboa Reservoir
2:30      Proposition F—Compensated Advocacy
3:00      Proposition G—Apartheid
3:20      Proposition H—AIDS
3:30      Propositions I, J—Embarcadero Freeway
3:50      Statewide Candidates

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Purchaser & Contracts

PROPOSITION B

Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?

YES 281

NO 282

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchaser must get the approval of the Chief Administrative Officer before signing certain contracts for more than $15,000. Only the voters may change that dollar limit. The Purchaser must personally sign every contract that comes through his office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would raise the limit on contracts requiring the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval to $50,000. It would also allow the Board of Supervisors to change that limit by ordinance. Proposition B would also permit the Purchaser to name certain people in his office to sign contracts on his behalf.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval only on contracts for more than $50,000. You also want the Purchaser to be able to name certain people in his office to be able to sign contracts on his behalf.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to require the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval on contracts for more than $15,000. You also want him to sign all contracts himself.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

“Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 3 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON B!

The City’s Charter requires that a permanent, non-elected City official, the Chief Administrative Officer, review all purchases and contracts above $15,000. Of course, CAO approval of major contracts is very important. But, due to inflation, the number of contracts that have to go to the CAO for approval is always increasing. Today there are too many documents requiring CAO approval. This slows down the purchasing process, occupies staff time—and ultimately costs the City money. Proposition B will raise the CAO approval level to $50,000, and help the City to improve the efficiency of its purchasing operations.

The City’s budget includes more than $250 million for purchases on tens of thousands of contracts. At the current $15,000 review limit, the CAO must approve thousands of documents every year—a costly, time-consuming process. In the long run the City loses money because of the inordinate length of time required to complete all the paperwork.

An adjustment must be made to remove the smaller contracts from this cumbersome process. Review and approval of contracts under $50,000 should be under the responsibility of the City Purchaser, a highly trained and experienced professional, who reports directly to the CAO. By changing the present $15,000 to $50,000, it will be possible for the CAO to give each document that comes to him the attention it requires. And, by placing its orders and paying its bills faster, both the City and businesses will benefit—especially small business and those owned by minorities and women.

Proposition B will allow future adjustments to the limit to be made by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility will ensure the City’s ability to adjust to inflation and changes in the market.

This amendment comes to you with the recommendation of auditors, controllers, bankers, and others who exercise top fiduciary responsibility within their own organizations.

VOTE YES ON B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will make essential changes to update the purchasing and payment procedures under the Chief Administrative Officer. These measures are necessary and desirable because they will save the City money by significantly increasing our management efficiency.

Right now, the City loses because it takes too long for contracts to be reviewed and payments okayed, which means that early payment incentives go unutilized. The CAO has to approve every contract greater than $15,000—and with City purchases last year over $250 million, the paperwork logjam is vast and overwhelming.

An increase in the review limit from $15,000 to $50,000 will make an adequate adjustment for inflation—$50,000 now is only about $15,000 in 1967 dollars. Proposition B will also enable the City Purchaser, who reports to the CAO, to maximize potential savings through early payments by designating appropriate personnel to approve contracts up to $50,000. These “Good Business” amendments are consistent with private sector practices and should be incorporated by the CAO in the City’s best interests.

Finally, Proposition B will give the City the ability to respond quickly to changes in the market place by allowing changes in the CAO review limit by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility is necessary to ensure that in the future we will not lose money because of institutional rigidity. Control is maintained with the necessity of Board action and Mayoral approval to adjust the review limit, and this same feature will allow for change when desired.

Vote yes on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON’T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
Civil Service

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the civil service system of the City of San Francisco. The structure of the civil service system and certain rules governing its operation are written into the Charter and can only be changed by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would make major changes. A Department of Personnel Administration would run the Civil Service system and would be able to change rules with Commission approval. Major features of Proposition D are described below. The complete charter amendment is printed in this voters' handbook.

Department of Personnel Administration

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Certain civil service rules governing the general operation of the system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs, are written into the Charter and carried out by the Civil Service Commission. Only the voters can change these rules.

THE PROPOSAL: A department of Personnel Administration would be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. A Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor would run the Department. Certain rules governing examination, selection and appointment would be taken out of the Charter. The Personnel Director would be able to change these rules with the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

Civil Service Commission

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the general operation of the civil service system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs. The Commission also hears and decides appeals on civil service matters.

THE PROPOSAL: The Civil Service Commission would no longer be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. The Commission could investigate the operation of the system, approve rule changes proposed by the Personnel Director, and hear and decide appeals only on claims of job discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest.

Employee Relations

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors appoints an Employee Relations Director to negotiate contracts with City employees; the Board approves all contracts.

THE PROPOSAL: The Mayor or his or her agent would negotiate with City employees; the Board of Supervisors would still approve all contracts.

What your vote means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing civil service system.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE
Controller's Statement on “D”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, and of itself it would not directly affect the cost of government, as it removes many civil service policy setting functions from the Charter and an independent Civil Service Commission and transfers responsibility for personnel matters, including labor negotiations, to the Mayor.

"As a product of its inherent flexibility and possible future application, costs could be affected or savings realized in amounts presently indeterminate but probably substantial."

POLL CLOSE AT 8:00 p.m.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy
(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisanship, political, social or other considerations. Consistent with the City's and County's affirmative action goals, no applicant or employee shall be selected, appointed, reduced in rank, removed or in any way favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, union activities, political affiliation or sexual orientation.
(b) The purpose of the civil service system is to obtain for the city and county the best qualified persons to fill city and county positions in a timely and economical manner, using professionals, fair and equitable personnel selection and personnel management practices with consideration of the following merit principles:
1. Recruiting, selecting and advancing employees on the basis of their ability, knowledge, skills and performance relative to the work to be performed.
2. Establishing equitable and adequate compensation, as provided elsewhere in this charter.
3. Training employees, as needed, to promote productivity and high quality performance and to facilitate career development.
4. Retaining employees during good service and separating employees for good cause.
5. Assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration, with proper regard for their privacy and constitutional rights; and assuring equal employment opportunity, based on the person's ability to do the job.
6. Assuring that employees are protected against coercion for political purposes and are prohibited from using their official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the outcome of an election or a nomination for office.
(c) This charter does not limit the power of departments, agencies, or other subdivisions of the city and county in their exercise of management prerogatives including but not limited to:
1. Directing employees in the performance of their duties;
2. Hiring, promoting, transferring and assigning employees from these qualified;
3. Classifying positions in accordance with Section 3.663 (b);
4. Disciplining employees;
5. Laying off employees because of lack of work, lack of funds or other reasonable cause; and
6. Determining the mission of its departments and divisions, and its budget, organization, the number of its employees, and the numbers, types, classifications and grades of positions or employees assigned to an organization unit, work project, shift or tour of duty, and the methods and technology of performing its work.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy
(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisanship, political, social or other considerations. No person shall in any way be favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, age, religion, national origin or other non-merit factors.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in subsection (a) or any other provisions of this charter, it shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, consistent with a policy of acquiring qualified personnel for the service of the city and county, to encourage the hiring of blind persons. It shall further be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that no otherwise qualified blind person shall be discriminated against in examination, re-examination, appointment, re-appointment, waiver of eligibility for appointment or re-appointment, promotion or demotion in any class, subclass or position in the civil service unless eyesight is indispensable for the performance of the duties and responsibilities of the class, subclass or position. It shall be the duty of the commission to classify, and from time to time it may reclassify, places of employment in the civil service duties of which may be efficiently performed by qualified blind persons and to conduct appropriate examinations which will fairly test the capacity of blind persons as well as sighted persons to perform such duties.

2.203-2 Employee Relations Director
Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3.510 of this charter, the employee relations director shall be appointed by the board of supervisors and shall hold office at the pleasure of said board.

3.102 Employee Relations and Recruitment
It shall be the duty of the mayor to meet and confer with employee representatives on behalf of the city and county and all its constituent boards, commissions, departments and agencies as required by applicable law. These duties may be performed by a designee of the mayor who shall serve at the pleasure of the mayor. Nothing herein shall limit the mayor from contracting for the performance of these duties.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the mayor shall submit all memoranda of understanding or ordinances to be enacted pursuant to Article VIII of this charter herein to the Board of Supervisors for its approval or rejection.

3.660 Commission; Composition; Meetings
There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county shall have the general powers and duties set forth in section 3.661.

The civil service commission shall consist of five members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and this charter section as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the last day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed.

However, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1991 and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following.

The respective terms of the commissioners who shall hold office on the effective date of this section as amended shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date. Thereupon, the mayor shall appointed on page 73
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Vote YES and join 34,000 San Franciscans who signed petitions to get this crucial reform on the ballot. "D" clears the way to modernize Civil Service so that it is fair and efficient. The present system is a 50-year conglomeration of rules that tie the City's hands—

— A protest by one applicant can hold up hiring for an entire job classification for months—even years.
— Often tests cannot be given frequently enough to maintain current tests of qualified employees. This leads to delays and temporary appointments that make hiring top candidates all but impossible.
— Appointments to jobs are restricted to the top three names on a list even though more than three people have the same score!
— Many provisions are out of date. Some deal with hiring during the Korean War. Others limit our ability to carry out affirmative action.

"D" would remove archaic rules from the Charter so they could be changed as the times require—subject to meet and confer and public hearings. Job tests could be expedited; hiring and promotions speeded up; opportunities opened to women and minorities.

Specifically, Proposition D:
1) Creates a Department of Personnel Administration at no additional cost. Like other U.S. cities, day-to-day administration would be the responsibility of a director, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Supervisors.
2) Makes the Civil Service Commission the oversight body to set policy and hear appeals. Rulings would have to be within 60 days, eliminating endless delays.
3) Moves the office of labor relations from the Supervisors to the Mayor, who must make the tough-minded decisions to balance the budget. Never again could the Board give labor $27 million for "comparable worth."

This reform is the product of years of work with SPUR, League of Women Voters, Chamber of Commerce. Members of the Board of Supervisors could have put the reform on the ballot last year but bowed to some labor leaders, and 34,000 San Franciscans had to do the job for them.

Proposition D will enable City government to work better for you. Vote YES.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON ‘D’

Proposition D is a complex proposition with a simple goal: remove the archaic restrictions on the hiring, promotion, or firing of city employees and bring San Francisco’s personnel system into the modern age.

Archaic is the only way to describe a system that keeps equally qualified people from competing for a job, and that takes months—sometimes years—to fill vacancies.

For example, if 50 people score equally high on a competitive examination, shouldn’t they all have a chance for any job for which they are eligible? Not under the current system, which requires complicated tie-breaking rules not at all related to a person’s qualifications or abilities.

Or what about being able to hire the best person available for a given job? Currently, eligibility lists are frozen for two years and every person on each list, including the lowest-scoring, must be offered a job before the highest-scoring person on a more recent list. Private businesses couldn’t function saddled with such absurdities.

Proposition D cuts through the red tape. It creates a modern personnel department, with a director responsible for carrying out rules to ensure fairness and efficiency. Accountable to the Mayor, the director would be selected from a list provided by the Civil Service Commission, and subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.

The Civil Service Commission remains an independent body, with the right to approve new personnel rules and hold hearings on abuses. Also under ‘D’, negotiations with employee unions would be under the Mayor, subject to approval by the Supervisors, providing checks and balances in balancing our budget.

With greater accountability and continued checks and balances, Proposition D will open the way to more efficient government in our City.

Bill Maher, Supervisor
Louise Renne, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON ‘D’

Proposition D is a necessary reform to the City’s Civil System. As the City’s Chief Administrative Officer for almost ten years, I have found that quality employee hiring is difficult and the process causes long delays.

The current system is:
• inflexible. The City cannot hire and promote the most qualified persons.
• inefficiently administered by a commission. Other large

(continued)
cities do not have such a bureaucratic process.
- antiquated. Civil service rules represent practices of the 1950s rather than the 1980s.

The new system:
- allows the Mayor to appoint an effective personnel director, who controls administration and procedures.

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D**

**VOTE YES ON D**

It's 1986 and we're still trying to manage City business as if it were 1932. As heads of City departments, charged with the daily responsibility of putting out fires, fighting crime, maintaining hospitals, parks, libraries and providing other essential services, we know from bitter experience about shortcomings of the existing Civil Service System.

Enacted with the City Charter in 1932, the system is foundering in red tape. Outdated rules are the subject of endless challenges. Tests are put off; vacancies go unfilled; promotions delayed; any appeal, however groundless, stops the process in its tracks.

Proposition D would take old procedures out of the Charter so they could be changed in an orderly process by the Civil Service Commission, which also would hear appeals.

Day-to-day administration of the tests—the content, scoring, all the myriad details of managing a complex system, would be put into a modern, highly professional personnel office. Tests would be speeded up. Hiring would keep pace with need. Promotions would be on the basis of competence. High performance would be the standard. Discipline could be imposed with working rights fully protected, and women and minorities would be assured equal opportunity.

Proposition D will help improve management and the quality of City services. Vote Yes on D.

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D**

The hiring practices outlined in San Francisco City Charter have been virtually unchanged since 1931, a severe handicap in running a modern city. Proposition D is designed to streamline the charter and ensure that the rights of present city employees and candidates for city jobs are protected, while improving the hiring process itself. The initiative also builds management accountability in the city system.

**Proposition D Is More Fair, More Efficient, More Economical**

The day-to-day personnel functions, including hiring, will be consolidated under a Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. Decisions of the Director of Personnel on examination content and administration are final, unless a decision is stayed during the appeal process by a unanimous vote of the Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D will make it easier to modernize the many archaic Civil Service rules and procedures now included in the Charter, while maintaining a strong and independent Civil Service Commission to safeguard the merit system and protect the rights of city employees. Many detailed rules will come out of

submitted by

**Louis Hop Lee, President**
Civil Service Commission

**Lee Munson**, Member Civil Service Commission and Treasurer, San Franciscans for Fair and Efficient Government
**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D**

**VOTE YES ON D**

Cities can survive only with strong management. The greatest budgetary restraint must be exercised to assure that full value is received for each tax dollar spent.

With firm limits on what it can spend and faced with a possible loss of Federal funds next year, the City must be managed with the greatest possible efficiency.

Essential to greater efficiency is the need for Civil Service reform. As members of City Commissions, we constantly confront the torturous delays and confused rules that gridlock the present system. The present system simply can't respond to the City's personnel needs.

Qualified applicants become frustrated and seek employment elsewhere. Promotions are blocked. Morale suffers. Temporaries fill in; overtime mounts. The ability to plan is crippled; management is weakened.

Proposition D would put the system on a business-like basis. A personnel department would handle day-to-day administration. The Civil Service Commission would be the watchdog to assure the integrity of the merit system.

This streamlined system would replace what is now inflexible and cumbersome. Testing could be accelerated; hiring made more efficient and promotions made on time. The result would be greater efficiency and elimination of costly waste.

Vote Yes on D.

Jerry E. Berg, President, Board of Permit Appeals
Henry Burnam, President, Fire Commission
Mo Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Hector Chinchilla, Rent Board
Rev. Harry Chuck, Housing Authority
Dr. Arthur Coleman, President, Port Commission
Owen Davis, Police Commission
J. Edward Fleischel, Airports Commission
H. Welton Flynn, President, Public Utilities Commission
James Foster, Health Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation & Park Commission
James Fussell, President, Housing Authority
Aune Halsted, Port Commission
Tommy Harris, Recreation & Park Commission
Tom Hora, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Walter J. Lebe, Public Library Commission
Jeffrey Lee, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Philip Lee, President, Health Commission
Bruce W. Litenthal, Small Business Advisory Commission
Jacqueline Nemirovski, President, Arts Commission
Toby Rosenblatt, President, Planning Commission
Dr. David Sanchez, President, Police Commission
Joan San Jule, Housing Authority
John Patrick Short, President, Parking Authority
Marjorie G. Stern, President, Public Library Commission

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D**

Proposition D contains civil service reform measures urged by the League of Women Voters since 1969.

Proposition D will:

— Modernize the City's outdated personnel system by creating a Director of Personnel, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors

— Preserve the principles of merit through policies set by the Civil Service Commission

— Create a more responsive Civil Service system at no additional cost to the taxpayer

**EFFICIENCY AND FLEXIBILITY**

Proposition D transfers authority for day-to-day management of the City's personnel system from the Civil Service Commission to the Director of Personnel. This will:

— Prevent hiring delays

— Ensure only the most qualified individuals are hired and promoted

— Provide City managers with more administrative flexibility

**FAIRNESS FOR EMPLOYEES**

Proposition D will:

— Safeguard the rights of City workers

— Protect gains made in hiring women and minorities

— Retain the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit appeals board

— Retain the ability of the City's unions to negotiate working conditions

— Create a system that can respond quickly and fairly to the needs of City workers

Proposition D will bring the Civil Service system into the 20th century by making the Mayor accountable for the management of a system employing more than 25,000 people. Hiring by merit is still guaranteed by the Charter. Please join us in voting for this Reform!

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
Esther Marks, Past President

Vote Yes on Proposition D the Civil Service Modernization Initiative.

Prevent abuse of a system that was intended to serve the public and protect against favoritism. Prevent situations like this: an employee failed to report to work for a week without explanation; he was telephoned, notified by certified mail and a message left under his door; he was terminated 13 days later; he did not appeal the termination and the civil service commission up-
Civil Service

held the termination. Two months later, the employee petitioned the commission for reinstatement. The employee got his job back, not because the process of termination was wrong but because the commission had a long standing objection to using "absent without leave" as a reason for firing.

The quality of public services is dependent upon the effectiveness of the staff who deliver them. The primary role of the civil service commission should be to facilitate recruitment and retention of the best available personnel. It must protect against favoritism and must assure that everyone has an equal and fair chance at employment.

The present system does not do that. We feel this initiative will make the system work better, for the managers, for the employees and for the public.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco government is huge, with a budget of more than $1 billion per year and 25,000 employees. It is expected to solve serious problems. This requires that the City have the ability to hire and promote talented people to do the job.

The present civil service system is so tied up in red tape that jobs remain vacant for six months to a year, and all too often someone who is not capable of doing a good job is hired. Your tax dollars are being wasted, and you are not receiving the quality of services you need and deserve.

Proposition D will modernize San Francisco's civil service system. It separates the personnel department from the Civil Service Commission, and puts the department under the Mayor where it belongs. The Mayor is responsible for balancing the budget and delivering city services as efficiently as possible. She cannot do this unless she can find capable people to do the job. That is the task of the personnel department in any organization.

Proposition D will also insure that the independent Civil Service Commission has sufficient authority to require the personnel system to be fair in its treatment of City employees. The Commission will be able to issue subpoenas and require testimony of witnesses on investigations it conducts. Should it find that discrimination has occurred, it can issue orders that must be obeyed.

Most major American cities, and virtually all cities and counties in California, have the kind of civil service system that will be established by Proposition D. San Francisco's present system is still mired in the past. It hobbles the ability of the City to deliver services and spend your tax dollars as efficiently as possible.

SPUR has not placed a statement in the Voter's Handbook for any other issue over the past 15 years. We feel that Proposition D is so vital for San Francisco's future that we are making this appeal for your support.

Vote "YES" on Proposition D.

SPUR — The San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Reform Initiative, will give San Francisco citizens the HIGH PERFORMANCE GOVERNMENT necessary to meet the many challenges of the future. Proposition D corrects the outdated and inflexible requirements originally written in San Francisco's City Charter in 1931. It will eliminate the problems which prevent San Francisco's personnel system from operating with efficiency the City's voters and taxpayers deserve:

Proposition D insures City jobs will be filled from current lists of the most qualified employees.

Proposition D prevents ungrounded appeals from delaying for years the appointment or promotion of qualified employees.

Proposition D eliminates the repetitive tasks currently monopolizing the Civil Service Commission meetings and directs the Commission to serve as an appellate body to protect the City's good employees.

Proposition D centralizes the day-to-day operation of the civil service system and makes the Director of Personnel responsible to the Mayor.

Proposition D simplifies the budgetary process by making the Mayor the City's chief labor negotiator, responsible for setting working conditions within the City's financial capacity.

Proposition D is the result of years of painstaking review by the most experienced, able and respected management experts in San Francisco. It is a plan intended to move City government out of the 1930s and equip San Francisco to enter the twenty-first century without being burdened by the red tape of the past.

After ten years of commitment to improving our City, the Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee is convinced adoption of Proposition D is one of the most important issues facing the voters. CHANGE IS LONG OVERDUE. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by,
The Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee

David Anachor
Jerome Anderson
Richard Blum
Charles Chapman
Arthur Cooke, Jr.
Benton Dial
James Edgar
Ruben Garcia

Robert Hayden
Walter Hoadley
John Jacobs
Michael McGill
Ellen Newman
Ray Novak
Frank Taiatu

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PERSONNEL MANAGERS SAY YES ON PROPOSITION D

As the personnel managers for City Departments, we are charged with the responsibility of managing the City’s personnel system. The activities include examinations, hiring, training, discipline, union-management relations, affirmative action and compensation. No one knows better than we the frustrations experienced in attempting to monitor an unbelievable sequence of overlapping bureaucratic activities in attempting to get the job done.

Proposition D will bring our personnel system into line with most other public personnel systems. The improved system will create the potential for being more responsive to the needs of operating departments. It will improve labor relations by transferring this function to the executive branch of government where it belongs.

Proposition D will streamline certain routine procedures resulting in a reduction of cost and time. Under the current system, delays are experienced due to lengthy appeals during which time the departments’ objectives are delayed.

Proposition D will create an atmosphere of increased accountability for department managers in the areas of affirmative action, discipline and job performance.

Proposition D has been endorsed by the San Francisco Council of Human Resource Managers, the association of over one hundred personnel managers in City government.

Proposition D strengthens merit system principles. Civil Service commissioners will have more time to enforce and protect these principles rather than being bogged down in the day-to-day activities of administration.

Proposition D will help bring about improved methods and practices in personnel administration and should result in a more competent and effective workforce which the citizens of San Francisco have a right to expect.

Alvin W. Schoof
Personnel Director
Recreation and Park Department

Marsha Ramirez
Personnel Officer
San Francisco Port

Edward M. Gatto
Personnel Director
Department of Health

James Horan
Senior Personnel Officer
Department of Social Services

James Iliechi
Personnel Director
San Francisco International Airport

Andrea R. Goudine
Manager, Bureau of Personnel & Training
Public Utilities Commission

Mori Noguchi
Senior Department Personnel Officer
Mary Smith
Senior Personnel Officer
Laguna Honda Hospital

Thelda Poteet
Senior Personnel Officer
San Francisco General Hospital

John Burke
Personnel Director
Controller’s Office

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will assist the Department of Public Works by streamlining the Civil Service process.

- The proposition still calls for checks and balances in that the Commission will continue to hear appeals on discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest. The Commission will act as a watchdog while leaving the general administration to the Personnel Director.

The initiative will make for an improved system for employees, management and the citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Donald Birrer
Director of Public Works

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Passage of this amendment will update our civil service system. These changes will make it comparable to other merit system agencies. Some of these changes are:

(A) removal of administrative details from the charter which inhibit timely and effective personnel actions.

The following subjects will be placed in personnel regulations:

- Examinations for employees on military leave
- Certification of eligibles – Rule of three
- Duration of employment lists
- Temporary employee appointments

(B) allows continuous up-dating of employment lists.
(C) allows equitable treatment of job candidates with same test score.

(D) realigns responsibilities: the Civil Service Commission dealing primarily with compliance and adjudication activities.

(continued)
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while the Personnel Department administers the day-to-day operation of the merit system.

**Equally Important** the amendment retains important merit system provisions dealing with:
- Employee salary setting procedures
- Positions subject to merit system examinations
- Public hearing and meet and confer requirements
- Penalties for examination fraud
- Seniority, meritorious service and applicable educational credits for promotional examinations in the Police/Fire De-

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D**

Proposition D, the Civil Service Initiative, is a long-overdue reform to streamline antiquated hiring practices in San Francisco's fifty-year-old charter. Proposition D will ensure that the best and brightest job candidates are chosen to serve our city, thus promoting excellence in job performance and helping to eliminate incompetence. This initiative builds management accountability in the city system, while giving the Civil Service Commission the independence to protect the rights of women and minorities.

**A Better, More Efficient System at Less Cost**

Proposition D consolidates personnel functions, including hiring, under a new Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. The Director has final authority over content of examinations given city job applicants, so more flexibility is possible in finding truly qualified candidates.

Submitted by
JAMES W. HAAS

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D**

For more than a half-century, San Francisco Mayors have abided by the employee examination, hiring and promotion policies administered by a strong and independent Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D is a deceptive and dangerous scheme that would give future Mayors and top-level bureaucrats the power to ignore competence and reward political loyalty.

Proposition D would take key Civil Service employment rules out of the City Charter and make them subject to wheeling and dealing by City Hall politicians.

There's an old saying—"if it ain't broke, don't fix it." Civil Service has worked well for more than 50 years. Proposition D is unnecessary, ineffective and even counter-productive. It's not just deceptive, it's dangerous.

JOSEPH L. ALIOTO
Former Mayor of San Francisco
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Time and time again, different groups have put various propositions on the ballot to weaken our Civil Service System and reintroduce political patronage into City employment practices.

And every time the voters have wisely rejected these schemes, no matter how cleverly they have been disguised.

Proposition D is just another power grab by bureaucrats at the top in City Hall.

We’ve said NO! loud and clear in the past. Let’s say NO one more time.

Submitted by:
TAXPAYERS FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT
Thomas Scanlon
City Treasurer, Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “D”!!!!

During the eight years while a member of the Board of Supervisors, I fought hard to reform the Civil Service Commission and to bring working conditions and city workers’ pay equitable to both workers and taxpayers. I fought to insure an independent Civil Service Commission that would remain just that—independent and free from political influence and political patronage of particularly the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

I am truly saddened by the Mayor’s insistence in bringing this disastrous Proposition “D” before the voters. Some of the Supervisors rejected this misguided measure for what it is; an unwise consolidation of authority to hire, fire and promote city workers by the Mayor and newly created personnel officer.

My efforts to bring pay equity to both taxpayers and city workers were continually squashed by then Supervisor Feinstein and Supervisor Molinari. Finally, in 1975, shortly after a disastrous city strike, I was able to place on the ballot, for voter approval, a measure that almost eliminates the power of the Mayor and Supervisors to manipulate the pay of city workers. This measure was overwhelmingly passed by the voters that year and we have not had any labor unrest since that date.

Vote No on “D”!
“D” stands for disaster. It will undo many of these reforms. Also, right now, the City is almost broke, thanks to the manipulation of Mayor Feinstein and her chief ally Supervisor Molinari.

If “D” passes the cost of operating our city government will increase in the next 24 months by not less than $65,000,000.

Contrary to the provisions of Proposition 13, property taxes would be increased, thus forcing up rents.

Vote No on “D”.

Don’t weaken our Civil Service Commission, whereby least deserving city employees could be promoted because of connection or clout.

Vote No on “D”.

We now almost have more problems than we can handle. We don’t want our city turned into another Chicago, where for nearly half a century a corrupt political system flourished under Mayor Richard Daley.

John Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We join San Franciscans for Fair Employment in opposing the Civil Service Initiative, Proposition D.

This measure will severely hamper the well-being of the San Francisco Fire and Police Departments. These departments are two of the finest in the Country and have consistently protected life and property in a professional manner. They must continue that tradition with a civil service system based on MERIT and not political patronage.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Andrew C. Gapper
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Keith P. Calden
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

William F. Murray
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Thomas J. Cahill
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired

Donald M. Scott
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Our present Civil Service system was designed to keep corruption out of government. It has generally served that purpose well. This proposition would dismantle that system and in my opinion open the doors to nepotism, favoritism, patronage and corruption. Better a city government that is bureaucratic than one that is corrupt. Vote NO on D.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is an attack on the merit system and an attempt to return patronage to the Mayor’s office by eliminating the authority of the Civil Service Commission and its built-in checks and balances.

The present Civil Service system is not perfect, but corrections can be made within the Charter without destroying a system that has worked for over 50 years and has been free from fraud and corruption.

This proposition will do nothing to improve the caliber of personnel performance and could have the opposite effect. I urge you to vote NO on PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by
The San Francisco Police Supervisors’ and Investigators Association

Don Goad, Captain SFPD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D could be a dangerous first step toward weakening the independent, impartial administration of our City government.

Proposition D would transfer power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor. The Director’s decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline and certification would be final. The Commission would have no right to hear examinations or disciplinary appeals.

With the transfer of duties and responsibilities from the Commission to the Mayor’s appointed Personnel Director, the Mayor would have control over personnel functions. Currently, commissioners have independent status and can be dismissed for cause. The Personnel Director could be dismissed at will.

The Merit System could be replaced by a patronage system. Proposition D could open the door to rules permitting the Personnel Director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his or her position on the list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Proposition D is NOT a reform package. The checks and balances for efficient City government would be lopsided, with too much power in the hands of unknown future Mayors.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
John L. Molinari, President
Harry G. Britt
Richard Hongisto
Willie B. Kennedy
Wendy Nelder
Nancy Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Beware of PROPOSITION D!

Powerful special interest groups are attempting to remove key City employees from the independent and impartial Civil Service system in the name of “reform”.

They want instead to make these employees answerable directly to future Mayors and politically-appointed Personnel Directors and department heads.

PROPOSITION D got on the ballot because the Chamber of Commerce and such companies as Pacific Bell and PG&E paid a professional southern California campaign firm, $70,000 to collect signatures.

They’re trying to destroy the merit system and replace it with an old-fashioned patronage system.

Department heads will be able to ignore examination scores and reward loyalty rather than competence in promotions and hiring.

Don’t let the Chamber of Commerce, big business and their allies in the City bureaucracy dictate who’s hired, fired and promoted among public employees.

PROPOSITION D is not just deceptive, it’s dangerous!

Vote NO on PROPOSITION D!

Libby Zenehein
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Ron Hoberman
Vice-Chairman, Democratic Central Committee
Jim Wescot
Democratic Central Committee
Roberto Estaves
President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Rick Pucarow
President, Harvey Milk Lesbian Gay Democratic Club
Walter L. Johnson
Exec. Secy., S. F. Labor Council
Michael Bernick
Linda Puri
Sal Roselli
Deborah Stein
John Mehling
Pat Norman
Nancy Walker
Gwen Craig
Harry Britt
Louise Mimsick
Carole Miglen
Agar Jaicks
Jock Morrison
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D places too much power in the hands of ONE. Proposition D will provide for a personnel director to be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. The Mayor now appoints five members of the Civil Service Commission who also serve at her pleasure.

You work for years to climb the civil service ladder and then somebody comes along with an idea to cut you off at the pockets.

Proposition D will lock in all the employees employed in the Mayor's office and will control the appointments of any new staff by the next Mayor elect in 1987 and years thereafter.

Like controlling your estate from the grave.

Vote NO on D.

Marguerite Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service Merit System has served our City well, giving San Franciscans an equal opportunity. It has helped us obtain employment and earn promotions based on objective examinations.

The Civil Service Merit system replaced the old patronage system that rewarded political loyalty more than competence.

Now the supporters of PROPOSITION D want to create a new Personnel Director, accountable only to the Mayor, and give department heads the absolute power to decide who works for the City and who gets promoted.

If PROPOSITION D passes, equal opportunity would give way to opportunity based on membership in the bureaucratic "establishment".

Keep our Civil Service Merit System strong and free from the political abuses of the past.

Vote NO on D!

Willy L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly
Ben Tom
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
JoAnne Miller
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
A. Richard Cerbatos
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Sodamin Wilson
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Ernest "Chuck" Aparo, President
S. F. Community College Governing Board
Julie Tung
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Alan S. Wong
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Henry Der
Albert Chang
Rudy Mera
Robert "Bob" Morales
Yori Wada

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Can you imagine studying for a civil service examination, being rated at the top of the eligible list and never receiving the promotion? That's exactly what Proposition "D" will do should the electorate adopt this amendment.

The civil service merit system has defects, but to totally eliminate the system and replace it with a patronage system where promotions are based on who you know, rather than what you know is scandalous.

Civil service was put into place to prevent scandal and the "favor seeking" individual from getting a paid position because he/she happened to support the right elected official.

Proposition "D" will allow one person, chosen by the Mayor, to decide who will be promoted, hired and fired. This is awesome power for one single individual to have at any level of government.

Our current Mayor may choose a fair person for this position, but will future Mayors be as careful? As each new Mayor assumes office, the civil service system will again change. The potential to favor one individual or group over others is great.

Proposition "D" has a great potential to diminish the quality of services we now provide to our citizens, as the future of how people are hired and promoted in the San Francisco Police Department is completely unknown.

It's true our promotional system is fraught with delays and delays frustrate us all, but Proposition "D" is not the answer. Proposition "D" will only add to our existing problems. Several years ago, our citizens elected a Charter Commission to streamline city government and make civil service work more efficiently. The voters eventually rejected those proposals. The checks and balances that made our government stable were no longer present. It simply went too far.

Proposition "D" goes even further. It brings about a system of patronage and should be defeated lest we want to engage in "free-wheeling and dealing" of civil service jobs and promotions.

We urge a strong No vote against Proposition "D"!

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry, President
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The purpose of the Civil Service Commission is to ensure that the merit system would be the only criteria in any examination process.

If Proposition D passes, all authority concerning examinations would be taken from the Civil Service Commission and given to a Personnel Director, who is appointed by the Mayor. This Personnel Director would have the authority to hire and fire at his discretion, with no appeal available. This proposition is contrary to everything the Fire Department and all City employees have strived for over the years.

The Civil Service Commission in its present form was instituted to prevent any possibility of a patronage system, where one person has complete control.

This proposition would do nothing to improve your Fire Department. If you are satisfied with the work and make up of the San Francisco Fire Department in its present form, "Vote No On Proposition D". You will be doing a service for the San Francisco Fire Department, and the people of San Francisco.

Submitted by the San Francisco Fire Chiefs' Association
John Flaherty, Battalion Chief SFFD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is bad government and bad politics, changing our independent civil service system into a system dominated by the Mayor:

..By shortening the six year terms of Civil Service Commission to conform to the Mayor’s four year term of office.

..By transferring most of the Commission’s powers to a Personnel Director who serves solely at the Mayor’s pleasure.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D fails to offer enough new and improved procedures to cure the current defects in the civil service system. Charter sections and civil service rules are repealed without specific known replacements.

Proposition D transfers power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created personnel director appointed by, and to serve at the pleasure of, the Mayor. The director’s decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline, and certification would be final. The commission would have no right to hear examination or disciplinary appeals.

There are hidden costs with Proposition D because the new Personnel Administration Department will employ a personnel director, and other employees "as may be necessary to carry out (its) functions and duties."

The Merit System could be replaced by an old style Patronage System. Proposition D could open the door to rules which permit the personnel director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his/her position on the civil service testing list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Police and Fire Commissions would lose functions as a result of the personnel director’s new power. The director’s unlawful employment discrimination policy would be binding upon department administrators. The director’s procedure for employee dispute resolution must be used by all department heads and appointing officers.

Proposition D is not the answer. The checks and balances for efficient city government would be lopsided.

I urge a no vote on Proposition D.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, 17th Assembly District

Sala Burton
Congresswoman

Art Agnos
16th Assembly District

Milton Marks
State Senator

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Balboa Reservoir Development Ban

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission declared Balboa Reservoir South (located across Phelan Avenue from San Francisco City College) surplus in 1984 and made the site available for low, moderate and market rate housing. In July 1985, a City-community advisory committee chose a developer to build 203 single-family homes on the 13 acre site. Construction has not yet begun.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would prohibit granting new building permits and would revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site (Assessor’s Block 3180, Lot 1) between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit granting any new building permits and you want to revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to allow building permits to be granted for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “E” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for a three-year ban on development of the Balboa Reservoir site had qualified for the June ballot.

Sidney Kass and Jesse David Wall, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 12,430 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 10,012 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 77
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Having been responsible for providing leadership at City College from 1947 to 1977, we cannot stand by and see this site converted to housing. We must speak out. Such a move would preclude forever the logical and much needed campus expansion to what was once our West Campus. We left that site reluctantly to make way for water storage. If it is no longer required for that purpose, let us return it to City College.

Thousands of San Franciscans—high school graduates, dropouts, veterans, re-entering women—representing all of the city's diverse ethnic groups, have been prepared for transfer to four-year colleges, profitable careers, and have had their lives enriched at the City College of San Francisco. Without City College's open door and easy access, many would have been deprived of these opportunities.

Its 56 acre campus originally housed 3,000 students. Now it serves over 23,000. This campus, compared to other community colleges, can be best described as cramped, inadequate, and second rate. The condition of the campus is to be contrasted with the excellence of its programs—which are recognized as among the best in the nation.

Lou Batmale
Chancellor 1970-1977
Louis G. Conlan
President 1947-1970

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 'E'

We question:
1. Why no EIR was required when the proposed development could have a substantial impact.
2. Whether the future needs of City College for classrooms, housing, and parking have been considered.
3. What the impact on taxpayers is with below market land sale and construction financing by bonds.

This moratorium will permit adequate study of these issues.
Vote YES on Proposition 'E'.

Bruce Bonacker, President
Board of Directors, Glen Park Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let a developer make a mint on land across from the most overcrowded college in the Bay Area! Parking is already an impossibility for residents near City College...adding 200 homes to this land would make the situation much worse.

It's simple: a college which can't find room for more students at a time when more people are returning to education doesn't serve the community.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This land is being sold at much less than its true value. The development wouldn't do much to ease the City's housing crunch, but it would undercut the future of City College and the peace of mind of the neighborhood.

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

You'd probably be upset. We certainly are. Please help us protect our neighborhood. Please vote YES on proposition E.

Westwood Park Residents:
Edna Book
Minnie Dorwin
Eugene Eden
Donna Nicotelli
Robert Armstrong
Pauline Armstrong
Joel Martinez
Richard & Lisa Patterson
David Boun
H. Besmore
William Burke
Richard Robel
Clyde Theriot
Dinae Manus
Euna Manus

Sunnsyde Residents:
Ellen Wall
Melissa Volund
David Wall
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let the greedy developers take this potentially picturesque open space.
A yes vote means you want more time to consider its future use. All we ask is time to think and plan.

John Barbegalata
Former member, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Suppose there was a publicly owned open space across the street from the main U.C. Berkeley Campus.
Can you imagine for one moment that it would be passed into private ownership?
Vote Yes on E for Equality and Excellence in Education

City College Students:
William Lew, Student
Tim McGuire, Student Council Member
Joseph Goldstein, Student Council Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

In 1952, the “Experts” said we needed reservoirs. They felt so strongly that they condemned the City College West Campus, destroyed the buildings, and constructed the reservoirs—all at taxpayer’s expense.
Now, in 1986 with more demand for water, the “Experts” say the reservoir is no longer needed. What is the concerned taxpayer to believe?
When in doubt, the city should hold on to the expensive things already paid for.

Stop the reservoir giveaway. Vote YES on E.

Taxpayers for Preserving the Reservoir.
Richard Patterson
Dorice Murphy
Lucille Carson
Daniel Gutierrez
Franz Witte
Bernhard Scholand
Ruth Hanson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This is a Planning issue
We have been accused of trying to stop housing for poor people. Not true. In the first place, the price levels are certainly middle income and above, but our main objection is that this badly done plan is damaging to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as to the over-crowded community college across the street.

WHAT WE WANT
Even our critics point out that we originally SUGGESTED housing for that site, but they don’t talk about what else we suggested. We want two levels of parking under a City College Library, Bookstore, and Auditorium, with housing on top.
Furthermore, let the housing be TRULY affordable—for students and seniors. We are trying to stop the bureaucrats’ subsidized middle income housing project because it makes our dream impossible.
We ask for three years to give the neighborhood and the college a chance to produce a better plan.

SNAP (Sensible Neighborhood Planning Committee)

Helen Crizer, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council, representing 17 neighborhood associations in the area of the surplus reservoir property in question has voted to endorse the three-year stop of private construction on the old West Campus of City College.
Dr. Louis Batmale, Chancellor of City College from 1970-1977, has persuaded us that City College needs the lands.

Juanita Raven, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Be a sport.
Give City College a vote of support.
City has 23,000 students and badly needs a library. The only place to put it is in the reservoir site. City College has walked closely with San Francisco for five decades. The reservoir site has always been understood to be reserved for City College.

Until now when someone wants it for housing. Housing is important, but it can be anywhere in town. But a City College library can only be located at the College.

Vote yes to support a book—and a reader.
Reading, studying, writing and research make up our town also.

It is hard to understand criticism of City for wanting to keep this area for a library. Sure, housing sites are at a premium—but even more so a library site for City which is one of the largest schools in the Nation.

Some people blast City for wanting a library because of the need for housing. Housing is needed. But some of those very same people want a big battleship stationed here that will bring in 15,000 new family members.

The Educational and cultural growth of San Francisco mandates living space for the City College library.

If this measure gets a no vote, it means there will be no site for a Library. This is the last chance. Vote YES to help out a book—and a reader.

State financing, when approved, will construct this building. It is the top building priority at City College.

A YES vote here means there will be time to think about the use of the site. During that three year period, cooler heads may realize this is the only site for a Library. If the housing goes in there will be no library there.

Vote yes for a book, for a good school and a better City.

John Riordan, Board of Governors
San Francisco Community College District.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Sunnyside Neighborhood Association is not against housing, but we are trying to stop a hasty and short-sighted plan. We are asking for this moratorium to get time for a better plan that will answer a variety of needs and benefit the entire city as well as our community.

This is a planning issue.
The release of the reservoir property as surplus by the water department came as a surprise to our neighborhood. The June 1984 “Residence Element” of the city’s Master Plan did not even list the land as surplus. By 1985 major decisions were being made for use of the land without adequate neighborhood input.

There were some meetings attended by a few people carefully selected for their zealous pro-housing views or potential financial gain. The resulting plan has gone out of control. Now it benefits only the developer and the lucky few who will get houses on free land.

Proposition E is not an attack on housing.
Please help us save our neighborhood against poor planning by voting YES on Proposition E.

Joe Mahoney, President
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Miraloma Improvement Club urges a YES vote on Proposition E.

Frank Mastro, President
Arnell Rodrigues

Maggie Kroll
Dorothy Evers

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION E

All the talk in the world can’t change the fact that City College has fewer acres of land relative to its student population than any college in the Bay Area.

Enrollment at City College is INCREASING, as is the enrollment of the San Francisco public schools from which City College draws most of its students. It is obvious that City College needs and deserves the reservoir land. The three year moratorium will give time to produce a better plan which will have in-

put by faculty, students and alumni who know the college's needs and want to support it.

Sid Kass
Susie Langdon Kass
Phil Kass
City College Student
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The homeowners of Westwood Park, a neighborhood adjacent to the Balboa Reservoir, support the ballot initiative calling for a 3-year development moratorium. We believe that the City and City College should take additional time to determine their needs and how they might be met by using the Reservoir. In the event that City College does not need this property, we support its development as open space or as single-family detached housing.

Westwood Park Association
Don C. Swander
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Let's not aggregate the traffic problem around City College before we first develop solutions for the existing problems.
A three-year moratorium only buys our neighborhood and elected officials time to find solutions; it doesn't say no to housing. A YES vote is a vote for prudent development. A YES vote helps to preserve the family character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ken Hoegger
Realtor and community activist

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As representatives of the students of City College, we understand first-hand, the intense need to reserve a site for future school expansion.
Preservation of the Balboa Reservoir, a site directly adjacent to the campus, is particularly crucial. The facilities that CCSF requires, such as a library and an auditorium, are essential to the main structure of the campus. Unlike classrooms, it would be unreasonable to build an auditorium or a library on an off-campus site, since these facilities are integral to the main function of the school.

In short, opposition to the moratorium based on the notion that alternate sites could be secured, is misleading. Once a site near the college is taken, any hope of expansion would be eliminated.

Associated Student Council of City College
Jack Lee, Vice President of Associated Counsel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Local 2121 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, representing City College faculty, urges a yes vote on Proposition E.
While this project provides short-term employment for a few, we are more concerned about the thousands of students who would benefit from planning and development that would better serve the community and the college.

Yes on E for continued excellence in community college education.

Anita Martinez, President
San Francisco Community College District
American Federation of Teachers

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is twice as crowded as any community college in northern California. It needs a much larger library, bookstore and auditorium, and more parking.
The college has always expected to use the empty SOUTH reservoir for educational needs. That land is finally surplus. Neither the college Governing Board nor the Chancellor attended the Mayor's planning sessions for the property and the faculty was not informed. When the 12.3 acre site was offered to a developer for $36,900 for subsidized housing, the Chancellor said, "We are at a crossroad and the correct path is for the Board of Supervisors, with the Mayor's support, to deed this surplus land to City College so that the college may continue to serve the city effectively for the next 50 years as it has for the past half century." The Mayor refused. Now only Board member John Riordan supports the correct path.
The Water Department says it may need the NORTH reservoir now used for student parking. If that crisis occurs, the Chancellor says, "We'll deal with the situation then." How, if the south reservoir is gone?

(continued)
When land is available other community colleges finance large projects through alliances with civic, athletic and cultural organizations, and through property sales. New methods for public funding are being developed.

The faculty would like three years of careful study to unravel misunderstandings and poor management, and to find the best way to be a good neighbor.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College needs land now for desperately needed facilities, one of which is a library. City College has an enrollment of 23,000 students but our library has seating for 450. There are other possible locations for new housing, but City College can’t be moved. Give us an opportunity to plan a development for the community and the college.

Annie M. Young
City College Library Faculty and Staff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty and staff members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco’s community college for our students’ needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco’s community college for our students’ needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Water Department has begun a resource study of water use, due for completion in two or three years. The study may well indicate that one or both reservoirs will be needed. The American Water Works Association states that reservoirs should be used in pairs. This is particularly important because it is the only reservoir at an elevation of 305 feet.

The Mayor twisted the arm of the Water Department to declare one of these reservoirs surplus before the water resource study is completed. Don’t let her get away with this kind of political manipulation.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Kurt Common
Ken Crizer
Ed Dierauf
Herb Naylor
CCSF Engineering Professors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The South Balboa Basin has been unused since college leased buildings, including a large auditorium, were torn down on that site thirty years ago. We hope that three years of thorough planning would explore the possibility of returning a part of that property to the college for the development of a multi-purpose medium-sized auditorium which could be shared with community groups.

Joseph Alessi
Mary Argenzi
Neyle Azevedo
John Bischoff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Robert Bezune
Mock Cooks
Bob Davis
Helen Dilworth
Franz Excise
Richard Esterman
Richard Fenner
Lawrence Ferrara
Todd Fleming
Peggy Gorham
William Grothkopp
David Hurdman

Judy Hubbell
Charles Hudspeth
Sieglinde Isham
Baruch Klein
John Kangsamark
Joshua Law
Steven Lopez
Jerry Mueller
Madelene Mueller
Marvin Tartak
Frank Townsell
City College Music Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition E. This moratorium is necessary because there are too many worthy uses for this land to make a hasty and potentially very costly decision. Only through careful planning can the limited land available for development be best used.

Nicolas Alexander
Paul Hewitt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Jerome Hasken
Robert Knarr
James Korck
Dack Lee
Checle Liu
William Maynez
Annelle Rappleyea
Oleg Rebut
David Wall
City College Physics Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, as Physical Education Instructors, have always been committed to a diversified program for our students and community. The reservoir space is a natural land resource for a Multi Educational and Cultural Center.

Your YES vote on E will allow us the freedom to explore ways that this property could most constructively benefit all.

Gail Baron
Curtis Decker
Brad Doigun
Tanako Hagiyama
Joan Hahn
Daniel Hayes

Lene Johnson
Grover Klemmer
Paula McCallum
Art Octavio
Louise Scourkes

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, full-time faculty of the Computer and Information Science Department of City College, urge a YES vote to postpone the decision until additional planning and surveys can be conducted. The current proposal would negatively impact the College’s enrollment.

William Beaver
Ronald Cernat, Chairman
Kirk Gibson
Howard Granger
Frank Holden
Michael Kelly

George Lanyi
Norbert Ludykey
Charles Metzler
Charles Miller
Marilyn Schmahl
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

A YES vote on Proposition E helps STOP a scheme to GIVE AWAY $12,300,000 worth of City land for $1,800,000 (or less) to a Redwood City real estate developer.

A YES vote will SAVE taxpayers $550,000 per year. The housing project will produce $240,000 in taxes, but supplying City services will cost $790,000 per year.

The Controller’s cost estimate does NOT account for the $12,300,000 land value, since land sale below value is NOT technically a cost of government. The Controller also is NOT permitted to assume that the housing project will be constructed, since construction has NOT yet been ordered by the Board of Supervisors.

The plan does NOT restrict housing sales to moderate-income first-time buyers. The plan only restricts use of tax-subsidized funds. Any person favored by the developer or politicians can buy these dwellings and get the benefits of the public land giveaway.

The houses are made “affordable” by giving away the land far below market value, by City-backed low interest, and by cutting construction corners.

The real beneficiaries of the subsidized housing project are the financiers (NOT the project dwellers). Bondholders receive 9.6% average tax-free interest, which is equivalent to 24.6% taxable interest at 61% maximum tax. The developer and bond establishment receive $5,340,000; this is $26,300 (or 22.40%) for each $117,400 unit.

The City loses $51,700 worth of land GIVEN AWAY for each unit.

Vote YES on Proposition E for good fiscal management.

William Marquardt
Financial Analyst, SnA
Helen Crizer, Treasurer, SnA

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is by far the most crowded community college in the Bay Area. With 22,600 students on a 56 acre campus, it is more than twice as crowded as any of the others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of College</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Campus (acres)</th>
<th>Area/1000 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City College of SF</td>
<td>22,624</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laney College, Oakland</td>
<td>9,805</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot College, Hayward</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa College</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of San Mateo</td>
<td>13,820</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>11.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Marin</td>
<td>6,663</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Friends of City College
David Newton
Glen Simpson
Jack Baker
Thomas Velasquez
Tillie McCullough

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The student population at City College is increasing. This semester’s enrollment is up 1,265 students over last semester.

The enrollment in the San Francisco public schools has been increasing by 1,218 per year for the last three years. City College draws most of its enrollment from public schools in San Francisco.

Obviously, City College will have a larger enrollment in the future years, and will be in desperate need of space if we do not give it back its old West Campus.

Please reserve this public land for the college.
Please vote YES on E.

Barbara Holman

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON E

In 1981, I launched a six-point program to expand San Francisco's housing supply and the voters had approved a City policy to add 20,000 new housing units within five years. This Proposition would destroy a major portion of the effort to build affordable, single-family housing in our city.

The Balboa Reservoir Site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now a site for development of 203 new single-family homes, most with three bedrooms and two baths. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed as other homes built under the City's program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom could not afford homeownernship. It is believed that these new homes will sell rapidly.

The Balboa Reservoir site is one of the few sites large enough to accommodate a substantial number of new homes. Please do not let a few people stop a major opportunity for new housing. Vote no on Prop E.

Not only would Proposition E halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site, but the 9.8% fixed-rate, 30-year mortgage money set aside for the housing would also be lost.

Nothing constructive is accomplished by this measure—it does not provide additional land or facilities for City College. As a matter of fact, City College has neither plans nor money to use the property. Further, the Community College Board of Directors, the governing body for City College, has voted overwhelmingly to oppose the initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting "No on E."

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the site of the unused Balboa Reservoir and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost.

These homes are desperately needed for San Franciscans who can't afford to buy in the city where the average house is selling for over $160,000. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

The homes would be built on land that belongs to the City. Over two years ago, it was declared surplus and available for housing. It is not part of City College, and City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

We urge you to vote no on Proposition E if you want more affordable housing for San Franciscans.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

In 1980 San Franciscans voted overwhelmingly (63% yes to 37% no) to construct 20,000 housing units. Good progress is underway towards achieving the voter goal. A 1986 report by Mayor Dianne Feinstein states, "In the last five years 3,559 new housing units were completed with another 3,000 by 1988 and 20,000 more in 10 to 15 years". Most of this housing will be built in underutilized commercial districts; not in existing residential neighborhoods.

The 203 affordable owner occupied single family units slated for the southern portion of Balboa Reservoir are part of the 1988 total. Our progress in addressing the City's housing shortage will be curtailed if this ill-advised initiative is approved. SUPPORT OWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Housing production is essential to check rising prices and to maintain our social, economic, and ethnic population diversity. AS A SAN FRANCISCO VOTER, YOU CAN BE PART OF OUR HOUSING PROGRESS BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E. Do not be misled. The Community College Governing Board opposes this initiative. The district does not have any future building plans for this housing site.

WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT THE CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY HOUSING BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt construction of affordable housing at Balboa Reservoir site. This surplus public property empty for 30 years was declared surplus by the City in 1984. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders. The housing is desperately needed. San Franciscans need affordable housing.

Doris M. Ward, Member
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

A critical issue facing San Francisco today is the lack of housing middle class San Franciscans can afford.

That is why I have joined these neighborhood associations to support the Balboa Reservoir neighborhood housing proposal. Those participating in the development of the proposal includes:

O.M.I. Community Association
Dorado Terrace Association
Outer Mission-Ingleside
Political Action Committee
Greater Ingleside Community
Mount Davidson Manor
Ocean Avenue Merchants Association
Ingleside Terrace Association
The San Francisco Open Space Committee
City College of San Francisco

From early in 1985 I worked closely with these neighborhood groups in the discussions between city government and community leaders concerning the development plans for this desperately needed new housing at the unused Balboa reservoir site.

THESE ARE THE REASONS YOU SHOULD VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

1. The neighborhood housing proposal that this initiative seeks to stop is the result of months of hard work by the largest coalition of neighborhood associations ever to join together to plan a housing development in San Francisco.

2. The housing at the Balboa Reservoir site was designed with the involvement of the coalition of neighborhood associations to enhance the surrounding community.

3. The governing Board of the Community College District has made clear that they have no plans for the site and no ownership rights to it. City College does not oppose the construction of this development and opposes this initiative.

4. Self-proclaimed "Friends" of City College want to stop the proposal in order to preserve the site for future faculty parking. A clique of City College staffers involved in a neighborhood association pose as community opposition to this development even though a representative from this organization, the Sunnyvale Neighborhood Association, had helped plan and support the proposal.

5. By masquerading as concerned neighbors these self-appointed "friends" of City College hope to prevent the construction of 204 critically needed units of housing and pull off one of the biggest land grabs in San Francisco's history.

DON'T BE FOOLSED. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Residence Element of the Comprehensive Plan of the City and County of San Francisco assesses the City’s housing needs and lays out specific steps to meet those needs. This document was adopted by the City Planning Commission in 1984 after extensive public review at neighborhood meetings and public hearings, and consideration of the detailed Environmental Impact Report.

The first objective of the Housing Element is "to provide new Housing for all income groups" in locations appropriate for residential development. To meet this goal, development of housing is to be aggressively pursued and encouraged on surplus, underused and vacant public land.

Proposition E would halt construction of affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site. This public property, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City in 1984. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

If you want more affordable housing in San Francisco vote no on Proposition E.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Susan J. Bierman, City Planning Commissioner
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on E.

Proposition E deprives San Franciscans of one of their last real chances to become homeowners at an affordable price. At the South Balboa Reservoir we have City-owned land on which 203 units of three-bedroom, two-bath homes can be built at low prices which average San Franciscans can afford to pay. These homes need to be built now, not in three years. In three years the low interest rates on mortgages and the bond financing will be gone. Two hundred families will have lost the opportunity to become homeowners, and the City will have lost the opportunity to ease the tight market in rental housing.

Nor does this ill-conceived initiative help City College in any way. City College does not need this land. Speculation that the College may at some future date find a use for the land is not founded on fact. The College may never be able to build on the reservoir. Their enrollment has dropped by over 4000 students in the last few years.

This initiative is designed to confuse you. It will make our housing shortage worse for three long years. If you support affordable housing in our City, Vote NO on Proposition E.

Bill Maher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Balboa Reservoir site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now planned for development of 203 new single family homes. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed — other homes built under this program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom would not otherwise be able to afford home ownership.

San Francisco has the most expensive housing in the nation where last year the average home sold for over $160,000. Housing is difficult to produce because the obstacles are great — little land on which to build, high construction costs and uncertain interest rates.

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond for mortgages would be lost. The initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional land or facilities for City College. The Community College Board, the governing body of City College, in fact recently voted to oppose this initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting "No" on Proposition E.

John L. Molinari

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

In 1980, the voters of the City and County of San Francisco approved a measure making it City policy to add 20,000 new units of housing within five years. In 1984 in an effort to satisfy this objective, the Board of Supervisors adopted a policy encouraging the expansion of the City’s housing supply. Making surplus City-owned land, such as the site at Balboa Reservoir, available for affordable housing was an important part of that policy. A proposal to build 203 homes on the unused Balboa Reservoir site was advanced to help implement the pro-housing policy.

Approval of Proposition E would HALT construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.

The Balboa Reservoir homes would be built on land currently belonging to the City and County of San Francisco. The property IS NOT part of the City College, and City College has neither plans or money to buy the property and convert it for City College use.

The only debatable issue is the future of affordable housing on the Balboa Reservoir site.

As we are all aware, San Francisco has the most expensive homes in the United States. The average cost of a home is $152,000. Not many can afford such prices. However, the housing proposed for the Balboa Reservoir will give many more citizens the opportunity to become homeowners. The homes to be built will be sold to first-time buyers at prices ranging from $83,000 to $145,000.

Other homes built in San Francisco under the direction of similar affordable housing programs have been snapped up quickly by San Franciscans. Without the program, most would not have been able to purchase the home and become homeowners.

Again, if you desire to preserve the construction of more affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site, vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Willie B. Kennedy

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Additional single family housing is undeniably San Francisco’s most acute social need. When some vacant surplus City land (12 acres) finally becomes available for 203 additional new private homes there will always be some selfish individuals who are in favor of new housing “just so long as it is not built across the street from me!” This unused, vacant City reservoir land hasn’t generated a dime of taxes for over thirty years! Let’s add 203 NEW home-owner taxpayers to the City’s rolls as quickly as possible. Stop these self-serving no-growth obstructionists! Please vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Prop E would halt affordable housing construction at the Balboa Reservoir site. Many gay people need affordable housing, too, and we join with other community groups urging you to vote NO on Prop E.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Robert Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E, if approved, would block the construction of 203 badly needed single-family homes on the south portion of the Balboa Reservoir in San Francisco. Sixty percent of these homes would be available for purchase by moderate and middle income families at purchase prices between $80,000 and $120,000. They would be constructed on surplus public land and financed by the sale of mortgage revenue bonds to enable the developer to sell the homes at below market prices.

A neighborhood group headed by two city college faculty members is responsible for placing Proposition E on the ballot. The group contends that the land which is intended to be used for the project should be made available instead to City College for the construction of new teaching facilities even though enrollment at City College is declining and the City College Board has voted 6 to 1 to oppose the initiative.

Like many other areas of the country, San Francisco suffers from a shortage of housing. Purchase prices here are among the highest in the nation. The use of surplus public lands and revenue bond financing provide a means for making single family homes available to a broad spectrum of families at affordable prices.

The Balboa Reservoir project is supported by the leaders of 8 neighborhood groups in the area surrounding the location of the proposed project, and by a majority of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, as well as by Mayor Dianne Feinstein. We urge you to encourage the construction of this type of housing in San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition E.

San Francisco Board of Realtors
William L. Jansen, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

SAVE OUR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS!
BERNAL HEIGHTS SAYS, “VOTE NO ON PROP E!”

We are residents of Bernal Heights in San Francisco. We’ve worked hard to build affordable family and senior citizen homes in our neighborhood.

We need more affordable housing in our City to survive. The real issue in Prop E is affordable family housing—a “yes” vote prevents the construction of 203 family homes. That’s crazy! Join us in preserving what’s best in our City.

Vote “no” on Prop E!

Sylvia M. Yee, Bernal Heights Community Foundation Board of Directors
Frank Hutchier, BHCF Board*
Mary Lou Bertolotti, BHCF Board*
Lola Havener, BHCF Board*
Elizabeth Egger, BHCF Board*
Sister Janet Simons, BHCF Board*
Stephen Antonarol, BHCF Board*
Lorenzo R. Dill, BHCF Board*
Barbara Bogot, BHCF Board*
Margaret C. Randolph, Northwest Bernal Block Club*
Maureen Lamb, NWBBC*
Tim Molinaire, BHCF Planning & Dev’t Committee*
Bob Bogot, BHCF P & D Committee*
***Organization for identification purposes only.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Balboa Reservoir Development Ban

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco Needs Affordable Housing—Vote No on Proposition E

Everyone agrees that San Francisco needs affordable housing. The questions are how and where that affordable housing can be built.

The Balboa Reservoir housing development, to be built on the site of a reservoir built thirty years ago and unused since that time, answers those important questions for more than 200 San Francisco first-time homebuying families by providing:
— 203 new affordable three-bedroom, single family homes
— 9.8% fixed-rate financing
— A mix of 30% low-income, 30% moderate-income and 40% market-rate first time buyers
— A convenient site that has been declared “surplus” by the City and “available for development of affordable housing”

The Balboa Reservoir housing development is a small but significant step in the effort to generate affordable housing in our City.

Thousands of San Franciscans from every community, neighborhood group and viewpoint agree that the Balboa Reservoir development is good for San Francisco. Virtually every elected official, including the Governing Board of City College also agree.

All these San Franciscans ask you to say “yes” to affordable housing and “NO” to Proposition E.

San Francisco Coalition for Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar, Executive Director

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The viable plan for affordable single family housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site is being threatened by Proposition E. If Proposition E passes, 203 single family homes will be lost to the citizenry of San Francisco at a time when they are greatly needed.

The facts about the proposed housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site argue strongly against Proposition E. All 203 homes will be for first time home buyers. One-third of the homes will be available to households earning $27,000. Another third of the homes will be available to households earning $36,000. Adequate parking will be provided within the development itself, thus answering any concerns that traffic in the area will be congested.

City College has no need or plan to use South Balboa Reservoir for its facilities. City College’s priority is to develop its existing campus. South Balboa Reservoir should therefore be used for one of the City’s greatest needs: increased and affordable housing which is available to lower and middle income families.

As homeowners who live in the vicinity of South Balboa Reservoir, we welcome its planned use for single family housing and feel it will become an integral and contributing part of the community. We therefore urge you to vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Submitted by:
Stephen Graham, Chairman of the Housing Sub-committee of the Citizen’s Committee for Community Development
Roderick A. McLeod, Vice-Chairman of the Citizen’s Committee on Community Development

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing is a group of neighbors which consists of many of the renters of Westwood Park and Sunnyside neighborhoods as well as owners and renters of Ingleside which are the closest neighbors to the Balboa Reservoir along with some of the students and teachers of City College.

We strongly support the Balboa Reservoir for housing. We believe that the Balboa Reservoir is an ideal spot for housing.

Our neighborhood wants homes in the South Balboa Reservoir.
Vote No On Prop. E.

Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughney
Submitted by Patricia Vaughney

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

As Merchants as well as residents of Ocean Avenue, Greater Ingleside and San Francisco, we support the Development of the Balboa Reservoir as housing.

A Traffic Survey has stated that there will be minimal impact on the existing patterns of traffic by this development.

Additional City College Parking is being considered on another location off I-280 to keep the college congestion away from the neighborhood’s streets.

City College has 44 more acres in which to expand and existing buildings at City College have viable means to expand.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
We believe that housing on the Balboa Reservoir is the most viable solution to develop a vacant piece of property that is directly adjacent to our stores on a Transpreferential Street.

Affordable housing is in great need in San Francisco and is as much needed here as anywhere. We want to help provide this need. Vote No on Prop. E.

Ocean Avenue Merchants Assoc.
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughg
Submitted by Patricia Vaughg

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction on much-needed affordable, single-family housing at the long vacant south Balboa Reservoir site. This proposition would also block a major housing development that would bring jobs into an area of the city that has little industry or private business.

Sale prices for these units are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the San Francisco housing market, where the average home is selling for $160,000. Construction of these homes will help all young, first-time home buyers and will require only 5% down, instead of the 20% down payment on houses bought with conventional home mortgages.

This plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by nine nearby neighborhood organizations. If Proposition E is approved and this project is blocked, more young adults will purchase their first home in Vallejo or some other outlying area, further draining San Francisco of the young families that every growing community needs.

San Francisco residents will gain apprenticeships, jobs, contracts and subcontracts from this development.

This plan calls for 2 and 3 bedroom, family-sized houses, with space for another bedroom which can be finished when needed.

Each house will have 2½ parking spaces in front and would not cause parking problems in the area. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

City College of San Francisco has no plans to buy the property, has no money for institutional expansion, nor any mention of this land in any master plan. Some supporters of this proposition are motivated by racist notions and have said they fear that this development will become another “Geneva Towers.” This type of thinking is similar to support for apartheid practiced in South Africa and must be defeated by progressive San Francisco voters. Property values will increase, instead of a decrease as a result of this project.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition E.

Larry Ukali Johnson-Reid — President, O.M.I. Pilgrim Community Center Inc.
Maria Campbell-Casey — Program Director, Bay Area Engineering Societies Committee for Manpower Training, Inc.
Clara Mills-Bradford — Program Director, O.M.I. Senior Center
John C. Jackson
Linda Rose-Gipson
Jon Still — Secretary, Young Adult Committee
Kenneth Butler

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhoods. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided — 2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Affordable Housing Alliance — Mitchell Omerberg, Director
Bay Area Urban League — Gregory Best, Field Representative
Bernal Heights Community Foundation — Andre Lennell Daye
Community Educational Services — Dorothy Chen, Executive Director
Japanese Community Youth Council St. Francis Square Apartments, Inc. — Sandra Mayor-Jenkins, Secretary
Minority Contractors Association of Northern California — James Hangabook, Secretary, Board of Directors
National Community Congress — Dr. Eddie C. Welban
Parkmarced Residents Organization, Inc. — Ricardo A. Collelo, Esq.
Potrero Hill Neighborhood House — Enola Maxwell
San Francisco Building Traders Council — Stan Smith
San Francisco Housing & Tenants Council — Joseph Lacey
San Francisco Tenants Union — Jim Faye
Rei Ainos C. Brown — Local Pastor & Community Servant
Greg Day — Chairman, Citizens Committee on Community Development
Polly V. Marshall — Commissioner, San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
Regina A. Sneed
Jim Wachob — San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Michael E. Willis, A1A — Fleming Corporation

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided—2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote "No" on Proposition E.

Greater Ingleside Political Club — Frank Noto, Treasurer
Housing Conservation and Development Corporation — Lonnie Lawon, Board of Directors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided—2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Bayview Baptist Minister Fellowship — Rev. N. B. Mills, President
Bread of Life Missionary Baptist Church — Rev. S. A. Bailey
Cosmopolitan Baptist Church — Rev. A. Ray Gentle
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Raymond M. Howard Sr.
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Carole Nelson
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Cornelius P. O'Reilly
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Paul G. Theiss
Old St. Mary's Housing Committee — Charles Gale, Chairman
St. Peters Housing Committee — Texas Fowler

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?

YES 296
NO 297

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: With certain exceptions, City officers, including elected officials and commission members, may represent clients before City boards and commissions other than their own, and be paid for their services. State legislators may represent clients before City boards and commissions, and be paid for their services. Any person may contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would prohibit City officers from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay. This proposition would prohibit State legislators from appearing before City boards, commissions and departments on behalf of clients for pay. City officers would be prohibited from discussing with these officers and legislators matters that the City is deciding. Proposition F would also prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit City officers and State legislators from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to allow City officers and State legislators to represent clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to allow any person to contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

Controller's Statement on “F”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 77

How “F” Got on Ballot

On February 26 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for limitations on compensated advocacy and campaign contributions had qualified for the June ballot.

Quentin Kopp, Marth Gillham and Cheryl Arenson, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 9,400 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,986 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The purpose of Proposition F is to cut campaign contributions by large contributors (and thus reduce campaign spending) and eliminate undue influence by officeholders retained as paid lobbyists for projects requiring City approval.

Let’s take a minute to analyze the untrue arguments against Proposition F:

* The opponents claim that Proposition F will force half the City’s Commissioners to resign. In fact, Proposition F does not force any Commissioners to resign. It simply says they can’t be a paid lobbyist and a City Commissioner at the same time. Does a commissioner value making money by lobbying more than public service?

* Some have also alleged that Proposition F will prevent duly-elected union leaders from serving as City Commissioners. No it won’t. Proposition F prohibits “compensated advocacy” — that means lobbyists hired by an organization, not members of the organization itself. Proposition F does not apply to salaried employees of labor unions, corporations, or non-profit agencies. Moreover, Section 8.105 of the Charter precludes it specifically from applying to any member serving as a representative of any profession, trade, business, union or association on any board or commission which requires membership of representatives of specific professions, trades, businesses, unions or associations.

* Another untrue argument against Proposition F is that it prohibits City officials only from discussing pending issues with other City officers or State Legislators who are also acting as paid lobbyists in a matter and doesn’t stop those officeholding lobbyists from writing City officials about their clients’ objectives. That’s not so. Proposition F applies to all such lobbying, written or oral. (The dictionary defines “discuss” as “to examine by means of speech or writing.”)

End government decision-making by “insiders” and reduce the influence of money on local campaigns.

VOTE YES ON F.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
San Franciscans for Good Government

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

In all our years of observing San Francisco City government, we have found one maxim to be true time after time: a good idea gets copied, especially among politicians.

For no sooner did Quentin Kopp promise to bring Proposition F to the voters than did Mayor Feinstein come up with an informal, administrative version of her own. Fine, you say (and the Mayor says), then why vote Yes on Proposition F?

(1) The Mayor’s remedy of asking City Commissioners who also act as lobbyists before City agencies to resign is nothing more than a hand slap, and is good only as long as she is mayor. It’s not binding on future mayors and could be changed without any vote of the Board of Supervisors, let alone the people of San Francisco. Proposition F prohibits this kind of conflict-of-interest, and it will be the law, no matter who is mayor.

(2) The Mayor’s action did nothing to state legislators who can also act as lobbyists before City Boards and Commissions, nor did her action stop the law or business partners of City Commissioners from picking up the slack in big-money lobbying. Proposition F will stop these practices in their tracks.

(3) What about the other half of Proposition F, which reduced the campaign contribution limit to $500 so that all San Franciscans can enjoy equal access to City officials, not just the ones with the big bucks? The Mayor can’t do anything about this, and she hasn’t. Only a Yes vote on Proposition F will reduce the weight of big money and ensure our full voice in City elections and City government.

VOTE Yes on Proposition F. If it’s important enough for the Mayor to copy part of it administratively, it’s important enough to do the job right and make it a law.

John J. Barbagelata
Harry Algo
June Calin
Dorothy Parrtridge

Robert Arenson
Rudolph Lohnes
Janet Wentworth

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The worst and most persistent problem in American politics is that politicians and political races can be “bought”. Reducing the size of campaign contributions will be a step forward in reducing the role of money in elections. Vote yes for more honest government.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

RESTORE to the people their rightful and equal power as individual voters by reducing the monetary clout and influence of private interests who make the laws and the policies as City officials and Commissioners or State legislators.

TELL the special interests that their money and influence can no longer interfere with representative government.

TELL the special interests that the voters will no longer tolerate the influence-buying which comes with large campaign contributions.

TELL the special interests that this measure will encourage highly talented citizens to serve San Francisco honestly and responsibly.

VOTE YES ON F.

Cheryl Arenson
Anne Renfrew
David Pacheco

Tom Hayes
Dorothy Vaksich

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

"Government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

These noble words from Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, cast in bronze at the entrance to City Hall, seem to have escaped the attention of some City officials who pass by them every day. For in San Francisco City government, Lincoln's simple formula for representative government would read quite differently: "Government of the powerful, by the lobbyists, and for the wealthy."

Government of, by, and for the privileged few is bad government. Government of, by, and for all the people is good government. It's as simple as that—as simple as Lincoln first put it.

Proposition F, the Good Government Initiative, will help San Franciscans maintain control of their government and will prevent undue influence by City officeholders.

To reduce undue influence, Proposition F outlaws the practice of City Commissioners and State Legislators representing special interests for pay before City Commissions and Boards. City Commissions should render their decisions deliberately and impartially, not be swayed by the political clout of the lobbyists appearing before them, or by any political favors those lobbyist/politicians might promise. "I'll scratch your back if you scratch my back" bargains do not belong in government. And until such backroom bargains are made illegal, City government will not belong to the rest of us either.

Proposition F also reduces the maximum amount that anyone can give to a local candidate from $1,000 to $500. If large contributors and other special interests can't give as much money, they can't buy as much influence with elected officials. And the lower the contribution limit, the less campaign spending and the more City government will be responsive to all San Franciscans.

You can "buy back" City government from the privileged and powerful with the most precious of all political commodities: your vote.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Mary Lohneis
Peter Fatouh
Judith Thorson

Babette Drefke
Daniel Jordan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F, an initiative of the people, is needed to protect the voters and the integrity of the legislative process from being corrupted by the power of money and influence. It prevents City officials and State Legislators from lobbying the City on behalf of high-powered special interests. It also lowers the campaign/contribution limit from $1,000 to $500, thus reducing the influence of those same special interests over our elections and elected officials.

The bogus argument that the Mayor won't be able to find qualified people to serve on City commissions if Proposition F is adopted ignores the plain fact that there are 700,000 people in San Francisco, a pool of civic-minded citizens more than large enough to accommodate the 250 commission appointments available in our City government. For example, there are plenty of architects to fill the one architectural appointment on the Art Commission, just as there are plenty of non-lobbyist business people and lawyers available to serve on other commissions.

Thousands of San Franciscans, not just the "insiders", are ready, willing, and able to serve the public.

Proposition F deserves your vote. Restore integrity to City government. Restore the confidence of the citizens of San Francisco in that government. Let's have no more Wilkes Bashford situations.

VOTE YES ON F.

Oscar Sutro
Martha Gillham
Marguerite Warren

Leonel Monterey
Tony Kilroy

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE "NO" ON F

This proposition disguises itself as "good government" but, in reality, would drive good people out of government. It is so crudely drawn — so sweeping in its implications — that it would bar from government almost anyone with even a remote business or community tie to government.

It would purge from City commissions anyone who "directly or indirectly" receives compensation from any "interests" with an issue before any City agency. Effectively, this could discriminate against employees from community and neighborhood groups, civil rights organizations, non-profit corporations, labor unions, merchant and business groups, as well as architects, lawyers and other professionals.

Actually, there currently are no commissioners who represent any clients before any City agency. All who are appointed in my administration sign a statement saying they will not advocate for any paying client before any official body of the City while they are commissioners. This proposition simply is not necessary.

Proposition F also would lower the limit for any individual campaign contribution from $1000 to $500. Although this sounds good, it would permit a wealthy person with various businesses and numerous family members to contribute many thousands of dollars through different sources. This would encourage "hidden" contributions. We must strive for disclosure of contributions, not a system which drives contributions underground. Candidates must be able to raise funds enough to put their message before the voters. Reducing the contribution limit can be a tactic to discourage persons from challenging incumbents.

Vote no on Proposition F.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition F purports to achieve a noble objective: The removal of "influence peddling" from City Hall. In fact, Proposition F is so poorly-crafted, it may have exactly the opposite effect on City government. It is not a "good government" initiative. It is bad legislation.

Proposition F provides no definitions and no standards for the public to judge whether City officials comply with its restrictions. Its uncertainties will be chaotic and lead to endless, needless lawsuits.

A measure similar to Proposition F was rejected by the Board of Supervisors because no public hearings were ever held on the legislation. If the public had had a chance to comment on this initiative, it might not have the critical shortcomings, deficiencies and uncertainties that now warrant its rejection by responsible San Franciscans.

In the coming months, the Board will review good government measures that are comprehensible, effective and, most important, certain. Proposition F is a misguided disaster.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

This should properly have been titled the "SINK WILLIE BROWN ORDINANCE"! The "meat of the cocoanut" is in Section 4.

Supervisor Kopp's intentions are good, however this sloppily drafted and incomprehensible measure succeeds in "burning down the barn" to eliminate a couple of rats!

Under this proposal, to avoid any potential INDIRECT conflict of interest, (which is undefined!), one would have to be a destitute, unemployed welfare recipient to qualify for service on any City Board or Commission! The Mayor has already solved this "hired advocacy" problem with the "conflict of interest" affidavits she demands IN ADVANCE from any prospective appointee.

Quentin's proposed $500.00 campaign contribution limit is an "inside joke" and he, of all people, knows it! It merely obliges a heavy contributor to have his wife, children, business associates, or friends send in SEPARATE $500.00 checks if he wants to contribute more than $500.00 to a politician's campaign.

These proposals require additional City employees for enforcement and wind up doing far more harm than good. Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr., President
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Union members and labor officials have legitimate reasons for meeting with City officers. It is unfair and wrong to lump them in the same category as special interest lobbyists, yet that's exactly what Proposition F does. Working people deserve representation on City boards and commissions. VOTE NO!

Walter Johnson
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council
LeRoy King
James Elliot
Keith Eickman
Reeva Olson

Jeff Groendorfer
Stan Smith
Larry Griffin
Steve Rabkin
Terrence Ryan
Jack Beggs
Tony Marovich

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

If you want to ban business owners and executives from serving on City boards and commissions, then vote for Proposition F.

If you think board members of non-profit corporations and employees of community agencies have nothing to contribute to City government, then vote for Proposition F.

If you believe union members and labor officials should not have a voice at City Hall, then vote for Proposition F.

But if you share our belief that these individuals have legitimate concerns and expertise that is valuable in running major City departments, then join us in voting NO on Proposition F.

Proposition F is a simplistic, sloppily-drafted, meat axe approach to a problem already resolved by Mayor Feinstein's ban on commissioners lobbying on behalf of private clients.

Proposition F is not good government and it is not reform. Proposition F is bad legislation. VOTE NO.

Hon. Amy Meyer
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Walter jebe
Hon. Bruce Lilienthal
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Jean Kortum
Hon. Thomas Horn
Hon. Henry Berman
Hon. Robert McCarthy
Hon. Richard Guggenheim
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Hon. Patrick McGrew
Hon. Kirk Miller
Hon. Melvin Lee
Hon. Jerry Berg
Hon. Bonnie Gibson
Hon. Mary Noel Pepys
Hon. Mark Buell
Hon. Tim Carrico
Hon. Jo Hanson
Hon. Kevin Malone
John Sanger
Tom Moore
Donald Ditler
Jim Hachob
Anne Daley
Linda Post
Lynne Williams
Todd Dickinson
Peter Hanson
Herbert Kurlan
William Scorsitis
Van Hart
Iris Flusilnen
Noam Band
John Schmidt
James Mock
Thomas Karvaki
Wendy Goldberg
Joseph Schwartz
Belle Lazarus
Antonio Barrios
Bruce Barrett
Charles Howell
Walter McGuire
Sharon Duvall
Joyce Mauriello

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

We're sympathetic to the need for political reform. But it's a complicated problem, and Proposition F just isn't the way to go.

Frankly, we can't tell who is and isn't affected by this measure. While a handful of people sometimes might abuse their positions, that's no reason to question the integrity of so many solid citizens who give tirelessly to public service. Proposition F is simply the wrong approach. Please join us in voting NO.

William E. McDonnell
Frances May McAteer
N. A. Sapunar
Caroline and Michael Fagin
Martin D. Murphy
Eugene C. Payne III
Suzanne B. McCarthy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Concerned about elected officials spending $400,000 to run for supervisor and $1 million on a mayor's race? Then vote NO on Proposition F.

That's right. NO.

Proposition F isn't going to do anything about campaign spending. Prop F simply limits the size of contributions, reducing the current limit from $1,000 to $500. Supervisors can and will continue spending outrageous sums on their re-election campaigns. With Proposition F they'll just spend twice as much time raising money from twice as many sources, and that makes special interests even more powerful. They can always find ways around campaign limits.

We need campaign spending reform, but Proposition F doesn't provide it. Please join us in voting No on F.

District 8 Democratic Club
Stephanie L. Tabor
Ruth Gravananis
Alan Razzick
Miriam Blaustein
Linda Chapman
Dale Carlson
James Firth
Debra Barnes
Lev Serbin
Debra Stein

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

55
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

When campaign contributions are limited, political freedom suffers. Your right to free speech includes not only your right to express your views, but also your right to support as much as you want, any candidate who speaks for you.

Minority viewpoints depend heavily on the contribution of a few dedicated supporters to get your message out. To limit your financial support of your beliefs is to silence your political voice.

Only incumbents, who have many opportunities for free media exposure benefit from this assault on free speech. The dangers of a campaign contribution limit far outweigh any possible benefit from this proposition. Defeat Proposition F!

San Francisco Libertarian Party
Michael R. Fowler, Secretary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

You may think Prop F only applies to big-time lawyers and a few legislators who represent developers. Think again!

Prop F would prohibit many community leaders from public service. If it passes, board members and employees of community and charitable organizations could be banned from serving on City boards and commissions.

We appreciate the public need for a government free of "influencing peddling." But restrictions on "compensated advocacy" ought to be clearly and carefully crafted to protect the voices of community leaders who argue on behalf of the public interest, not private special interests.

Vote No.

Hon. Jeffrey Ken Mori
Japanese Community Youth Council, Inc.
Bill O'Callahan
American Red Cross
Hon. George Sancin
Horizons Unlimited
Hon. Jean Risa Alviar
Mission Education Project
Hon. Greg Day
Polk Street Town Hall
Hon. Naomi Gray
Hon. James Foster
Carol Wong
Marlene Marseille
Lee Woods
Jo Daly
Dennis Collins
Hon. H. Welton Flynn

(Organizations listed only for purposes of identification.)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will have no effect on developers' lawyers. None.

It won't make any difference to state legislators either.

Don't kid yourself. This is not "reform" and it isn't "good government." Proposition F will allow the special interests and influence peddlers to continue exercising influence over our elected officials. It has so many loopholes, lobbying will actively continue, untouched, in the back rooms of City Hall.

And developers will always find ways around campaign contribution limits. As Common Cause has noted, Prop F simply makes tracing their dollars more difficult for the public.

Real reform would directly attack the source of huge contributions—the developers and other special interests that employ the lobbyists to peddle their influence.

VOTE NO.

Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
David Looman
Michael Mason
Rich Willer
Susan Klugerman
Rene Cazensaye
Margie O'Driscoll

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
South Africa Boycott

PROPOSITION G

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?

YES 300

NO 301

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has adopted an ordinance prohibiting the City, with certain exceptions, from purchasing goods or services from companies doing business with South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a declaration of policy that says the City must try to avoid doing business with companies that significantly profit from or help maintain the Apartheid system in South Africa. It calls on other public bodies and private groups to adopt similar policies. It directs the Board of Supervisors to identify the companies which have the greatest ties to Apartheid so that the public can also boycott those companies.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to avoid doing business with companies that help maintain Apartheid, and you want a public boycott of those companies.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

“The proposed Declaration of Policy be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “G” Got on Ballot

On November 6, 1985 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for the City to boycott businesses with significant ties to South Africa had qualified for the June ballot.

Arlo Hale Smith, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,546 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on October 11.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,941 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

POLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:

It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This measure calls for a public boycott of companies that aid apartheid.

Any claim of "conflict" between Proposition G and existing anti-apartheid legislation is imaginary: It is the legislative intent of supporters of this measure that it can be construed as a directive for making existing law tougher.

Personal attacks have no legitimate place in a ballot measure campaign. As proponent of this measure, I repudiate all such tactics.

Vote NO on apartheid. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Arlo Hale Smith

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Boycotts are grassroots politics. They've helped the farm-workers, they've helped win integration, and they can help end the legal racism called "Apartheid".

A Gallup poll found 77% of South Africa's black majority favoring international economic boycotts to force the Apartheid regime to accept reform peacefully.

After the Boycott Initiative made the ballot, the San Francisco Supervisors unanimously passed a similar city purchasing policy. The issue that remains is whether to call on the general public to join in, boycotting companies identified by the Supervisors as the worst offenders in each industry.

The companies that would be targeted consider profits to be the "bottom line". Economic pressure is all they understand.

The AFL-CIO, NAACP, and NOW have called a boycott of Shell Oil because of its profiteering from South Africa's oppressive economic conditions. Proposition G supports that and would put the same pressure on other industries as well.

This proposition is supported by the elected county central committee of the Democratic Party, the Peace-and-Freedom Party and the Humanist Party, and by leading attorneys, such as Terry Francois, Terence Hallinan, Tony Serra, Lewis Hope Lee, Marc Van Der Hout, Abby Ginsberg and Terence Redmond.

If South Africa were a democracy, its majority would long ago have voted to end Apartheid. We need to vote Yes — because they can't.

Atty. Arlo Hale Smith, Democratic Party County Central Committee
Paul Kangas, Peace and Freedom Party
Lois Salisbury, Public Advocates*
Dr. Kevin Danaher, Food First*
Jesse James, Mission Rebels
Terry Collins, Community Activist
Shon Gertet, Election Action
Robert McCull, Hotel & Restaurant Employees
Executive Board Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Attorneys speak out against Apartheid:

South African police can arrest anyone without charge. They can hold you incommunicado — no contacts with family, lawyers or press.

They regularly censor news, books, music. They have banned Christmas caroling, funerals and other peaceful gatherings. Groups which criticize the government are forbidden to hold meetings.

Blacks are subject to legal segregation; their property and employment rights are greatly restricted; often, they are simply murdered.

As attorneys, we help people who have legal rights that are being violated. But what can we do for those who have no legal rights?

Boycotts and other economic sanctions are the only way to make the Apartheid government accept reform peacefully.

In the Court of World Public Opinion, Apartheid has been convicted of crimes against humanity. By imposing a sentence of economic isolation, we can end Apartheid.

Vote Yes — take a stand for justice.

Terence Hallinan
Arlo Hale Smith
Terry Francois
Karen Anderson Ryer
Robert R. Bryan
Ann Menasche
Rachel Ginsburg
Leo Pauli
Gabriel Gusner
Orr Prechovnick

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is a moderate, responsible but effective proposal to bring economic pressure on the South African government to establish constitutional rights for all of its citizens.

Vote Yes.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

All decent Americans abhor apartheid. However, boycotting U.S. investment in South Africa is counterproductive; it only penalizes the actual victims of apartheid.

U.S. international firms have acted as progressive agents for change through the Sullivan principles. Their investments have improved the social and economic condition of the labor force.

It is improper to penalize their positive contributions.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

We are individuals and organizations working actively to end the racist system of apartheid in South Africa. And we are voting NO on Proposition G.

Why?

(1) Because Proposition G will weaken San Francisco’s present divestment law. This law requires companies doing business with the city to sign affidavits that they will make no new contracts with South Africa.

Proposition G has no such provision.

(2) Proposition G provides no mechanism or funding to carry out its declared purpose of “boycotting” South Africa.

Proposition G will not stop South African products from entering the Port of San Francisco.

Vote against this useless, confusing, and deceptive initiative.

Preserve the stronger divestment law San Francisco already has.

Vote NO on Proposition G!

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1983 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!
AIDS Research

PROPOSITION H

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?

YES 303
NO 304

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Several city and private agencies conduct various programs related to AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a declaration of policy that says San Francisco should support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council, consisting of a Committee on Education and a Fund-Raising Committee. The Research Committee would make recommendations on the most useful AIDS research projects and try to prevent duplication of efforts. The Education Committee would inform the public about the latest research and about ways to prevent AIDS. The Fund-Raising Committee would seek donations and grants for AIDS research and education projects.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

“The proposed Declaration of Policy for an AIDS research and education council and the formation of advisory committees of civic leaders would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, additional expenditure of public funds for AIDS research may result, the amount of which cannot be determined.”

How “H” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for AIDS research had qualified for the June ballot.

Stony Gebert, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 10,540 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on December 6, 1985.

A check of each signature on the petition showed that 7,564 of the signatures were valid. This is more than 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We need a council to expose and address major AIDS issues without the impasse of present medical/political bias.

As taxpayers, we are subsidizing a treadmill of continual AIDS casualties. There are major oversights where AIDS is concerned. Only recently was it learned that CDC statistics suggest 79% of early AIDS cases appear drug-related. We hear AIDS is 100% fatal. Perhaps that is because death may also be drug-related in the way of immuno-suppressive antibiotic and radiation overloads to already compromised immunity systems. Prevailing medicine is both tunnel-visioned and high-profit motivated. Also well-funded. This solution may be part of the problem. Some physicians are beginning to feel where AIDS is concerned many current practices are ethically, medically bankrupt.

Remissions occur. Largely through immunity-enhancing, holistic medicine. Significantly, only 1% of AIDS cases occur among people at risk in the Asian community. Perhaps this is due to less drug abuse or use of an unfunded, ignored resource: herbolgy as part of diet. More options: homeopathy, acupuncture, etc.

If, as anticipated, upwards of 40% of those testing positive come down with AIDS, we may become overburdened. To ignore all of the above becomes part of the problem. Vote Yes on Proposition H.

Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Rich McKirkeby, Former Orderly,
Marketing Associate, Pacific Bell
Joseph P. Clady, AIDS Hospice, Shanti Counselor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There is great need for research and education about AIDS and related conditions.

We need to attack the disease, not its victims.

Knowledge is the only vaccine available today.

Vote Yes.

John Lorenzini, President,
People With AIDS Alliance
Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Jan Beck, Steven Russell, Eugene Ewins, ARC/AIDS Vigil

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There are many possible treatments for AIDS and related conditions which are not being examined by the federal government, especially therapies based on natural substances and processes.

Vote Yes for an AIDS Research Council open to all viewpoints.

Scott Gregory, M.D.
Paul Kangas

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A tape recording (Talking Book) of the San Francisco Voter Information pamphlet is available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name

Address

Apt. #

Telephone No. (required)

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): 

Second choice locations (if any)

Signature
PROPOSITION I
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?

YES 307
NO 308

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the Freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a policy statement asking whether or not the Embarcadero Freeway should be torn down.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City’s policy to remain as it is, and you want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to change the City’s policy, and you do not want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway demolished, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by at least $10.2 million in local funds. Potential private sector financing and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “I” Got on Ballot

On March 3 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy placing the question of demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway before the voters had qualified for the June ballot.

Richard Hongisto, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 11,119 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,720 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I
In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land now under the Broadway ramps is put back on the tax rolls, with low-rise buildings limited by restrictive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when united with Proposition J, recognizes these facts:
1) The Embarcadero Freeway is what is left of a never-completed elevated freeway that would have ringed the City through North Beach and Marina neighborhoods to the Golden Gate Bridge.
2) Today this massive freeway, which separates us from our waterfront, would never be built.
3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.
4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman’s Wharf will be preserved.
5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked for this new system.
6) Only that portion of the Embarcadero Freeway east and north of the Main and Beale Street ramps—basically the portion directly on the waterfront—will be removed to make way for the new system. The removal cost, approximately $10 million to be paid for with privately-generated new revenues, is a relatively small part of the overall new system.

As for Proposition I, vote “YES, let’s tear down the Embarcadero Freeway.” Then turn to Proposition J and support the plan for a beautiful waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I
Removing the Embarcadero Freeway will allow San Francisco to:
• Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero.
• Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway.
• Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula.
• Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero.
• Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.
• Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won’t benefit San Francisco. Don’t let outsiders determine our future. Vote YES on I.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON I
This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY—VOTE YES ON I
Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds—without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city’s fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.

Hon. Toby Rosenblatt Hon. Susan Bierman Hon. Yoshio Nakashima Hon. Douglas G. Wright Anita Sanchez
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT—VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to $7.5 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown, Fisherman's Wharf and the financial district would be reduced.

Travel within the city would be slowed down at all hours. Vote no to the destruction of the freeway.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
- Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for this (21 intersections only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%)
- Opening or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to 3 and Golden Gate Bridge person hours of travel.
- Commuters will be 75% the freeway is allowed to

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land now under the Broadway ramps is put back on the tax rolls, with low-rise buildings limited by restrictive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when united with Proposition J, recognizes these facts:

1) The Embarcadero Freeway is what is left of a never-completed elevated freeway that would have ringed the City through North Beach and Mission neighborhoods to the Golden Gate Bridge.

2) Today this massive

VOTE YES ON PROPOSAL I

Removing the Embarcadero to:

- Create a six-lane, two-way boulevard to speed traffic.
- Build new on and off-ramps closer to the Bay Bridge.
- Remove the unused and potentially dangerous portion of the freeway from the Peninsula.
- Provide bike paths along the waterfront.
- Link Fort Mason to the Presidio by light rail transit line.
- Extend Muni Metro to the Embarcadero with special interests wanting to profit from the waterfront, would never be built.

3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.

4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf will be preserved.

5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked for this new system.

6) Only that portion of the Embarcadero Freeway east and north of the Main and Beale Street ramps—basically the portion directly on the waterfront—will be removed to make way for the new system. The removal cost, approximately $10 million to be paid for with privately-generated new revenues, is a relatively small part of the overall new system.

As for Proposition I, vote "YES, let's tear down the Embarcadero Freeway." Then turn to Proposition J and support the plan for a beautiful waterfront.

FROM:

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION? (¿FIRMO SU APLICACIÓN?)

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

STOP GRIDLOCK—This is our chance to close the Embarcadero Freeway. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY—VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside for this project, without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city's fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities. DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT—VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

Hon. Doris W. Kahn
Monica H. Halloran
Lisa Klarmon
Jeffrey Heller
Nancy Katz
Robert Katz
Bob Isaacson
John Behanna
City Lights Books, Inc.
Kenneth R. Lerch

Alan Lubliner
Norman Rolfe
Jerry Hurtado
Gregory E. Jones
Marc Kasky
James W. Haas
Richard Retanski
Mrs. Bland Platt
Donald Black
David M. Hartley

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to 15.7 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown, Fisherman's Wharf and the financial district would be reduced.

Travel within the city would be slowed down at all hours. Vote no to the destruction of the freeway.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
• Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
• Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
• If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
  — By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will in-
crease from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
  — Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
  — MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
  — Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Judith Tornese

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Tear it down? The concept is preposterous! There are 70,000 cars a day whizzing by on this high speed downtown elevated waterfront freeway! Where will they all go?

Aside from the outrageous demolition costs involved, (some engineers estimate $40,000,000 of taxpayer money!), eyeball observation, logic, and just plain "common sense" dictates that ground level "total gridlock" will result if this expensive freeway is now destroyed.

Nostalgic individuals must realize that the times have changed! We can't bring the Bay back up to Montgomery Street! On behalf of San Francisco's overburdened taxpayers, we urge a NO vote!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled.
Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

Anna M. Guth
Republican Committeewoman
K. Martin Keller
State Central Committeeman

Clay Sanders
Republican Committeeman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic? YES 310, NO 311

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a policy statement that says that the City would replace the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt a policy statement which says that the Embarcadero Freeway would be torn down if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt a policy statement to replace the Embarcadero Freeway under these conditions.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway replaced with a tree-lined six lane boulevard and other traffic and transit improvements, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by approximately $27.5 million. This includes a one-time freeway demolition cost of $10.2 million plus $17.3 million required to match potential federally-funded transit improvements. Potential financing by the State and private sector and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “J” Got on Ballot

On March 5 a declaration of policy regarding the future of the Embarcadero Freeway was delivered to the Registrar from the Mayor and several supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows the Mayor or four or more supervisors to submit a declaration of policy to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

In addition to Mayor Feinstein, the March 5 document was signed by Supervisors Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker, Molinari, Kennedy and Nelder.

POLLS ARE OPEN
FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans now have a chance to remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with an at-grade, six-lane parkway, which will open our waterfront and restore views blocked for years by this large freeway.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for traffic and transit improvements:

- New, shorter freeway ramps connecting directly with The Embarcadero;
- A tree-lined, at-grade, 6-lane Embarcadero Boulevard, with a new waterfront Muni line, a jogging and bicycle path from Fisherman's Wharf to Mission Bay;
- Extension of Muni Metro south to the Caltrain station at 4th and Townsend;
- New ramps connecting I-280 with The Embarcadero;
- Changes in traffic flow and improvements to existing freeway ramps.

Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf will be preserved and enhanced.

The Board of Supervisors has specified that the Embarcadero Freeway will be torn down only if preliminary engineering during the next two years confirms — as traffic and environmental studies already have — that removal of the freeway will not result in more problems than it solves.

San Francisco became eligible for $88 million in federal highway funds for this new system when the Supervisors approved the plan in 1980. The $10.2 million cost of freeway demolition itself can be paid from revenues from low-rise development of the parcels now under the Broadway ramps and the increased values of nearby properties. Strict waterfront zoning limits the size of any development.

Traffic and environmental studies by the California Department of Transportation since 1980 clearly indicate that the new waterfront transportation system will be vastly superior to the existing situation, and that traffic congestion levels will not be notably different with the elevated structure removed.

Vote Yes on J and let's remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with a parkway and transit system — once again let us see our waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J gives the voters a chance to be heard on an important and timely issue. This issue is the replacement of a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway as one element of a comprehensive package of transportation improvements in the Waterfront area.

Last fall, the Board of Supervisors adopted for further study a set of traffic and transit improvements for the Waterfront. These improvements include:

- a new landscaped surface-level boulevard
- replacement of the Clay/Washington and Broadway on and off ramps with new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom
- removal of the unused stub of I-280 and construction of new ramps connecting the new waterfront boulevard to Route I-280
- a new light rail transit line linking Fort Mason with the Caltrain Depot
- extension of the Muni Metro to the train depot, improving the Peninsula Commute Service

A YES vote on Proposition J does not allocate funds for these projects. It does allow for further design and engineering studies, including cost analysis, assessment of impacts on traffic, and other matters. The studies will then be presented to the Supervisors so that they can make an informed decision on the plan. If the studies prove positive, San Francisco will be able to transform its Waterfront for the benefit of all.

Proposition J will insure that the City will not proceed with the removal of any of the Freeway until all the studies are completed and all potential consequences are assessed. This is the responsible approach. Vote YES on J.

SPUR
League of Women Voters
Embarcadero Citizens Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SAN FRANCISCO’S NEIGHBORHOODS ASK YOU TO VOTE YES ON J.

REDUCE TRAFFIC CONGESTION — YES ON J!

Traffic backed up by the Embarcadero Roadway slows travel and creates congestion in North Beach and other nearby neighborhoods. J will speed traffic flow.

IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION — YES ON J!

 Proposition J will provide regular streetcar service along the Embarcadero and extend Muni Metro service to the south, ultimately extending to Bayview-Hunters Point.

PROMOTE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY — YES ON J!

If Proposition J does not pass, San Francisco could lose $88 million in federal funds for traffic improvements.

(continued)
RESTORE THE WATERFRONT—YES ON J!
San Francisco's waterfront could become a focal point for the city, graced by a grand promenade, instead of the dismal, deteriorating eyesore it is now.
San Francisco's neighborhoods join together to ask your support for an improved Embarcadero. We guarantee the freeway will not be removed unless it is replaced by facilities that will assure a smoother, more efficient traffic flow. YES ON J!
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Robert Bradford
Ruth Gravanis

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SUPPORT PUBLIC TRANSIT—VOTE YES ON J.

SAVE SAN FRANCISCO FROM GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON J.

The revitalization of the Northeastern Waterfront... as included in San Francisco's Master Plan and transit plans, as overwhelmingly approved by the Board of Supervisors and as urged by Mayor Feinstein... will allow almost $90 million in unused federal highway funds to be used for vital downtown and waterfront transit and street improvements which will be a key to reducing needless auto congestion in San Francisco.

PROPOSITION J SUPPORTS IMPORTANT TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS TO THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT. It will:
- extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific/CalTrain depot
- create a new rail line (possibly using historic streetcars) to connect the entire waterfront from Mission Bay to the Ferry Building to Fishermans Wharf and Fort Mason
- set the stage for a possible streetcar line along Third Street

Since the city of San Francisco adopted the Transit First policy in the early 1970's, transit investments in the Muni Metro, in new electric trolley an articulated bus service, and in BART and Golden Gate Transit, have saved downtown San Francisco from gridlock!

IF you are concerned about the future of transit in San Francisco, IF you are concerned about reducing needless auto congestion, THEN we urge you to join Mayor Feinstein and the majority of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in voting Yes on Proposition J.

Norman Rolfe
San Francisco Muni Coalition
California Transit League
Jack Wholey
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Regina Sneed
Tony Kilroy
Hon. Jack Morrison
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Bay Area Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Hon. Amy Meyer, Recreation and Park Commissioner
Alain Lubliner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A SOUND BUSINESS PROPOSITION—YES ON J:
Common sense and good business demand we make the most of our resources. San Francisco's waterfront is an economic and civic asset unrivaled anywhere—yet much of it is cut off by an ugly, noisy, elevated roadway. The traffic improvements called for by Proposition J will benefit workers, tourists, property owners, neighborhoods, ... and business.

Traffic flow and transit will move quickly on a realigned, reorganized Embarcadero Roadway, allowing easier, more pleasant access to waterfront businesses.

An improved and beautified Embarcadero will create new commercial opportunities and increase the value of existing property and businesses.

New jobs and an expanded tax base will generate increased revenue for the city as several lots now covered by freeway ramps return to productive private ownership. Though limited to low rise development (40 to 65 feet), tax revenues from development will more than make up the city's share of the project.

— Other projects in the area, such as upgrading piers 1½, 3, and 5 as well as the Ferry Building and existing facilities like the YMCA will benefit from the proposed improvements.

— Traffic studies show overall access to the downtown will be improved by Proposition J. Federal money has been set aside for this proposal and cannot be used for other projects in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON THIS CAREFULLY PLANNED PROJECT TO REVITALIZE OUR WATERFRONT!

Robert Meyers
Dennis J. Potts
Kenneth R. Lorch
M. Arthur Gensler, Jr., FAIA
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones

Randal Ross
Karl A. Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
Jon Twitchell
Pitts Arko
Michael J. O'Shea

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J OFFERS RESIDENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO A ONCE IN A LIFETIME OPPORTUNITY TO RECAPTURE THEIR WATERFRONT.

Coverting the Embarcadero into a tree-lined boulevard and building a new streetcar line will make the waterfront more pedestrian and transit oriented, that is, more people oriented.

A freeway structure that is a source of objectionable noise and casts a pall over a large part of the waterfront will be removed. The waterfront will be opened up to sunlight and fresh air and made more inviting and cheerful to those who wish to walk on one of the world’s outstanding waterfronts. Air pollution that is now retained by the existing elevated structure will be dissipated.

The transit orientation of the new waterfront will encourage energy conservation. Proposition J will:

— Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero
— Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway
— Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula

— Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero
— Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line
— Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won’t benefit San Francisco. Don’t let outsiders determine our future.

VOTE YES ON J FOR A BETTER SAN FRANCISCO.

Sierra Club
Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage
Willinda McCrea
Bob Cramer
Rebecca Evans
Richard Livingston
Marilyn Clemens
Jennie Levy
Jeffrey Henne
Jane Winlow
Roger Boyer

A. Lee Knight
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Patrick S. Hobin
Monica Hulloran
Walter E. Morris
Lisa Klairemont
Jeffrey Heller
Bob Isaacson
George T. Rockrise, FALA
Jon Twitchell
Marc Kozak

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J GIVES US A CHANCE TO CORRECT A COLOSSAL MISTAKE!

The Embarcadero Freeway should never have been built. The original plan was to build a freeway from bridge to bridge, destroying the Northern Waterfront, Fisherman’s Wharf, Fort Mason, and Marina Green in the process. When the people of San Francisco saw what was happening, they stopped it in mid-air—literally.

Walk under it. Hear the noise. Feel the gloom. See how it cuts out light.

It’s time to remove this mistake.

The new waterfront plan will give us a tree-lined boulevard, a new streetcar line, and a Muni Metro extension to the Southern Pacific/Caltrain depot. It will give us a transit and pedestrian oriented waterfront that will give us pride and pleasure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J!

San Francisco Tomorrow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, with a membership of 1700 working architects in San Francisco, urges a “YES” vote on Proposition J. In 1968 the citizens of San Francisco stopped highway planners from ringing our waterfront with freeways. Today voters have another opportunity to return the waterfront to our citizens. Removal of the Embarcadero Freeway is one part of a carefully researched transit plan for San Francisco. This proposition supplies an unique opportunity to carry out a broad range of transportation improvements that will have many positive effects on the City of San Francisco.

Removal of the freeway will:

1. Return the waterfront to the people by removing this barrier to access and view,
2. Facilitate needed MUNI improvements.
3. Encourage development of the Embarcadero as a grand civic boulevard unifying the City of San Francisco.

The members of the American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition I and “YES” on Proposition J.

Donald Kennedy, FAIA
President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans love their City, the ambiance, the Bay, waterfront, the views, the healthy neighborhoods.
Freeway builders did their damnest to destroy the City and divide our neighborhoods.
Now we can remove that damned spot, the concrete dinosaur, the hideous barrier that destroys our scenic views, the fence that keeps us from the Bay, the concealer of the Ferry Building.
Correct a mistake.

VOTE YES ON J.
Miriam Blaustein
Charlene Clark
Marie Cleasby
Zach Cowan
Dick Grosboll
Rick Hauptman
Tony Kitroy
Jean Kortum
Ira Kurlander
Jack Morrison
Andy Nash
Norman Rolfe

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

NO ON PROPOSITION J.
"J" is for JOKE—a cruel joke on us. What will J really do?
Add traffic to every street east of Gough. Delay the construction of waterfront streetcar service. Cost millions in local dollars needed to improve MUNI. Create a ground-level freeway on the waterfront as big as Van Ness, with more cars.
I'm a private citizen who's concerned about traffic and what it's doing to our City. If you are too, vote NO on Proposition J.
Steve Colman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
• Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
• Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
• If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
—By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%.
If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
—Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
—MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
—Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.
Blair C. Pascoe

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:
1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION A

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by boldface type. 3.202 Office of Risk Management
There is established under the chief administrative officer an office of risk management which shall review, analyze and report to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the finance committee of the board of supervisors the practices of the several departments, boards and commissions of the city and county regarding loss prevention and risk management, including the insurance requirements of the city and county. The office shall also establish and assist in the implementation of planning and operational guidelines regarding risk management and loss prevention for each department, board or commission. The chief administrative officer may appoint, at his or her pleasure, or contract with, a qualified individual or organization for the operation of the office. The qualifications of the individual or organization operating the office shall include relevant education, training and experience in insurance and risk management.
3.401 City Attorney
(a) The city attorney shall be an elective officer. He shall furnish an official bond in the sum of ten thousand dollars ($10,000). He shall appoint, and at his pleasure may remove, all assistants and employees of his office. He shall devote his entire time and attention to the duties of his office. He must, at the time of his election, be an elector of the city and county, qualified to practice in all the courts of the state, and he must have been so qualified for at least 10 years next preceding his election.
(b) The city attorney must represent the city and county in all actions and proceedings in which it may be legally interested, or, for or against the city and county, or, any officer of the city and county in any action or proceeding, when directed so to do by the supervisors, except where a cause of action exists in favor of the city and county against said officer. Whenever any cause of action exists in favor of the city and county, the city attorney shall commence the same when within his knowledge or when directed to do by the supervisors. He shall give his advice or opinion in writing to any officer, board or commission of the city and county when requested. Except as otherwise provided in this charter, he shall not settle or dismiss any litigation for or against the city and county, unless in writing recommendation, he is ordered so to do by ordinance.
(c) The city attorney shall prepare, or approve as to form, all ordinances before they are enacted by the supervisors. He shall approve, by endorsement in writing, the form of all official or other bonds required by this charter or by ordinance before the same are submitted to the proper commission, board or office for final approval, and no such bonds shall be finally approved without such approval as to form by the city attorney. Except as otherwise in this charter provided, he shall prepare in writing the draft or form of all contracts before the same are executed on behalf of the city and county. He shall examine and approve the title of all real property to be acquired by the city and county.
(d) He shall keep on file in his office copies of all written communications and opinions, also all papers, briefs and transcripts used in matters wherein he appears; and books of record and registers of all actions or proceedings in his charge in which the city and county or any officer or board thereof, is a party or is interested.
(e) The duties of the city attorney in connection with the bureau of delinquent revenue collection shall be transferred to and performed by the attorney for said bureau who shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.
(f) There is established in the office of the city attorney a bureau of claims investigation and administration which shall have the responsibility of investigating, evaluating and processing for the several boards, commissions and departments all claims for money or damages made upon the city and county pursuant to section 7.903 of this charter or the general law of the State of California. Claim investigation functions of the police department in existence on June 4, 1986, shall continue as an adjunct to the bureau established under this section. Claims functions of the public utilities commission shall remain under that commission unless transferred to the bureau of claims investigation and administration by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the bureau shall also have the power to investigate events and occurrences giving rise to potential civil liability against the city and county and adjust and settle demands, within dollar limits to be established by ordinance, prior to their presentation as claims. There shall be established by ordinance a revolving fund to satisfy such demands adjusted prior to their presentation as claims. The bureau shall be responsible for the investigation of all claims and the analysis of city policies and practices upon which the bureau shall report and advise the several departments.

The city attorney shall appoint a chief of the bureau who shall serve at his or her pleasure. The chief of the bureau may appoint, subject to confirmation by the city attorney, investigators who shall serve at the pleasure of the chief; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status as to the position of civil claims investigator or any equivalent classification on the date of approval of this amendment by the electorate shall continue to have civil service status as to said position under the civil service provisions of this charter.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by boldface type; deletions are indicated by horizontal strikethrough.
7.100 Materials, Supplies and Equipment
The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreements for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.
Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.
All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract. All purchases in excess of one thousand dollars ($1,000) shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases and a permanent record of all such quotations shall be kept. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) for materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of ten thousand dollars ($10,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.
The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of materials, supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two or more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.
Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary purpose equipment may require each department requisitioning the same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned and may advertise for
bids on the basis of such specifications, under condi-
tions permitting manufacturers of or dealers in other
articles made and sold for the same purpose to bid on
such specifications or on the specifications of their
own products. The purchaser of supplies shall recom-
mend the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stat-
ing his reasons in writing therefor, and if the de-
partment head concerned recommends the accep-
tance of any other bid on such proprietary articles,
stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall
be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require depart-
ments to make adequate inspection of all purchases,
and shall make such other inspections as he deems
necessary. He shall direct the rejection of all articles
which may be below standards, specifications or
samples furnished. He shall not approve any bill or
voucher for articles not in conformity with specifi-
cations, or which are at variance with any contract.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and
warehouses of the city and county. He shall also have
charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of
city and county equipment. All garages and shops
heretofore maintained by departments for the con-
struction, maintenance, and repair of departmental
supply and equipment, and the personnel assigned
thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire
alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufact-
ure and repair operated by the department of elec-
tricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage
and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller,
maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and
equipment purchased for and in use in all depart-
ments and offices of the city and county. He shall
be responsible for the periodic check of such property,
and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be
due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the
mayor, the chief administrative officer and the con-
troller. He shall have authority to require the transfer
of surplus property in any department to stores or to
other departments.

7.103 Requisition, Contract and Payment
All purchase orders and contracts shall be based on
written requisitions, or, for materials, or supplies in
common use in the various departments, on the pur-
chases of the Controller by order of all departments.
Purchase orders and contracts in excess of fifteen-
thousand-dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars
($50,000) must be approved by the chief administra-
tive officer. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the
board of supervisors shall be authorized to in-
crease or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of
contracts requiring approval of the chief
administrative officer under this section. The pur-
chaser of supplies shall approve all bids and vouchers
for materials, supplies, equipment, and contractual
services before the controller shall draw and approve
of warrants therefor. All contracts for the purchase
of materials, supplies and equipment shall be made after
inviting sealed bids by publication. All sealed bids
received shall be kept on file. When an award of con-
tract is made, notice that the same has been made
shall be given by one publication, and any interested
person may examine the bids and records at the pur-
chaser's office.
The purchaser of supplies shall by rules and
regulations, approved by the chief administrative
officer and the controller, designate and authorize
appropriate personnel within the purchasing de-
partment to exercise the purchaser's signature
powers for purchase orders and contracts ap-
proved as provided in this chapter.

7.200 Public Works and Purchasing Contracts
The construction or repair of public
buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or
improvements, and the purchasing of supplies, ma-
terials and equipment, when the expenditure involved
in each case shall exceed the sum of fifteen-thousand-
dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000),
shall be done by contract, except as otherwise
provided by this chapter. It shall constitute official
misconduct to split or divide any public work or im-
provement or purchase into two or more units for the
purpose of evading the contract provisions of this sec-
tion. In an emergency, provided an actual emergency
be declared by the board of supervisors to exist, and
when authorized by resolution of said board, any pub-
lic work or improvement may be executed in the most
expeditious manner. Notwithstanding any other pro-
vision in this section or this chapter contained, upon
the approval of the chief administrative officer
declaring the work to be emergency in character,
there may be expended by the department of public
works the sum not to exceed five hundred dollars
($500) for new construction of any type in or upon
unimproved or unaccepted streets.

Any public work or improvement estimated to cost
less than fifteen-thousand-dollars ($15,000) fifty
thousand dollars ($50,000) may be performed under
contract or written order or by the employment of the
necessary labor, materials and supplies directly by the
city and county. Any public work or improvement executed by
the city, other than routine repair work, shall be author-
ized by the chief administrative officer when the cost
exceeds fifteen-thousand-dollars ($15,000) fifty thou-
sand dollars ($50,000), or by the heads of depart-
ments not under the chief administrative officer, only
after detailed estimates have been prepared and sub-
mitted by the head of the department concerned.

There shall be separate accounting for each work or
improvement so executed, which accounting shall in-
clude all direct, indirect and supervisory elements of
cost chargeable to such work or improvement, and
each cost accounting shall be reported to the chief ad-
ministrative officer, or to the mayor when such work
shall have been performed by departments not under
the chief administrative officer. All such accounts
shall be reported to the controller. Any public work or
improvement costing less than fifteen-thousand-dol-
ars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) and
not performed by the chief administrative officer,
materials and supplies shall, if not performed under
contract, be covered by written order or agreement
which shall be based on not less than three bids, not-
ice of which shall be given by three days' posting.
Records of such bids shall be kept by the department.
When the expenditure for any public work or im-
provement shall exceed the sum of fifteen-thousand-
dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000),
the same shall be done by contract, except as other-
wise provided in this chapter. The head of the depart-
ment in charge of or responsible for the work for
which a contract is to be let, or the purchaser of sup-
plies in the case of purchases of materials, supplies
and equipment, shall let such contract to the lowest
reliable and responsible bidder not less than ten days
after advertising by one publication for sealed pro-
posals for the work, improvements or purchase con-
templated. Each such advertisement shall contain the
reservation of the right to reject any and all bids.
The officer responsible for the awarding of any such
contract shall require from all bidders information con-
cerning their experience and financial qualifications,
as provided by general law relative to such investiga-
tions authorized by department of public works.

The purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the
chief administrative officer for bids in excess of fif-
een-thousand-dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dol-
ars ($50,000), or the department head concerned,
with the approval of the board or commission which
he represents, may reject any and all bids and ad-
vertised for bids.

The department head or the purchaser of supplies,
as the case may be, shall have power to sign such con-
tact for the estimated expenditures thereunder not in
excess of fifteen-thousand-dollars ($15,000) fifty
thousand dollars ($50,000), except in any case where
any person is bonded under a contract of insurance.
Any contract involving the expenditure of more than fifteen-thousand-dollars
($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), if for the
purchase of materials, supplies or equipment, shall
require the joint approval of the purchaser of supplies
and the chief administrative officer. If such contract is
for any public work or improvement, it shall re-
tain the signature of the department head and the
chief administrative officer for amounts in excess of
fifteen-thousand-dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand
dollars ($50,000), relative to departments under his
jurisdiction, or the signature of the department head
and the approval by resolution of the board or com-
mission concerned for departments not under the
chief administrative officer.

The board of supervisors, by ordinance, shall es-
tablith procedure whereby appropriate city and
county departments may file sealed bids for the exe-
cution of any work to be performed under contract. If
such bid is the lowest, the contract shall be awarded to
the department. Accurate units costs shall be kept of
all direct and indirect charges incurred by the depart-
ment and paid under any such contract, which unit costs
shall be reported to and audited by the controller monthly
and on the completion of the work.

In any case where the lowest gross price or unit cost
bid is not accepted, and a contract is entered into with
another bidder, written report shall be made to the
chief administrative officer, the mayor and the con-
troller by the officer authorized to execute the con-
tact, with the reasons for failure to accept such
lowest bid.

If any provision of this section is in conflict with
any provision of section 7.100 of the charter, the pro-
vision contained in section 7.100 shall govern and con-
trol.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of
supervisors shall be authorized to increase or de-
crease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in
any provision of this section.

7.201 Public Works Contract Procedure by Ordinance

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter
and, in particular, the provisions of section 7.700, the
board of supervisors shall by ordinance determine the
monetary limits not to exceed $50,000 fifty thousand
dollars ($50,000), within which the construction,
reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets,
utilities or other public works or improvements may
be done by contract or by written order or by the em-
ployment of the necessary labor and purchase of the
necessary materials and supplies directly by the city
and county, consistent, save as to monetary limits,
with the manner provided for in section 7.200 and
section 7.100.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of
supervisors shall be authorized to increase or de-
crease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in
any provision of this section.
point two commissioners to terms of one year each, one commissioner to a term of two years, one commissioner to a term of three years and one commissioner to a term of four years. Thereafter, the terms of the commissioners shall be for four years from the commencement thereof. Not less than one-fourth members of said commission shall be of the same sex, and one member shall have prior experience representing labor and one member shall have prior experience representing management.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following at such time: as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission, after the regular daily working hours of 8am to 5pm. Such person or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such personnel.

In accordance with section 3.500, the commission shall have the power that it deems necessary to appoint an executive assistant to assist in the administration of the affairs under its control and as an agent. The executive assistant shall be an agent of the commission to the city and county and shall be subject to the rules and regulations of the commission.

The commission shall have the power to make and adopt rules and regulations for the better organization, government, and operation of the city and county.

The commission shall have the power to make and adopt rules and regulations for the better organization, government, and operation of the city and county.

(c) The civil service commission may hear appeals from an action of the personnel director with respect to:

1. Allegations of discrimination. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the allegation of the civil service commission regarding allegations of discrimination shall be subject to appeal by every officer and employee.

2. Allegations of fraud and

3. Allegations of conflict of interest, pursuant to section 8.105.

(d) No action by the personnel director which is the subject of any appeal shall be stayed during the appeal process except by the unanimous vote of the civil service commission.

(e) The commission shall be notified of the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal of personnel regulations and may comment on such proposed adoption, amendment or repeal. The civil service commission shall have the power to adopt, amend or repeal any personnel regulation governing merit system principles on examination, appointments, promotions, transfers, resignations, and terminations shall be subject to ratification by the commission. The commission shall ratify or reject any such regulation within 60 days of receipt. The commission's failure to act shall be deemed approval.

3.662 Department of Personnel Administration

There is hereby established a department of personnel administration which shall consist of a personnel director and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. Any employee who was a permanent civil service employee prior to the establishment of the personnel department shall be continued in his position and be considered a permanent employee.

(a) The civil service commission shall have the power to inquire into the operation of the personnel system of the city and county and to ensure compliance with the principles set forth in section 8.310. After such inquiry, the commission may recommend to the attorney general any changes or amendments to the charter that it deems necessary to carry out the civil service provisions of this charter.

(b) The civil service commission may require periodic reports from the personnel director in a manner and form which it shall prescribe.

3.663 Personal Director

(a) A personnel director shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the mayor; provided, however, that the personnel director shall be selected from candidates nominated by any civil service commissioner and confirmed by vote of the board of supervisors. The personnel director shall have the power to subpoena and require the attendance of witnesses and the production of records as provided in section 3.701.

(b) The civil service commission may hear appeals from an action of the personnel director with respect to:

1. Allegations of discrimination. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the allegations of discrimination shall be subject to appeal by every officer and employee.

2. Allegations of fraud;

3. Allegations of conflict of interest, pursuant to section 8.105.

(d) No action by the personnel director which is the subject of any appeal shall be stayed during the appeal process except by the unanimous vote of the civil service commission.

(e) The commission shall be notified of the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal of personnel regulations and may comment on such proposed adoption, amendment or repeal. The civil service commission shall have the power to adopt, amend or repeal any personnel regulation governing merit system principles on examination, appointments, promotions, transfers, resignations, and terminations shall be subject to ratification by the commission. The commission shall ratify or reject any such regulation within 60 days of receipt. The commission's failure to act shall be deemed approval.

3.662 Department of Personnel Administration

There is hereby established a department of personnel administration which shall consist of a personnel director and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. Any employee who was a permanent civil service employee prior to the establishment of the personnel department shall be continued in his position and be considered a permanent employee.

(a) The civil service commission shall have the power to inquire into the operation of the personnel system of the city and county and to ensure compliance with the principles set forth in section 8.310. After such inquiry, the commission may recommend to the attorney general any changes or amendments to the charter that it deems necessary to carry out the civil service provisions of this charter.

(b) The civil service commission may require periodic reports from the personnel director in a manner and form which it shall prescribe.

(c) The civil service commission may hear appeals from an action of the personnel director with respect to:

1. Allegations of discrimination. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the allegations of discrimination shall be subject to appeal by every officer and employee.

2. Allegations of fraud;

3. Allegations of conflict of interest, pursuant to section 8.105.

(d) No action by the personnel director which is the subject of any appeal shall be stayed during the appeal process except by the unanimous vote of the civil service commission.

(e) The commission shall be notified of the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal of personnel regulations and may comment on such proposed adoption, amendment or repeal. The civil service commission shall have the power to adopt, amend or repeal any personnel regulation governing merit system principles on examination, appointments, promotions, transfers, resignations, and terminations shall be subject to ratification by the commission. The commission shall ratify or reject any such regulation within 60 days of receipt. The commission's failure to act shall be deemed approval.

3.662 Department of Personnel Administration

There is hereby established a department of personnel administration which shall consist of a personnel director and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. Any employee who was a permanent civil service employee prior to the establishment of the personnel department shall be continued in his position and be considered a permanent employee.

(a) The civil service commission shall have the power to inquire into the operation of the personnel system of the city and county and to ensure compliance with the principles set forth in section 8.310. After such inquiry, the commission may recommend to the attorney general any changes or amendments to the charter that it deems necessary to carry out the civil service provisions of this charter.

(b) The civil service commission may require periodic reports from the personnel director in a manner and form which it shall prescribe.
but not limited to, announcements, minimum qualifications, classes of applicants, components, construction, weighting, content, type, list length, duration and certification shall be final.

(c) The employer shall adopt personnel regulations which, except as otherwise provided in this charter, shall govern both the administrative matters within the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration and the exercise of the authority granted in this section, including, but not limited to, recruitment; applications; examinations; qualifications; eligibility; duration of eligible lists; certification of eligibles; permanent, temporary and provisional appointments; regular performance evaluations; promotions; transfers; resignations; layoffs or reduction in force due to lack of work or lack of qualification, reduction in scope or completion of work; and classification. No personnel regulations shall be adopted, amended or repealed without a prior public hearing upon at least two weeks public notice by the personnel director and after meet and confer sessions with recognized employee organizations as required by state law. All civil service commission rules relevant to the foregoing as well as the provisions of former sections 8.322, 8.323, 8.326, 8.328, 8.329, 8.330, 8.331, 8.332 and 8.340 of this charter shall become personnel regulations on the effective date of the first of the following:

(d) The personnel director shall conduct the salary surveys for the civil service commission as set forth elsewhere in this charter.

(e) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall establish procedures to review and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the personnel director shall forthwith be enforced by every employee and officer, unless the decision is appealed to the civil service commission in accordance with personnel regulations.

(f) The personnel director shall investigate all employee complaints concerning job related conduct of City and County employees and shall promptly report to the source of the complaint.

(g) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall promote effective and efficient management through personnel programs that encourage high employee and employer performance.

(h) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall provide a procedure for resolution of employee disputes which shall be consistent with other provisions of this charter and shall be utilized by all department heads and appointing officers upon the expiration of the existing term of any other binding agreements.

(i) Consistent with the foregoing and other applicable provisions of this charter, the personnel director shall delegate to the various appointing officers appropriate personnel responsibilities, including but not limited to appropriate disciplinary procedures, and consult with appointing officers with respect to personnel regulations affecting their operations.

(j) Personnel services contracts shall be reviewed and approved by the personnel director in accordance with personnel regulations. Personnel services contracts reasonably expected to involve payment by the city and county of more than twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000) shall also be reviewed and approved by the Commission. Failure of the Commission to review and approve submission of such contract by the personnel director shall be deemed to constitute approval by the commission.

(k) The personnel director shall establish a system of job classification. The provisions of section 8.200 shall govern whenever new classifications are created or previous classifications are reclassified. The personnel director shall be the judge of such classification determinations.

(l) From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the department of personnel administration shall determine whether a position within a classification is, in character, temporary or permanent. Appointments may be made on a permanent, temporary or, where confirmation is required, a provisional basis.

(m) Excepting sections 8.350, 8.360, 8.601, 8.105, 8.107, all but the second to the last paragraph of section 8.346, the last sentence of section 8.400, all but the last three words in the first sentence of the third paragraph of section 8.401, sections 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.406, 8.407 and this section, wherever the words "civil service commission" or "commission" appear in the personnel provisions of this charter, they shall be replaced by the words "department of personnel administration", "department", "personnel director" or "director" as the context permits, the word "rule" or "rules" shall be replaced by the words "personnel regulation" or "regulations," the word "words" shall be replaced by the words "personnel director" or "director" and the words "section 3661" shall be replaced by the words "section 3662" or "section 3663", as appropriate.

The clerk of the board of supervisors, after consultation with the city attorney, is hereby directed to conform the language of the charter as herein amended when next the charter is submitted for republication.

8.322 Protest of Written Questions and Answers

After the conclusion of a civil service examination, questions and answers on any continuous or standardized test shall be available for review by the participants. This review period shall not apply to questions and answers on any continuous or standardized test. After the review period, participants shall have an opportunity to protest questions and answers they believe to be incorrect or improper. After all protested items have been acted on and after the official rating key has been adopted, the identification sheets have been opened; further changes in the rating key shall not be made.

8.323 Protest of Standards

—Following the completion of any examination, a tentative list of eligibles shall be posted for the inspection of the public and of participants. The posting period shall be for a minimum of three (3) working days for the examinations or five (5) working days for promotional or combined entrance and promotional examinations. During this period a fee for the inspection of the papers of each eligible shall be charged by the civil service commission. The amount of such fee shall be established by ordinance of the board of supervisors. The fee shall be waived for eligibles who wish to inspect their own papers. Inspection of papers shall include all documents supporting the eligibles rank and score except neither the identity of the examiner giving any mark or grade in an oral examination nor the questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or combined entrance and promotional examinations. Only participants in the examination may review the questions used in the examination. If no protests are received during the posting period the eligible list is automatically adopted. If protests are received during the posting period the investigation and action of the general manager; personnel; shall be expedited so that final adoption of the eligible list is not delayed beyond sixty (60) days after the date of posting. Eligibles who, as a result of their rating, would receive a notice of appointment regardless of the outcome of the protest procedure, shall be given written notice of the protest and of any protest(s) and amendment to the adopted eligible list.

8.326 Promotional Examinations—General

Except as specifically provided for in this section, the Civil Service Commission shall provide for examinations on an entrance, promotional or combined entrance and promotional examination basis. Promotions shall be given to permanent employees in separate, promotional examinations and in promotional examinations which are combined with entrance examinations for city- and county-service when the passing mark has been attained and may include evaluation of work performance and experience. Where an examination announcement is issued for a class on both a promotive and entrance basis, there shall be one resulting list of eligibles which shall include all successful candidates both promotive and entrance in order of relative performance.

—Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this or any other provision of the charter, an employee who has been certified from a regularly adopted eligible list to a non-permanent position in a civil service classification shall be permitted to participate in a promotional examination or applicant-holding examination on the same terms and conditions as a person holding a permanent appointment to a position in that same classification, subject to a demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in a manner provided by rule of the civil service commission.

The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to promotional examinations announced after its effective date.

8.328 Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave

—Employees under permanent civil service appointment who, because of absence on duly authorized military leave after June 27, 1950, did not participate in a promotional examination held after June 27, 1950, and during time of war as defined in section 8.324 of this charter, and in which examination the employee would have been otherwise eligible to compete had the war not intervened, and which examination is hereinafter referred to as the "original promotional examination", after abridgment of his military leave, have the right to participate in a similar promotional examination. Provided, that persons and employees who were on entrance or promotive eligible lists shall, for the purpose of this amendment, be deemed to be eligible to participate in their classifications from the time their applications were received on file for permanent certification while in the military service.

—In order to qualify for participation in a similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section, such employee who desires to participate therein must make application in writing to the civil service commission within thirty (30) days after the abridgment of his military leave, or within thirty days after the effective date of this amendment. Failure to file such written request to participate in a similar promotional examination as herein provided shall be deemed a waiver of all right of the employees to participate in such similar promotional examinations.

—The civil service commission shall arrange to hold such similar promotional examination within a reasonable time after employees eligible to request participation in any such similar promotional examination have indicated their desire to so participate; or have waived their right to participate, as herein provided.
more than the minimum passing mark established by the civil service commission for inclusion on the list of eligibles resulting from the original promotional examination. The name shall thereafter be entered on the list of eligibles in accordance with the merit or pecuniary excellence obtained by all the qualified participants in the original and similar promotional examinations.

Such employees shall be eligible for appointment from such list of eligibles in accordance with civil service rules to any vacancies therefor occurring, and subject to satisfactory completion of a probationary period as provided in section 8.340 of this charter for a period of four years after the date on which their names are entered on the eligible list and before eligibles procuring standing through examinations held subsequently make the regular examination.

If it is determined by the civil service commission that the name of such person would have been reached for permanent appointment from the list of eligibles established as a result of the original promotional examination during his term of military service, had the name of such person appeared thereon, then such employee upon appointment to a permanent position as herein provided, shall be granted seniority in such appointment from the date his name would have been reached had his name appeared thereon, but such seniority shall be used only for the purpose of determining salary increments and calculating city and county service credits in other promotional examinations held subsequent to the similar promotional examination herein authorized. For all other purposes, seniority of service shall date from the date of appointment as a result of qualifying in the similar promotional examination as herein authorized.

Such employees who qualify for appointment as a result of a similar promotional examination as herein provided, and who are appointed to permanent positions, as herein provided, shall be permitted to participate in other promotional examinations for which they qualify while serving under probationary appointment in the position to which appointed as a result of the similar promotional examination, provided that certification from lists of eligibles established from such other examinations shall not be made until the employee has satisfactorily completed the aforesaid probationary appointment.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules to govern the administration of similar promotional examinations herein authorized, and appointments and other matters resulting therefrom.

§ 8.329 Certification of Eligibles; Rule of Three

Whenever a position controlled by the civil service provisions of this charter is to be filled; the appointing officer shall certify to the civil service commission for a person to fill it. Thereupon, the commission shall certify to the appointing officer the names and addresses of the three persons standing highest on the list of eligibles for such position. In case the position is promovable, the commission shall certify to the appointing officer the names and addresses of the three persons standing highest on such list. If there are fewer than three names on such list from which certification is to be made, there shall be certified the number thereon.

The appointing officer shall fill the position by the appointment of the person of the certificate.

The provisions of this section as herein amended at the election of November 2, 1976, shall be applicable only to lists of eligibles finally adopted by the civil service commission pursuant to the provisions of section 8.529 of this charter on or after the effective date of this amendment. Section 8.529 shall be disregarded except when a statute, a rule of the commission or the appointing officer specifies otherwise.

From the reappointment of the appointing officer or otherwise, the commission shall determine whether the position is, in character, temporary, seasonal or permanent, and shall notify the candidate in accordance therewith to the end that the candidate may have knowledge of the probable duration of employment. The commission shall provide for such waiver of temporary or seasonal employment as it may deem to be in the public interest. In such case, such certification to the appointing officer shall be terminated one day after the expiration of the period of time specified for the duration of such service.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this or any other provision of the charter, an employee who has been certified from a regularly adopted eligible list to a non-permanent position in a civil service classification shall be entitled to appointment to a permanent position within that same classification provided that before the commission certifies to the appointing officer the names and addresses of persons standing higher on the list of eligibles who are not then current employees, subject to a demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the commission. The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to requisitions for permanent positions filled from and after January 1, 1980.

§ 8.330 Duration of Lists of Eligibles

The civil service commission may remove all names from the list of eligibles after they have remained thereon for more than five years and all names thereon shall be removed at the expiration of four years. The commission may, however, provide in the examination announcement that the list of eligibles secured thereby shall automatically expire at a date not less than more than four years after the adoption of such list.

§ 8.331 Limited Tenure Appointments

When in time of war declared by the Congress of the United States eligible lists are not available for appointment from registers established through the regular examination procedure as provided under Sections 8.520, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof, the civil service commission may make appointments to war-time appointments to positions through informal and non-competitive tests. Such tests and appointments resulting therefrom shall be governed solely by the provisions of this section and by rule of the civil service commission adopted pursuant thereto and the tests shall be adequate in the judgment of the civil service commission to determine the capacity of applicants to perform the duties of the positions to be filled pending creation of lists of eligibles through the regular examination procedure as provided in Sections 8.520, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof. Appointments made under this section shall be designated "limited tenure appointments" and may continue only until registers of eligibles are established through the regular examination procedure provided in Sections 8.520, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof but in no event to exceed six months beyond the cessation of hostilities. Limited tenure appointments may be terminated by the appointing officer at any time for lack of work or funds. Limited tenure appointments may be terminated by the appointing officer for good cause at any time with the approval of the civil service commission without reference to the procedures prescribed in this section. Persons serving under limited tenure appointments as in this section provided shall by reason of such service acquire no right or preference to permanent civil service status as defined elsewhere in this charter or by rule of the civil service commission which is conferred on persons completing probationary appointments made from lists of eligibles established through the regular examination procedure provided in Sections 8.520, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 of this charter. Service after January 1, 1951 under limited tenure appointments by platform employees of the municipal railway shall not be included in the calculation of service of such employees for the purpose of determining assignments of runs when such assignments are made on the basis of seniority of service.

Non-civil service appointments in the absence of civil service eligibles as provided in Sections 8.520, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 of this charter shall not be authorized if applicants qualified for limited tenure appointments are available. The civil service commission shall make every effort consistent with the personnel policies of the department to maintain adequate registers of eligibles established through the regular examination procedure provided in Sections 8.520, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules to carry out the provisions of this section and to govern the administration of limited tenure appointments.

In time of national emergency declared by the President of the United States or by the Congress of any other act authorizing compulsory military service or training in is effect, the provisions of this section may also be made operative upon recommendation of the civil service commission and approval of the board of supervisors by ordinance enacted by the board of supervisors by ordinance enacted by the board of supervisors. The authority for limited tenure appointments, if established pursuant to the authority of this subsection, shall cease six months after repeal by the board of supervisors of the ordinance which authorized such appointments.

§ 8.332 Temporary and Emergency Appointments

When no list of eligibles exists or no eligible is available on an existing list for a position in the class of 62.0, the appointing officer, and immediately report such temporary and emergency appointment to the board of supervisors. In the absence of such board, the acting appointing officer and another list exists which is deemed by the civil service commission to be suitable to provide temporarily the service desired, the commission shall certify for civil service temporary appointment an eligible from such list. If no such list is deemed by the commission to be suitable to the commission pursuant to its rules may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment therefor for a period not exceeding one hundred and thirty working days. Non-civil service or emergency appointments extended beyond ninety days must be approved by the civil service commission. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such one hundred and thirty working days at the time a civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in Section 8.329 of the charter.

If a list of eligibles exists for the position requisitioned, but immediate service is deemed necessary by the appointing officer pending the time an eligible from such list is certified and reports for duty as provided in Section 8.329 of the charter, the commission may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment therefor for a period not exceeding thirty working days.

Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such thirty working days at the time a civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in Section 8.329 of the charter.

If a list of eligibles exists for the position requisitioned, but immediate service is deemed necessary by the appointing officer pending the time an eligible from such list is certified and reports for duty as provided in Section 8.329 of the charter, the commission may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment therefor for a period not exceeding thirty working days.

Said non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such thirty working days at the time a civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in Section 8.329 of the charter.

If a list of eligibles exists for the position requisitioned, but immediate service is deemed necessary by the appointing officer pending the time an eligible from such list is certified and reports for duty as provided in Section 8.329 of the charter, the commission may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment therefor for a period not exceeding thirty working days.

Said non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such thirty working days at the time a civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in Section 8.329 of the charter.

If a list of eligibles exists for the position requisitioned, but immediate service is deemed necessary by the appointing officer pending the time an eligible from such list is certified and reports for duty as provided in Section 8.329 of the charter, the commission may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment therefor for a period not exceeding thirty working days.
mayor shall request and the supervisors shall make supplemental appropriation therefor in the manner provided herein for supplemental appropriations.

8.340 Dismissal During Probation Period

Any person appointed to a permanent position shall serve a probationary period. The civil service commission personnel director shall by rule establish a probationary period of not less than six months' service and up to a maximum of twelve months' service for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed rank of the police department, fire department, sheriff's department and San Francisco International Airport police force shall be for twelve months except that, within the same period of such uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve months' service from the day following completion of the prescribed department field training officer program, but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment, provided further that probationary members of the uniformed ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in section 8.343 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four months may be established for executive and management classifications. At any time during the probationary period the appointing officer may terminate the appointment upon giving written notice of such termination to the employee, and to the civil service commission specifying the reasons for such termination. Except in the case of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments the civil service commission shall review the termination. The civil service commission shall by rule establish the procedures for such review. If the appointment resulted from an entrance examination the commission may declare such person disqualified or may require the return of the list of eligibles, under such conditions for further appointment as the commission may deem just. If the appointment resulted from a promotional examination the employee shall have the right of appeal and hearing before the civil service commission. The commission shall render a decision within thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person disqualified; or (b) order such person reinstated to the position without prejudice; or (c) the commission may in its discretion reduce the pay and salaries of the employee at the time of the termination of the appointment; or (d) order the return of such person to a position in the classification from which that person was promoted and may reestablish the employee's eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same or a promotive classification under such conditions as the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall be final. Immediately prior to the expiration of the probationary period the appointing officer shall report to the civil service commission as to the competence of the probationer for the position; and if competent shall recommend permanent appointment. Nothing in this section shall prejudice the civil service commission from reestablishing terminations for the purpose of future employability including terminations in the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments.

8.407 Definition of Generally Prevailing Rates of Wages

Notwithstanding any provision of section 8.401 or any provision of this section to the contrary, generally prevailing rates of salaries and wages for those employees covered by section 8.401 of the charter shall be determined by the civil service commission as set forth below.

The civil service commission personnel director shall conduct a comprehensive investigation and survey of basic pay rates and wages and salaries in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment for like work and like service, based upon job classifications as provided in section 3.066 and 3.062 of this charter and shall make its findings, based on facts and data collected, as to what are the generally prevailing basic pay rates for each benchmark class of employment solely in the manner hereinafter provided. A benchmark class is defined as a "key class" within an occupational grouping selected as the class for which a representative sample of data will be collected. Basic pay rate data for public and private employment shall be collected solely from the Bay Area counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, San Francisco and Santa Clara; provided, however, that for any benchmark class of employment for which the civil service commission personnel director determines there is insufficient data from Bay Area public jurisdictions the commission personnel director shall determine major public agencies in the state employing such major public agencies to be defined as these employing more than 3,000 persons.

The commission personnel director shall collect basic pay rate data for like work and like service from Bay Area public jurisdictions as follows:

(a) The counties of Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara.

(b) The ten most populous cities in these five Bay Area counties based on the latest federal decennial census.

(c) Agencies of the state and federal governments and from school districts and other special districts in the Bay Area counties as determined by the civil service commission personnel director.

The commission personnel director shall collect private basic pay rate data from recognized governmental Bay Area salary and wage surveys of private employers in the city and county of San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara. The data collected shall be limited to basic rates of pay and salaries actually being paid by public and private employers for like work and like service.

The term "prevailing rates of wages" for employers governed by chapter section 8.401 and this section shall be defined as the rate ranges developed from the weighted average of the benchmark rates, excluding fringe benefits, for surveyed public and private area salary and wage surveys of private employers and the median of the pay rates for private employment to be determined as follows:

(1) Multiply the medians from the private and midpoints from public employers data base by the number of employees in the given classification from each data base.

(2) Add the products of (1).

(3) Divide the sum by (2). The total number of employees surveyed for that classification; and

(4) Extend this figure by 10 percent to establish the maximum of the range and reduce this figure by 10 percent to establish the minimum.

When further study of the data on the board of supervisors shall fix basic pay rates as close as reasonably possible to prevailing rates, provided, however, that the board of supervisors shall not set the maximum rate of pay for any class in excess of the maximum prevailing rate for that class; provided further, however, that no employee shall have his basic pay rate reduced to conform to prevailing rates except as provided for in section 8.406. For those classifications of employment in which the practice is customary, the schedules of compensation shall provide for minimum, not less than three intermediate, and maximum salary steps and for a method of advancing the salaries of employees from minimum to intermediate to maximum with due regard for seniority of service.

The term "basic pay rate" as used in this section is hereby defined as applying only to the basic rate of wages, with included range scales, and does not include any other benefits of employment or working condition benefits.

It is the declared intent of the qualified electors of the county of San Francisco either the board of supervisors nor the mayor have any base or power to provide any benefits of employment except those enumerated already provided for in the charter and any. In addition, deletion or modification of benefits of employment enumerated in the charter shall be submitted, as a charter amendment, to the qualified electors of the county of San Francisco and the electors shall expressly state that they understand that benefits of employment are sometimes referred to as "fringe benefits" of employment and the qualified electors expressly reserve the right to either grant or deny such benefits except those conditions of employment commonly referred to as "working conditions". Any reference to "working conditions" shall mean those compensations which must necessarily be provided in order for the employee to perform his job description duties efficiently and safely, and shall include but be not limited to such working conditions and benefits as are typically included in the administrative provisions of the salary standardization ordinance of the salary ordinance of the city.

The board of supervisors, mayor, in its at his or her discretion, may provide working condition benefits for employees covered under this section and section 8.401 of this charter only in accordance with the following provisions:

(a) The civil service commission personnel director shall certify and recommend to the board of supervisors mayor that the working condition benefit is equitable or necessary for the efficient and safe performance of the employee's duties as enumerated in his job description.

(b) The working condition benefit, as recommended by the civil service commission personnel director, shall be paid by the supervisors in such manner as to fit the work and like service to that provided for the job classification and is provided to not less than 50 percent of the employees of the class in the jurisdiction covered by the salary survey.

9.108 Initiative, Referendum, and Recall

(a) The registered voters shall have power to propose by petition, and to adopt or to reject at the polls, any ordinance, act or other measure which is within the power conferred on any other board, commission, or officer, to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinance, act, charter amendment or other measure may be so proposed by filing with the registrar a petition setting forth said measure in full, signed by registered voters of the city and county as in number as the percentages hereinafter required of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election. Any declaration of policy may be submitted to the electorate in the manner provided for the submission of ordinances; and when approved by a majority of the qualified voters voting thereon, be made a part of the charter. The qualified voters shall, thereupon be the duty of the board of supervisors to enact an ordinance or ordinances to carry such policies or principles into effect, subject to the referendum provisions of this charter.

Any ordinance which the supervisors are empowered to pass may be submitted to the electors by a majority of the board at a general election or at a special election called for the purpose, said election to be held not less than thirty days from the date of the call. Any such ordinance may be proposed by one-third of the supervisors, or by the mayor, and when so proposed shall be submitted to the electors at the next succeeding general election. No ordinance passed by the supervisors granting any public utility franchise
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or privilege, shall go into effect until the expiration of sixty days from the date it becomes final. At the end of such sixty days such ordinance shall be in force and effect, unless within such period there shall be filed with the registrar a petition signed by registered voters equal in number to five percent of the entire vote cast for mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election, requesting that such ordinance be submitted to the electors. In case such petition is filed, such ordinance shall not go into effect until approved by a majority of the voters voting thereon at a general or special election.

If, before the time any other ordinance involving legislative matters becomes effective, there shall be filed with the board of supervisors a petition signed by qualified electors of the city and county equal in number to at least ten percent of the entire vote cast for all candidates for mayor at the last preceding general municipal election at which a mayor was elected, protesting against the passage of such ordinance the same shall be suspended from going into operation, and it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to reconsider such ordinance, and if the same be not entirely repealed, said board shall submit the ordinance to the vote of said electors either at the next general municipal election or at a special election to be called for that purpose, and such ordinance shall not go into effect or become operative unless and until a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon shall vote in favor thereof. The provisions of sections 9.109 and 9.110 of the charter shall apply to and govern the verification and certification of such petition.

Annual budget and appropriation ordinances, supplemental appropriation ordinances, the annual salary ordinance, or ordinances amending the same, the ordinances levying taxes, any ordinance appropriating money from the emergency reserve fund, ordinances authorizing the city attorney to compromise litigation and ordinances necessary to enable the mayor to carry out any of the powers vested in him in the case of public emergency as defined in section 3.100 of the charter, ordinances enacted pursuant to section 8.410 of the charter, as well as ordinances relative to purely administrative matters, shall not be subject to referendum.

Any elected official, the chief administrative officer, the controller or any member of the board of education or public utilities commission may be recalled by the electors. The procedure to effect such recall shall be as follows: A petition demanding the recall from office of the person sought to be recalled shall be filed with the registrar. Said petition shall contain a statement of the grounds on which the recall is sought. Any insufficiency of form or substance in such statement shall in no way affect the validity of the election and proceedings held thereunder. No recall petition shall be filed against any officer until he has held his office for at least six months.

In the event the representative of the board of supervisors or the representative of recognized employee organizations is in agreement with the meet-and-confer process on matters contained in the annual salary standardization ordinance by March 15 of any year, the mayor shall recommend and the board shall approve or reject a schedule of compensation which reflects current-prevailing-rates for the classifications covered by Section 8.401 of this charter. The last good faith offer presented by the mayor or his or her representative.

In any year when an agreement on matters contained in the salary standardization ordinance has not been achieved, the civil service commission personale will, upon receipt of a written demand from a recognized employee organization made upon the mayor and the personnel director, shall prepare, prior to April 1, a schedule of compensation and administrative provisions which reflect additional rates that would be payable, and working conditions, based upon the last demands made by the recognized employee organizations (a) which participated in the meet-and-confer process.

 Said schedule shall be transmitted to the registrar of voters for submission to the electors of the city and county at a general election or a special election called for the purpose, and said special election shall be held no less than sixty (60) days from the date of the call. Such schedule shall be withdrawn after it has been received by the registrar of voters. At said election, the ballot shall contain the following two alternatives:

(1) Approval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

(2) Disapproval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

If a majority of the valid votes cast in the election favor paying the additional rates set forth in the schedule of compensation based upon the last demands of the recognized employee organizations which engaged in the meet-and-confer process, it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to amend the salary standardization ordinance to reflect said increased
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TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: All sections are new.

Be it ordained by the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. This ordinance may be called the “City College Public Lands Preservation Ordinance.”

Section 2. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall disapprove or deny, WITH NO EXEMPTIONS OR EXCPTIONS, any building permit application for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, which consist of Assessor’s Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

Section 4. The term “building permit” includes building permits, site permits and any other permits for the performance of construction work.

Section 5. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of the ordinance shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. No provision of this ordinance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent Implementation of the policy stated above.

located across Phelan Avenue from the presently occupied campus of City College and consisting of Assessor’s Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

Section 4. The term “building permit” includes building permits, site permits and any other permits for the performance of construction work.

Section 5. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of the ordinance shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. No provision of this ordinance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent Implementation of the policy stated above.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION F

NOTE: All sections are new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The People of the City and County of San Francisco desire and are entitled to a local government whose officers do not engage in, assist or promote compensated advocacy on behalf of private interests before City and County commissions and boards while also serving as City and County officers.

Section 2. No officer of the City and County may, during the term of office, engage in compensated advocacy before any City and County board, commission or its staff, in order to represent any private interest, for which representation the officer receives, directly or indirectly, any compensation, reward or gift.

Section 3. Officers of the City and County shall not discuss matters pending before their commission or department with other City and County officers or state legislators when those other officers or state legislators are acting as compensated advocates for a private interest.

Section 4. No member of the California State Legislature shall appear before any City and County board, department or commission as a compensated advocate representing a private interest.

Section 5. In the financing of city and county campaigns: (a) No person other than a candidate shall make, and no campaign treasurer shall solicit or accept, any contribution which will cause the total amount contributed by such person with respect to a single election in support of or opposition to such candidate, including contributions to political committees supporting or opposing such candidate, to exceed $5000.00. (b) If any person is found guilty of violating the terms of this section, each campaign treasurer who received part or all of the contribution or contributions which constitute the violation shall pay promptly, from available campaign funds, if any, the amount received from such person in excess of the amount permitted by this section to the City and County Treasurer for deposit in the General Fund of the City and County. (c) This section shall not apply to any in-kind contribution of television or radio airtime to any candidate or committee granted to said candidate or committee pursuant to the “Fairness Doctrine” articulated in Cullman Broadcasting, 49 F.3d 1115, 94 Cal.App.2d 313 (1953).

Section 6. Any person violating the terms of this ordinance shall be subject to the penalties set forth in San Francisco Charter Section 8.105. Such penalties shall include, but not be limited to, removal from office.

Section 7. If any provision of this ordinance, or its application to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, it is the expressed intent of the people of the City and County of San Francisco that the remainder of the ordinance, or the application of such provision, or any other provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.
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rates and the same shall be in lieu of said annual compensation, and notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, said rates shall become effective and be payable as if adopted prior to April 1, of any year.

The provisions of sections 3.100 and 3.100-1, relating to the emergency powers of the mayor, shall not be applicable to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

11.105 Effective Date of Amendments

The effective date of the amendments, additions and deletions to the civil service provisions of the charter shall be ninety (90) days after the acceptance and filing thereof with the Secretary of State.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION G

We the people of San Francisco declare this to be our policy:

1) IT IS IMPROPER TO PROFIT FROM OR PROVIDE SUPPORT TO THE RACIST POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SYSTEM IN SOUTH AFRICA, KNOWN AS APARTHEID.

Therefore it is necessary to sever commercial ties to South Africa, until people of all races obtain equal rights in that country, including equal voting rights.

2) COMPANIES HAVING SUBSTANTIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH APARTHEID MUST BE CONSIDERED IRRESPONSIBLE.

(a) The Board of Supervisors must determine which companies doing or seeking business with the City have the greatest ties to Apartheid. Companies that have a significant involvement in profiting from or maintaining the Apartheid system, may, on that basis, be deemed "irresponsible bidders."

In purchasing goods and services and awarding other contracts, the city must give priority to avoiding such companies; the degree of the preference must be in proportion to the company's complicity with Apartheid, according to the following criteria:

— how much business the company does in or with South Africa;
— how much the company profits from that business;
— how much support the company provides the Apartheid government in taxes, loans, payments or other funding;
— the nature of the company's South Africa business;
— the degree of the company's cooperation with South African political censorship or secrecy agreements;
— the degree to which the company provides the South African government with the technology, materials and other means to maintain and enforce Apartheid.

(b) City funds must not be deposited or invested with any bank or other company which does business in or with, or makes loans to, South Africa.

(c) If any exception to the above policies is found to be necessary or appropriate, the responsible official must promptly and publicly report it to the Board of Supervisors, clearly describing the exception and the reasons for it.

(d) The term "city" includes all agencies, departments, officials, employees, units and subunits of the city and county of San Francisco, and all funds administered by or on behalf of the city or county.

(3) WE CALL ON ALL OTHER PUBLIC BODIES AND PRIVATE OR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS TO ADOPT SIMILAR POLICIES.

(4) WE CALL A GENERAL PUBLIC BOYCOTT, FOCUSING ON THOSE COMPANIES HAVING THE GREATEST TIES TO APARTHEID.

The Board of Supervisors must determine and announce which company or companies are the worst offenders within each major industry, so that the public can focus its boycott on those companies.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION H

SUMMARY: THIS INITIATIVE STATES THAT THE AIDS EPIDEMIC IS A MAJOR PUBLIC HEALTH PROBLEM OF CONCERN TO EVERYONE, REQUIRING INCREASED SUPPORT FOR RELATED MEDICAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION. IT CALLS FOR A COUNCIL FOR AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION OR SIMILAR UNITED EFFORT TO STOP AIDS.

We the people of San Francisco hereby adopt the following policy:

The AIDS epidemic has rapidly become a major public health problem, costly both in human lives and in general community resources.

The first steps in dealing with such a crisis are:

— the scientific research needed to discover and understand the nature, causes, co-factors, prevention, diagnosis and treatment of the disease, and
— the education of the public about the lessons of that research;

A proper program of research and education pays for itself in the long run;

Prompt action is urgent, because of the rapidly growing number of persons affected, increasing not only the suffering but also the difficulty of eradicating the disease;

The leadership and support of such an effort is everyone's responsibility;

While San Francisco's role in the overall effort against AIDS has been viewed as a positive example to other areas, the continued rapid increase in the spread of the disease means that we cannot afford to rest on our laurels or leave further responsibility to others.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

We call on all appropriate government bodies as well as medical, professional, charitable and community organizations and concerned individuals to join together in an all-out effort to stop AIDS;

We call for support to an organized united effort along the lines of an AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION COUNCIL, including, in some form:

— A COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, to provide informed evaluations as to priorities among research projects and proposals, recommending those which are most cost-effective and most likely to produce early results useful in the prevention or treatment of the disease, to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts or neglect of promising approaches, and to provide the council with complete and up-to-date information regarding comparative results of experimental treatments, prevention programs and other existing research;

— A COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, to inform the public regarding prevention and other research findings, and to inform relevant government officials and the general public, concerning the factual basis for a re-ordering of current public funding priorities toward an increased war against disease, including research and education against AIDS and related conditions;

— A FUND-RAISING COMMITTEE, to solicit donations, lobby for grants, organize benefits and other fund-raising projects spending the financial burden by appealing to many sources;

We ask the council and committees to be responsive and accessible to public input, to include representation of all interested groups, to consider all viewpoints, and to be capable of prompt action;

We ask appropriate city officials to determine whether a suitable form of such a council already exists; if it does, we wish the city to support it actively; if not, we wish the city to seek to encourage its formation by such means as may appear proper.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION I

SUMMARY: This initiative asks "Shall we tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?" The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated portion of Route 480 known as the Embarcadero Freeway. This initiative declaration of policy will give the voters the opportunity to establish the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco regarding the proposed teardown of the Embarcadero Freeway.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION J

Shall the City replace a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if such replacement would open up the Waterfront to its citizens, improve the tax base, and create a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic?
Candidates

FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER
JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: The Bill of Rights guarantees that every person accused of a crime shall have the effective assistance of counsel. Whether an individual is rich or poor, that person is entitled to a competent and dedicated attorney.
In San Francisco it is the duty of the Public Defender to uphold this sacred right. In every case, we provide the client with the best defense under the law.
In the last 7 years, my outstanding staff has done this work with the highest degree of professionalism. In the next 4 years, that same strong, professional, independent and ethical representation will continue.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John D. Burdis, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wei Ying Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Sara Burton, 8 Stair Blvd., Representative In Congress, 5th District
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesale
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Clerk
Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Artist/Community Organizer
Brian Getz, 55 22nd Ave., Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson, Sheriff of San Francisco
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., International Vice President, ILGWU
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for Children & Youth
Suzan Kelly Kennedy, 3070 26th Ave., Executive Assistant to Sala Burton M.C.
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
Carole Mignone, 561 Webster St., Community Health Director
Linda Ann Post, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative
Jim Rivaldo, 430 Steiner St., Political Consultant
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Member, SF Community College District
Governing Board
Yuri Wada, 563 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel W. Walker, 562 Campbell Ave., President — Local 250-A Transport
Workers Union of America
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hillcrats Ave., Minister
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realitor
C. R. Zanca, 1896 Pacific Ave., Auto Repair Proprietor

FOR ASSessor
SAM DUCa

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I was elected your Assessor in 1978 and re-elected in 1982. My years in the Assessor’s Office were spent in a professional appraisal capacity personnel and administration. I have two university degrees, the coveted MAI designation, and am the recipient of a special Congressional Advisory Board award from the United States Congress. I have served in an advisory capacity, both nationally and internationally, in property tax administration and will continue to serve the taxpayers of the City and County of San Francisco in dealing with Article XIIIa of the State Constitution. My community involvement includes participation in cultural, civic business organizations.

Sam Duca

The sponsors for Sam Duca are:
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 740 Broadway St., Investor
Eugene L. Fried, 2910 Lake St., Investor
Nancy Pelosi, 40 Presidio Ter., Housewife and volunteer in politics
Walter H. Showenstine, 740 El Camino del Mar, Chairman, Milton Meyer & Co.
Stanley Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Emma W. Louis, 1257 Jackson St., Housewife
Alfred S. Wilsey, 2590 Jackson St., Chr. of Exec. Comm. of Diversified Holding Co.
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hineckley Walk, Physician
Garson Bakar, 2310 Hyde St., Investor
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired
Joseph C. Orego, Sr., 866 Faxon Ave., Publicity Dept. — S.F. Giants
James A. Scatena, 101 St. Elmo Way, Chairman of the Board, Scatena York Co.
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher
Frances May McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Recreation & Park Commissioner
Frederick F. Campagnoli, 2609 Larkin St., Attorney
Betty Brooks, 1738 26th St., Field Representative
Jesse Teruel Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Businessman
Cyril J. Magnin, 994 California St., Merchant
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John H. Swanson, 145 Lake Merced Hill South, Bowling Alley Owner
Frances G. Goldman, 745 El Camino Del Mar, Child Guidance
Irma M. Bernardo, 2124 34th Ave., Housewife
Leo J. Murphy, 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Charles M. Cunningham, 475 Connecticut St., Self Employed
Lawrence V. Eppinet, 815 Fel St., Conf. Secretary
Mary M. O’Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Volunteer & Homemaker
Elizabeth R. Duca, 16 Wawona St., Homemaker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Application for Absentee Ballot

is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

Name ____________________________

Residence Address ____________________________

Mailing Address ____________________________

Signature ____________________________

If the person to whom this pamphlet is addressed no longer resides at this address, please draw a diagonal slash (/) through the address label and drop the pamphlet in the mailbox.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods. Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
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YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 5, 1986.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
• are a U.S. Citizen,
• are at least 18 years of age on election day,
• are a resident of California, and
• are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, such as this one, you can only choose among the candidates of your party.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Senator, State Assemblymember, County Central Committee, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your polling place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 3, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in”. If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

Q—Can a worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
• Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
• mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—An application form is not necessary. You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
• your home address,
• the address where you want the ballot mailed,
• then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail by absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 3, 1986.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS CONCERNING VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

Note: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

STEP 1
USING BOTH HANDS INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

STEP 2
BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.
Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coincidan con las dos cabecitas rojas.

STEP 3
HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.
Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfure con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

STEP 4
AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.
Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

D 第三步
请把带针的选票插入，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO ÚNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfóra la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfóra la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota,

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfóra la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SÍ" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borraduras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfóra, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuelvala al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

選民須知:

選舉所選擇的任何候選人，請在選票上箭頭所指之候選人名下打孔，如果有兩位或以上候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上箭頭所指之所有候選人中，選擇你要投之候選人打孔，但不超過要選舉的規定人數。

投票合乎非候選之候選人，請在非候選候選人選票信封所提供之預定空位上及候選人所選舉的職位和候選人的姓名。

投票任何提案，請在選票上箭頭所指 "YES" 或 "NO" 字樣打孔。

選票上如有偽造或未照投票，選票即作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔錯誤，請撕或弄毀了，或撕毀了、弄毀了非候選候選人的選票信封，應把該選票送還給選舉處的監票員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

請在下頁開始投票

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>WILLIAM H.R. “BILL” CLARK</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEORGE “DUKE” DEUKMEJIAN</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>MIKE CURB</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.L. “BILL” RICHARDSON</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>BRUCE NESTANDE</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RALPH E. WINKLER</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MICHAEL CYRUS</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The number is the vote count, and the arrow indicates the official position.*

*(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controller</strong></td>
<td>DON A. SEBASTIANI</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARZ GARCIA</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILLIAM CAMPBELL</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAN STANFORD</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treasurer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attorney General</strong></td>
<td>DUNCAN M. JAMES</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRUCE GLEASON</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAWRENCE J. STRAW, JR.</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Member, State Board of Equalization</strong></td>
<td>A. JOHN SHIMMON</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLAUDE W. PARRISH</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT W. NAYLOR</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED ZSCHAU</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL ALLEN</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM H. PEMBERTON</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH WILLIAM KNOWLAND</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTHUR B. &quot;ART&quot; LAFFER</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE C. MONTGOMERY</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELDREDGE CLEAVER</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN W. SPRING</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOBBI FIEDLER</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED DAVIS</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE HERSHEYENSOHN</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN): To vote for a candidate not on the ballot, write the name and office title on the long side of your ballot.
**United States Representative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United States Representative</th>
<th>MIKE GARZA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>159 → 161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State Senator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Senator</th>
<th>(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal)</td>
<td>本區沒有州參議員選舉。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Member of the State Assembly**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member, State Assembly</th>
<th>MAX WOODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cable Car Gripman</td>
<td>177 → 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fijador de Tranvías con Cables</td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Republican Party**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Republican Party</th>
<th>PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 3, 1986</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL)</td>
<td>請選 1 人 Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly</td>
<td>MAX WOODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable Car Gripman</td>
<td>177 → 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRIET ROSS</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE M. O’NEILL</td>
<td>Banker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN H. NICHOLS</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANLEY F. BRAMWELL</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTOPHER LANCE BOWMAN</td>
<td>State Senate Staffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTORIA THOMPSON</td>
<td>Industrial Firm President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX WOODS</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM N. POST, II</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE GARZA</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN ENG</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIAN L. MAVROGEORGE</td>
<td>Data Processing Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTORIA SHEEHAN</td>
<td>Automotive Company Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID SIGAL</td>
<td>World Trade Broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM SPINOSA</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Write-In): To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>BILL HONIG State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>DANIEL NUSBAUM Teacher</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Project Advisor</td>
<td>JEANNE BAIRD Educational Project Advisor</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and County</td>
<td>SAM DUCA Incumbent En posesin del Cargo</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and County</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN Incumbent En posesin del Cargo</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE PROPOSITIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO PARTISAN BALLOT</strong></td>
<td><strong>PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 4, 1986</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td>VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $850,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td>COMMUNITY PARKLANDS ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for acquiring, developing, improving, rehabilitating, or restoring urgently needed local and regional parks, beaches, recreational areas and facilities, and historical resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td>WATER CONSERVATION AND WATER QUALITY BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $150,000,000 to provide funds for water conservation, groundwater recharge and drainage water management, and clarifies language in the Clean Water Bond Law of 1984.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td>DEPOSIT OF PUBLIC MONEY IN CREDIT UNIONS. Authorizes Legislature to provide for deposit of public moneys in any credit union. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect. Legislation already approved implementing measure could result in greater interest income to state and local governments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. Provides exception to property tax limit when acquisition or improvement of real property approved by two-thirds of voters. Fiscal Impact: By itself, measure has no fiscal effect. No increase can occur in local property tax rate unless bond issue is approved by two-thirds vote. State costs for tax relief programs could increase. State income tax revenues would decline as taxpayers deduct greater amounts for property tax payments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td>ALLOCATION OF VEHICLE LICENSE FEE TAXES TO COUNTIES AND CITIES. Requires allocation of Vehicle License Fee taxes to local governments. Fiscal Impact: Measure would have no direct fiscal effect. Prevents Legislature from changing the law to take vehicle license fees away from counties and cities. Measure would not prevent state reducing other forms of aid to local governments or changing existing formula for dividing vehicle license fee revenues between counties and cities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td>LEGISLATORS’ AND JUDGES’ RETIREMENT SYSTEMS. Limits retirement allowances for persons entering Legislators’ and Judges’ Retirement Systems after January 1, 1987. Fiscal Impact: Minor savings to state in future years if rate of inflation exceeds increase in salaries paid to current officeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATUALES

ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1946. Esta acta dispone el empréstito de $50,000,000.00 para proporcionar assistencia en la compra de viviendas y casas para los veteranos de California.

ACTA DE TERRENOS DE PARQUES DE LA COMUNIDAD DE 1946. Esta acta dispone la venta de terrenos para $90,000,000.00 para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición, desarrollo, mejoramiento y mantenimiento de los parques y áreas de recreación.

LEY DE BONOS PARA LA CONSERVACIÓN DE AQUA Y CONTROL DE LA CALIDAD DEL AGUA DE 1946. Esta ley dispone la emisión de $100,000,000.00 para conservar el agua y mejorar la calidad del agua en el estado.

DEPÓSITO DE FONDOS PÚBLICOS EN COOPERATIVAS DE CRÉDITO. Autoriza a la Legislatura para que disponga el depósito de fondos públicos en cualquier cooperativa de crédito.

FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD: Dispone exenciones a los limites de impuesto a la propiedad en la adquisición de bienes raíces. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. La legislación ya contiene exenciones que pueden afectar el impuesto a la propiedad.

ASIGNACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS POR PAGOS DE LICENCIA DE VEHÍCULOS A LOS CONDADOS Y CIUDADES. Requiere la asignación de fondos provenientes de los impuestos a la propiedad. Impacto Fiscal: La medida no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo.

SISTEMAS DE JUBILACIÓN DE LOS LEGISLATORES Y JUECES. Limita las pensiones de jubilación para aquellos que se afilien al Sistema de Jubilación de los Legisladores y Jueces desde el 1° de enero de 1987. Impacto Fiscal: Abiertas máscaras para el estado en años futuros si la tasa de inflación excede el aumento en los salarios que se pagan a los que actualmente ocupan cargos.
## MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NONPARTISAN OFFICES.</strong> Prohibits a political party or party central committee from endorsing, supporting, or opposing a candidate for nonpartisan office. Fiscal Impact: No direct state or local government fiscal impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPERTY TAXATION. DISASTERS.</strong> Base-year value of property damaged or destroyed by disaster transferable to comparable replacement property in same county. Fiscal Impact: Local property tax revenues would decrease by an unknown amount. County assessor and tax collectors would have nonsignificant higher administrative costs. State would replace revenues lost by school and community college districts. State income tax revenues could increase due to lower property tax deductions on replacement properties. These state costs and revenues cannot be estimated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MULTIPLE DEFENDANTS TORT DAMAGE LIABILITY.</strong> Plaintiff’s non-economic damage recovery limited to defendant’s liability based on defendant’s percentage of fault. Fiscal Impact: Substantial savings to state and local governments. Savings could be several millions of dollars in a year, varying significantly from year to year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COUNTY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1986.</strong> This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county correctional facilities and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of four hundred ninety-five million dollars ($495,000,000).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY &amp; COUNTY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgements against the City?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSITION C HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THE BALLOT BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

CARGOS NO PARTIDARIOS. Prohibe a un partido político o a un comité central de un partido político patrocinar, apoyar u oponerse a un candidato a un cargo no partidario. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo a los gobiernos estatales o locales.

IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE DEBASTES. El valor en el que se base la propiedad inmueble debe o destruido por un desastre puede ser transferido a propiedad inmueble de reemplazo comparable en el mismo condado. Impacto Fiscal: Los recibos provenientes de impuestos locales a la propiedad disminuyen en una cantidad desconocida. Los taxadores y recaudadores de impuestos del condado tendrían insignificantes costos administrativos más altos. El estado reemplazará los recibos que los distritos escolares y de colegios de educación superior dejen de percibir. Los recibos del Impuesto estatal a la tierra podrían aumentar debido a menores deducciones en el impuesto a la propiedad en las propiedades de reemplazo. Estos costos y recibos estatales no pueden ser calculados.

RESPONSABILIDAD CIVIL DE MULTIPLES PARTES DEMANDADAS EN JUICIOS DE AGRAVOS INSEGUAZORES. Se limita la indemnización que puede recibir el dañado por daños no económicos a la responsabilidad del demandado basada en el porcentaje de la culpa del demandado. Impacto Fiscal: Ahorro sustancial para los gobiernos estatales y locales. Los daños podrían ser algunos millones de dólares al año, que variarán significativamente de año en año.

ACTA DE BONOS PARA DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA INSTALACIONES CORRECCIONALES DE CONDADOS DE 1985. Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelación, y reemplazo de instalaciones correccionales de los condados y la ejecución del mantenimiento diferido en las mismas en conformidad con un empréstito de bonos por cuatrocientos noventa y cinco millones de dólares ($450,000,000).

PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONTADO

"¿Deberá la Ciudad establecer una oficina de administración del riesgo y un departamento de investigación y administración de contratos para ayudar y reducir el riesgo de plagas y sentencias contra la Ciudad?"

"¿Deberá autorizarse al Comprador a firmar contratos por menos de $0,000,000 sin la aprobación del Jefe Administrativo y a permitir que sus agentes firmen contratos en su lugar?"

OFICIALMENTE ELIMINADA

正式撤消
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?</td>
<td>YES 288 NO 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?</td>
<td>YES 292 NO 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?</td>
<td>YES 296 NO 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?</td>
<td>YES 300 NO 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?</td>
<td>YES 303 NO 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?</td>
<td>YES 307 NO 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?</td>
<td>YES 310 NO 311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

288 SI 贏成
289 NO 反对

"¿Debería la Ciudad transferir la administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil a un departamento de administración de personal que tenga poder para cambiar las normas del servicio civil que el presente constan en la Carta Constitucional?"

292 SI 贏成
293 NO 反对

"¿Debería la Ciudad negar o revocar cualquier permiso de construcción para edificar en la Regresa Balboa en las Avenidas Ocean y Pahalan en los próximos tres años?"

906 SI 贏成

"¿Debería la Ciudad nominal la defensa permanente efectuada?"

VOTER SELECTION CARD

PRIMARY ELECTION
JUNE 3, 1986

POLLS ARE OPEN
FROM
7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR CANDIDATE SELECTION

假如有任何疑问或者未决年终问题的答辩
通知本选民委员会，费金山人民委员会
选民登记委员会
# MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>into the Charter?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the City prohibit campaign contributions before any city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commission, at candidate for municipal office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people's greatest ties with South Africa?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people's and private organizations to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>election Council?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people on Freeway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people on Pecadero Freeway, if it would</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in traffic?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### VOTER SELECTION CARD

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>County Central Committee*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td>6.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>7.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>8.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate</td>
<td>9.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td>10.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Public Inst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to your sample ballot for the number of County Central Committee members to be elected. The number varies with each district.

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR PROPOSITIONS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Propuesta</th>
<th>Resultado</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>288 SI</td>
<td>&quot;¿Debe la Ciudad transferir la administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil a un departamento de administración de personal que tenga poder para cambiar las normas del servicio civil que al presente constan en la Carta Constitucional?&quot;</td>
<td>Aprobado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;如果废除服务委员会的职务，将行政管理职能赋予新成立的行政部门，以增加新的服务委员会的权力担任职务。&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292 SI</td>
<td>&quot;¿Debe la Ciudad exigir o revocar cualquier permiso de construcción para edificar en la Regresión Balboa en las Avenidas Ocean y Phelan en los próximos tres años?&quot;</td>
<td>Aprobado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;如果要求在该地区建造，需要在即将到来的三年内要求所有施工许可被取消。&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296 SI</td>
<td>&quot;¿Debe la Ciudad prohibir la defensa remunerada efectuada por oficiales de la Ciudad y legisladores estatales ante cualquier comisión de la Ciudad, y limitar la cantidad con la que una persona pueda contribuir para un candidato a una oficina municipal en $500?&quot;</td>
<td>Aprobado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;如果禁止政府官员与其他市议员在市议会上为候选人辩护，且限制候选人每人能够支付给的辩护费用至$500。&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 SI</td>
<td>&quot;¿Debe ser plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el boicotar las empresas que tengan mayor vinculación con la segregación racial sudáfrica?&quot;</td>
<td>Aprobado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;如果禁止企业参与种族隔离政策，能够制定出更加有效的反种族隔离政策。&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303 SI</td>
<td>&quot;¿Debe ser plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el apoyar a todas las organizaciones apropiadas, públicas y privadas, para establecer y mantener un Consejo para la Investigación y Educación sobre S.I.D.A. (A.I.D.S)?&quot;</td>
<td>Aprobado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;如果支持一切可能为S.I.D.A.提供研究和教育的合作组织。&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307 SI</td>
<td>&quot;¿Debe ser plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el demoler el Autopista Embacadero?&quot;</td>
<td>Aprobado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;如果街道持有高速公路的财产，这将对街道有利。&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310 SI</td>
<td>&quot;¿Debe ser plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el reponer parte de la Autopista Embacadero, si esto aumentara el acceso del público a la avenida de los muelles y mejorara el tráfico?&quot;</td>
<td>Aprobado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;如果不再需支出高速公路的一部分，将有助于增加街道的安全性，以及改善交通状况。&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

**BALLOT** — An official list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT** — If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL** — See Absentee Ballot, above.

**POLLING PLACE** — The place where you go to vote.

**PROPOSITION** — This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

**MEASURE** — Another name for proposition.

**CHALLENGE** — Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

**SUPERVISORS** — Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

**CHARTER AMENDMENT** — The charter is the basic set of laws for the city government. A charter amendment changes one of those basic laws. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

**ORDINANCE** — A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

**DECLARATION OF POLICY** — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, the supervisors must carry out the policy, to the extent legally possible.

**INITIATIVE** — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

**PETITION** — A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

**PERMIT** (noun) — A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building. Proposition E concerns the issuance of a permit.

**COMPENSATED ADVOCACY** — Compensated means being paid for doing something; Advocacy means speaking or writing on behalf of someone else. Proposition F concerns the issue of compensated advocacy.

**RISK MANAGEMENT** — This field covers two areas: (1) deciding on when it is better to buy insurance and when it is better to be self insured or uninsured, then shopping for the insurance; (2) identifying hazardous conditions on one's property and seeing that they are corrected so that liability and damage claims will be avoided. Proposition A concerns risk management.

---

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.
Risk Manager; Claims Investigation

PROPOSITION A

Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgments against the City?

YES 278

NO 279

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Consultants hired by the Chief Administrative Officer are available to City departments that have questions about "risk management", such as how to keep damage claims to a minimum and how to find the best insurance rates. In some cases, the departments use these consultants. In other cases, the departments make their own decisions. When damage claims are filed, some are handled by the City Attorney’s Office and some are handled by City departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would amend the City Charter to create an Office of Risk Management, under the Chief Administrative Officer. The office would set risk management guidelines for all City departments, boards and commissions. Proposition A would also establish a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration in the City Attorney’s Office. The bureau would be responsible for investigating, evaluating and processing all damage claims made against the City, except those claims made against the Public Utilities Commission and the Police Department. The bureau would also have the power to investigate potential suits against the City and to make settlements within dollar limits to be set by ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer and a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want damage claims and risk management decisions to continue to be handled the way they are now.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not affect the cost of government. However as a result of its potential future application and the exemption of certain employees from the civil service provisions of the Charter, costs may be affected in an amount presently indeterminate."

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On March 10 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 71
Risk Manager; Claims Investigation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON A

Last fiscal year, over 6,400 claims and law suits were filed against the City, costing us more than $10 million in settlements. I believe that it is time to change the way we handle our claims, secure insurance, prevent risks and settle legitimate claims against the City.

Last summer, we appointed a task force of citizens, under San Francisco Bar President Jerry Falk, to make recommendations on how to streamline our procedures and save money at the same time. The present system is very slow, costly, and inefficient.

Currently, all claims are investigated by the department involved. The City Attorney cannot act on any claim until the department is ready. This results in delay and duplication of effort and increased costs. A centralized and accountable Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney would be more efficient, cost-effective, and professional. It would enable the City to settle many claims quickly, before litigation is begun, saving the City the costs of defending itself in court and lowering the average cost of settling a case.

This can be accomplished without creating new jobs by simply moving into one office the city positions presently scattered throughout the government.

VOTE "Yes" on A. Reduce the cost of City government.

Adoption of this measure would also formally establish responsibility for Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer, where it has been unofficially since 1978. With this strengthened authority, the Risk Management Office would be responsible for the gathering of claims data on a City-wide basis, the creation of incentives for both reducing the possibility for injuries and damage and the number of claims for each department, the coordination of insurance purchasing and specific suggestions to avoid and reduce risk.

This amendment is presented with the recommendation of the Mayor’s Task Force on Claims and Judgments, the Chief Administrative Officer, City Attorney, the President of the San Francisco Bar Association, and the President of the Lawyers’ Club of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Each year the City spends almost $10 million to settle damage claims. It is estimated that the overall costs to the City for all risk-related activities exceed $125 million a year. It is time for action to be taken to reduce these huge expenditures. This charter amendment is designed to do just that.

Claims Investigation and Adjustment

Right now, the City claims investigation process is decentralized and largely unorganized. Each department investigates its own claims. Investigators may or may not be specially trained for their duties. There is no uniformity of investigation procedure or claims reporting. In only a few departments do investigators contact injured parties within days of an accident in order to settle the claim quickly and economically.

This amendment will create a claims investigation and adjustment bureau in the Office of the City Attorney. Claims investigation and adjustment activities will be centralized, economized and made much more efficient. The new bureau will be able to respond immediately to accidents and claims, providing quick compensation to deserving persons while at the same time producing a prompt, professional investigation. This reform is greatly needed.

Risk Management

Presently, there is no overall plan for the management of the City’s risk exposure: insurance purchasing, avoidance of industrial accidents, gathering data on accident patterns, etc. Again, risk management as a function is fragmented among the various City departments. As a consequence, departments cannot develop the necessary expertise to manage themselves to reduce risk-related costs.

This measure will establish a risk manager under the Chief Administrative Officer. For the first time, overall City planning will be possible in order to control risk. Departments will be told what activities are producing injuries or damage and advised on corrective measures. Private industry has been utilizing risk managers of this type for years. It is time that the City did the same.

This amendment will reduce the cost of government and insure a more efficient delivery of City services to all San Franciscans. We urge you to give it your unqualified support.

Board of Supervisors

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This charter amendment was proposed by a citizens’ task force appointed by Mayor Feinstein. Its mission was to propose ways of reducing the number and financial costs of claims and lawsuits against the City.

The amendment has two principal features. The first is to centralize within the City Attorney’s office the investigation of claims filed against city departments. This will allow for improved training and discipline of the investigators, who presently are scattered throughout city government. The result will be more efficient, cost-effective and professional investigation of claims. By improving the quality of claims investigation, the City can identify those claims which have merit and attempt to reach early — and less costly — settlements. Meritless claims will be denied with greater confidence that if suit is filed it can be defended successfully.

The second major feature of the amendment will establish a Risk Management Office under the Chief Administrative Officer. Risk management is a concept widely used in private business. Risk managers are professionals skilled in reducing the overall cost of claims. The Risk Manager would be responsible for coordinating the City’s insurance program, data collection, and correcting problems within the City which lead to claims. The Risk Manager would review those claims which have been filed against the City. Where it appears that an unsafe condition or practice has led to a claim, the Risk Manager would suggest to the affected department that corrective measures be taken. Reports to the Mayor and to the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors of the recommended corrections and the actions taken would ensure that the various departments will be responsive.

The City cannot eliminate claims and lawsuits against it. But it can limit its exposure by managing the claims process more effectively. This measure will reduce injuries and reduce claims, and that is good for everyone.

Jerome B. Falk, Jr.
Chair, Mayor’s Task Force on Claims and Judgments Against the City

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN
KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, May 31, 1986

12 Noon  State Senate, Assembly, Congress and State Propositions
1:00   Proposition A — Risk Management & Claims
1:15   Proposition B — Purchaser & Contracts
1:30   Proposition D — Civil Service
2:15   Proposition E — Balboa Reservoir
2:30   Proposition F — Compensated Advocacy
3:00   Proposition G — Apartheid
3:20   Proposition H — AIDS
3:30   Propositions I, J — Embarcadero Freeway
3:50   Statewide Candidates

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Purchaser & Contracts

PROPOSITION B

Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him? YES 281 NO 282

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchaser must get the approval of the Chief Administrative Officer before signing certain contracts for more than $15,000. Only the voters may change that dollar limit. The Purchaser must personally sign every contract that comes through his office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would raise the limit on contracts requiring the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval to $50,000. It would also allow the Board of Supervisors to change that limit by ordinance. Proposition B would also permit the Purchaser to name certain people in his office to sign contracts on his behalf.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval only on contracts for more than $50,000. You also want the Purchaser to be able to name certain people in his office to be able to sign contracts on his behalf.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to require the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval on contracts for more than $15,000. You also want him to sign all contracts himself.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

“Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 3 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON B!
The City’s Charter requires that a permanent, non-elected City official, the Chief Administrative Officer, review all purchases and contracts above $15,000. Of course, CAO approval of major contracts is very important. But, due to inflation, the number of contracts that have to go to the CAO for approval is always increasing. Today there are too many documents requiring CAO approval. This slows down the purchasing process, occupies staff time—and ultimately costs the City money. Proposition B will raise the CAO approval level to $50,000, and help the City to improve the efficiency of its purchasing operations.

The City’s budget includes more than $250 million for purchases on tens of thousands of contracts. At the current $15,000 review limit, the CAO must approve thousands of documents every year—a costly, time-consuming process. In the long run the City loses money because of the inordinate length of time required to complete all the paperwork.

An adjustment must be made to remove the smaller contracts from this cumbersome process. Review and approval of contracts under $50,000 should be under the responsibility of the City Purchaser, a highly trained and experienced professional, who reports directly to the CAO. By changing the present $15,000 to $50,000, it will be possible for the CAO to give each document that comes to him the attention it requires. And, by placing its orders and paying its bills faster, both the City and businesses will benefit—especially small business and those owned by minorities and women.

Proposition B will allow future adjustments to the limit to be made by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility will ensure the City’s ability to adjust to inflation and changes in the market.

This amendment comes to you with the recommendation of auditors, controllers, bankers, and others who exercise top fiduciary responsibility within their own organizations.

VOTE YES ON B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will make essential changes to update the purchasing and payment procedures under the Chief Administrative Officer. These measures are necessary and desirable because they will save the City money by significantly increasing our management efficiency.

Right now, the City loses because it takes too long for contracts to be reviewed and payments okayed, which means that early payment incentives go unutilized. The CAO has to approve every contract greater than $15,000—and with City purchases last year over $250 million, the paperwork logjam is vast and overwhelming.

An increase in the review limit from $15,000 to $50,000 will make an adequate adjustment for inflation—$50,000 now is only about $15,000 in 1967 dollars. Proposition B will also enable the City Purchaser, who reports to the CAO, to maximize potential savings through early payments by designating appropriate personnel to approve contracts up to $50,000. These “Good Business” amendments are consistent with private sector practices and should be incorporated by the CAO in the City’s best interests.

Finally, Proposition B will give the City the ability to respond quickly to changes in the market place by allowing changes in the CAO review limit by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility is necessary to ensure that in the future we will not lose money because of institutional rigidity. Control is maintained with the necessity of Board action and Mayoral approval to adjust the review limit, and this same feature will allow for change when desired.

Vote yes on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON’T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!
You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
Civil Service

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the civil service system of the City of San Francisco. The structure of the civil service system and certain rules governing its operation are written into the Charter and can only be changed by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would make major changes. A Department of Personnel Administration would run the Civil Service system and would be able to change rules with Commission approval. Major features of Proposition D are described below. The complete charter amendment is printed in this voters' handbook.

Department of Personnel Administration

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Certain civil service rules governing the general operation of the system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs, are written into the Charter and carried out by the Civil Service Commission. Only the voters can change these rules.

THE PROPOSAL: A department of Personnel Administration would be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. A Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor would run the Department. Certain rules governing examination, selection and appointment would be taken out of the Charter. The Personnel Director would be able to change these rules with the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

Civil Service Commission

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the general operation of the civil service system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs. The Commission also hears and decides appeals on civil service matters.

THE PROPOSAL: The Civil Service Commission would no longer be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. The Commission could investigate the operation of the system, approve rule changes proposed by the Personnel Director, and hear and decide appeals only on claims of job discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest.

Employee Relations

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors appoints an Employee Relations Director to negotiate contracts with City employees; the Board approves all contracts.

THE PROPOSAL: The Mayor or his or her agent would negotiate with City employees; the Board of Supervisors would still approve all contracts.

What your vote means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing civil service system.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE
Text of Proposed Initiative Charter Amendment

PROPOSITION D

On January 9, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative Charter amendment rewriting the civil service provisions of the Charter had qualified for the June ballot.

Robert Bradford, Jonathan Bulkeley, Lee Munsen and Mary Milton, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 36,049 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 25,027 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

Polls close at 8:00 p.m.

CITY CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT ON "D"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, and in of itself it would not directly affect the cost of government, as it removes many civil service policy setting functions from the Charter and an independent Civil Service Commission and transfers responsibility for personnel matters, including labor negotiations, to the Mayor.

"As a product of its inherent flexibility and possible future application, costs could be affected or savings realized in amounts presently indeterminate but probably substantial."

How "D" Got on Ballot

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. Consistent with the City's and County's affirmative action goals, no applicant or employee shall be selected, appointed, reduced in rank, removed or in any way favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, political activities, political affiliation or sexual orientation.

(b) The purpose of the civil service system is to obtain for the city and county the best qualified persons to fill city and county positions in a timely and economical manner, using professional, fair and equitable personnel selection and personnel management practices with consideration of the following merit principles:

1. Recruiting, selecting and advancing employees on the basis of their ability, knowledge, skills and performance relative to the work to be performed.

2. Establishing equitable and adequate compensation, as provided elsewhere in this charter.

3. Training employees, as needed, to promote productivity and high quality performance and to facilitate career development.

4. Retaining employees during good service and separating employees for good cause.

5. Assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration, with proper regard for their privacy and constitutional rights; and assuring equal employment opportunity, based on the person's ability to do the job.

6. Assuring that employees are protected against coercion for political purposes and are prohibited from using their official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the outcome of an election or a nomination for office.

(c) This charter does not limit the power of departments, agencies, or other subdivisions of the city and county in their exercise of management prerogatives including but not limited to:

1. Directing employees in the performance of their duties;

2. Hiring, promoting, transferring and assigning employees from those qualified;

3. Classifying positions in accordance with Section 3.663 (b);

4. Disciplining employees;

5. Laying off employees because of lack of work, lack of funds or other reasonable cause; and

6. Determining the mission of its departments and divisions, and its budget, organization, the number of its employees, and the numbers, types, classifications and grades of positions or employees assigned to an organization unit, work project, shift or tour of duty, and the methods and technology of performing its work.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. Consistent with the City's and County's affirmative action goals, no applicant or employee shall be selected, appointed, reduced in rank, removed or in any way favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, age, religion, national origin or other non-merit factors.

(b) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in subsection (a) or any other provisions of this charter, it shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, consistent with a policy of acquiring qualified personnel for the service of the city and county, to encourage the hiring of blind persons. It shall further be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that no otherwise qualified blind person shall be discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, age, religion, national origin or other non-merit factors.

(c) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in subsection (a) or any other provisions of this charter, it shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that no otherwise qualified blind person shall be discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, age, religion, national origin or other non-merit factors.

(d) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in subsection (a) or any other provisions of this charter, it shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that no otherwise qualified blind person shall be discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, age, religion, national origin or other non-merit factors.

(e) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in subsection (a) or any other provisions of this charter, it shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that no otherwise qualified blind person shall be discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, age, religion, national origin or other non-merit factors.

(2) 3.102 Employee Relations

It shall be the duty of the mayor to meet and confer with employee representatives on behalf of the city and county and all its constituent boards, commissions, departments and agencies as required by applicable law. These duties may be performed by a designee of the mayor who shall serve at the pleasure of the mayor. Nothing herein shall limit the mayor from contracting for the performance of these duties.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the mayor shall submit all memoranda of understanding or ordinances to be enacted pursuant to Article VIII of this charter herein to the Board of Supervisors for its approval or rejection.

3.661 Generation; Composition; Meetings

There is hereby established a civil service commission which may be created with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county shall have the general powers and duties set forth in Section 3.661.

The civil service commission shall consist of five members appointed by the mayor. The commission, in office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and this charter section as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members of the commission, as provided for in this section, and the terms of appointment of any new members of the commission, as provided for in this section, shall be the terms of that person's appointment.

The terms of any additional members of the commission appointed under this section shall expire on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members of the commission, as provided for in this section, shall be the terms of that person's appointment.

The respective terms of the commissioners who shall hold office on the effective date of this section as amended shall expire at the time of the first regular election for the office of mayor, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, including the term of any additional member of the commission appointed under this section.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Vote YES and join 34,000 San Franciscans who signed petitions to get this crucial reform on the ballot. “D” clears the way to modernize Civil Service so that it is fair and efficient. The present system is a 50-year conglomeration of rules that tie the City’s hands—

— A protest by one applicant can hold up hiring for an entire job classification for months— even years.
— Often tests cannot be given frequently enough to maintain current tests of qualified employees. This leads to delays and temporary appointments that make hiring top candidates all but impossible.
— Appointments to jobs are restricted to the top three names on a list even though more than three people have the same score!
— Many provisions are out of date. Some deal with hiring during the Korean War. Others limit our ability to carry out affirmative action.

“D” would remove archaic rules from the Charter so they could be changed as the times require — subject to meet and confer and public hearings. Job tests could be expedited; hiring and promotions speeded up; opportunities opened to women and minorities.

Specifically, Proposition D:
1) Creates a Department of Personnel Administration at no additional cost. Like other U.S. cities, day-to-day administration would be the responsibility of a director, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Supervisors.
2) Makes the Civil Service Commission the oversight body to set policy and hear appeals. Rulings would have to be within 60 days, eliminating endless delays.
3) Moves the office of labor relations from the Supervisors to the Mayor, who must make the tough-minded decisions to balance the budget. Never again could the Board give labor $27 million for “comparable worth.”

This reform is the product of years of work with SPUR, League of Women Voters, Chamber of Commerce. Members of the Board of Supervisors could have put the reform on the ballot last year but bowed to some labor leaders, and 34,000 San Franciscans had to do the job for them.

Proposition D will enable City government to work better for you. Vote YES.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON ‘D’

Proposition D is a complex proposition with a simple goal: remove the archaic restrictions on the hiring, promotion, or firing of city employees and bring San Francisco’s personnel system into the modern age.

Archaic is the only way to describe a system that keeps equally qualified people from competing for a job, and that takes months—sometimes years—to fill vacancies.

For example, if 50 people score equally high on a competitive examination, shouldn’t they all have a chance for any job for which they are eligible? Not under the current system, which requires complicated tie-breaking rules not at all related to a person’s qualifications or abilities.

Or what about being able to hire the best person available for a given job? Currently, eligibility lists are frozen for two years and every person on each list, including the lowest-scoring, must be offered a job before the highest-scoring person on a more recent list. Private businesses couldn’t function saddled with such absurdities.

Proposition D cuts through the red tape. It creates a modern personnel department, with a director responsible for carrying out rules to ensure fairness and efficiency. Accountable to the Mayor, the director would be selected from a list provided by the Civil Service Commission, and subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.

The Civil Service Commission remains an independent body, with the right to approve new personnel rules and hold hearings on abuses. Also under ‘D’, negotiations with employee unions would be under the Mayor, subject to approval by the Supervisors, providing checks and balances in balancing our budget.

With greater accountability and continued checks and balances, Proposition D will open the way to more efficient government in our City.

Bill Maher, Supervisor
Louise Renne, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON ‘D’

Proposition D is a necessary reform to the City’s Civil System. As the City’s Chief Administrative Officer for almost ten years, I have found that quality employee hiring is difficult and the process causes long delays.

The current system is:
• inflexible. The City cannot hire and promote the most qualified persons.
• inefficiently administered by a commission. Other large

(continued)
cities do not have such a bureaucratic process.

- antiquated. Civil service rules represent practices of the 1950s rather than the 1980s.

The new system:
- allows the Mayor to appoint an effective personnel director, who controls administration and procedures.
- allows efficient procedures to be developed with review of the Civil Service Commission.
- eliminates cumbersome and dated rules and practices.
- expedites City hiring and promotion procedures.

I urge a Yes vote on Proposition D.
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

It's 1986 and we're still trying to manage City business as if it were 1932. As heads of City departments, charged with the daily responsibility of putting out fires, fighting crime, maintaining hospitals, parks, libraries and providing other essential services, we know from bitter experience about shortcomings of the existing Civil Service System.

Enacted with the City Charter in 1932, the system is foundering in red tape. Outdated rules are the subject of endless challenges. Tests are put off; vacancies go unfilled; promotions delayed; any appeal, however groundless, stops the process in its tracks.

Proposition D would take old procedures out of the Charter so they could be changed in an orderly process by the Civil Service Commission, which also would hear appeals.

Day-to-day administration of the tests—the content, scoring, all the myriad details of managing a complex system, would be put into a modern, highly professional personnel office. Tests would be speeded up. Hiring would keep pace with need. Promotions would be on the basis of competence. High performance would be the standard. Discipline could be imposed with working rights fully protected, and women and minorities would be assured equal opportunity.

Proposition D will help improve management and the quality of City services. Vote Yes on D.

Frank Jordan, Chief of Police
Emmet Condon, Fire Chief
Don Bjerre, Director, Public Works
Mary Burns, General Manager, Recreation & Park
John Frantz, City Librarian
Eugene Garland, Director, Port
Marvin Geislinger, Purchaser
Willard Hamilton, Executive Director, Redevelopment Agency
Claire Isaac, Director, Arts Commission
Ray King, Director, Parking Authority
Dean Macris, Director, City Planning
Grant Mickels, Director, Human Rights Commission
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, PUC
Joyce Ream, Director, Aging
Ed Sarsfield, General Manager, Social Services
Thelma Shelley, Managing Director, War Memorial
Moiran Sio, Executive Director, Community Development
Louis Turpen, Director of Airport
Dr. David Werdegger, Director, Health Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The hiring practices outlined in San Francisco City Charter have been virtually unchanged since 1931, a severe handicap in running a modern city. Proposition D is designed to streamline the charter and ensure that the rights of present city employees and candidates for city jobs are protected, while improving the hiring process itself. The initiative also builds management accountability in the city system.

Proposition D Is More Fair, More Efficient, More Economical

The day-to-day personnel functions, including hiring, will be consolidated under a Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. Decisions of the Director of Personnel on examination content and administration are final, unless a decision is stayed during the appeal process by a unanimous vote of the Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D will make it easier to modernize the many archaic Civil Service rules and procedures now included in the Charter, while maintaining a strong and independent Civil Service Commission to safeguard the merit system and protect the rights of city employees. Many detailed rules will come out of the Charter and will become personnel regulations. These regulations can then be modernized, but only through a process which includes public hearings and meet and confer sessions with the union involved. In addition, the Civil Service Commission must approve any changes or new regulations governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfer, resignation and terminations.

Proposition D Will Improve Performance And Public Confidence

The openness and fairness of the proposition will benefit everyone. Well-qualified job candidates will have a better chance of being hired, and well-qualified job holders will have a better chance of being promoted. This means generally better job performance in all departments, resulting in higher employee morale and more public confidence in city government.

Submitted by
Louis Hop Lee, President
Civil Service Commission
Lee Munson, Member Civil Service Commission and Treasurer, San Franciscans for Fair and Efficient Government
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Cities can survive only with strong management. The greatest budgetary restraint must be exercised to assure that full value is received for each tax dollar spent.

With firm limits on what it can spend and faced with a possible loss of Federal funds next year, the City must be managed with the greatest possible efficiency.

Essential to greater efficiency is the need for Civil Service reform. As members of City Commissions, we constantly confront the torturous delays and confused rules that gridlock the present system. The present system simply can't respond to the City's personnel needs. Qualified applicants become frustrated and seek employment elsewhere. Promotions are blocked. Morale suffers. Temporary positions fill in; overtime mounts. The ability to plan is crippled; management is weakened.

Proposition D would put the system on a business-like basis. A personnel department would handle day-to-day administration. The Civil Service Commission would be the watchdog to assure the integrity of the merit system.

This streamlined system would replace what is now inflexible and cumbersome. Testing could be accelerated; hiring made more efficient and promotions made on time. The result would be greater efficiency and elimination of costly waste.

Vote Yes on D.

Jerry E. Berg, President, Board of Permit Appeals
Henry Berman, President, Fire Commission
Mo Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Hector Chinchilla, Rent Board
Rev. Harry Chuck, Housing Authority
Dr. Arthur Coleman, President, Port Commission
Owen Davis, Police Commission
J. Edward Fleishell, Airports Commission
H. Welton Flynn, President, Public Utilities Commission
James Foster, Health Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation & Park Commission
James Fussell, President, Housing Authority
Anne Halsted, Port Commission
Tommy Harris, Recreation & Park Commission
Tom Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Walter Jebe, Public Library Commission
Jeffrey Lee, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Philip Lee, President, Health Commission
Bruce W. Lillienhal, Small Business Advisory Commission
Jacqueline Nemerowski, President, Arts Commission
Toby Rosenblatt, President, Planning Commission
Dr. David Sanchez, President, Police Commission
Joni San Jule, Housing Authority
John Patrick Sherr, President, Parking Authority
Marjorie G. Stern, President, Public Library Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D contains civil service reform measures urged by the League of Women Voters since 1969.

Proposition D will:
— Modernize the City's outdated personnel system by creating a Director of Personnel, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors
— Preserve the principles of merit through policies set by the Civil Service Commission
— Create a more responsive Civil Service system at no additional cost to the taxpayer

EFFICIENCY AND FLEXIBILITY

Proposition D transfers authority for day-to-day management of the City's personnel system from the Civil Service Commission to the Director of Personnel. This will:
— Prevent hiring delays
— Ensure only the most qualified individuals are hired and promoted
— Provide City managers with more administrative flexibility

FAIRNESS FOR EMPLOYEES

Proposition D will:
— Safeguard the rights of City workers
— Protect gains made in hiring women and minorities
— Retain the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit appeals board
— Retain the ability of the City's unions to negotiate working conditions
— Create a system that can respond quickly and fairly to the needs of City workers

Proposition D will bring the Civil Service system into the 20th century by making the Mayor accountable for the management of a system employing more than 25,000 people. Hiring by merit is still guaranteed by the Charter. Please join us in voting for this Reform!

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
Esther Marks, Past President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote Yes on Proposition D the Civil Service Modernization Initiative.

Prevent abuse of a system that was intended to serve the public and protect against favoritism. Prevent situations like this: an employee failed to report to work for a week without explanation; he was telephoned, notified by certified mail and a message left under his door; he was terminated 13 days later; he did not appeal the termination and the civil service commission up-
Civil Service

held the termination. Two months later, the employee petitioned the commission for reinstatement. The employee got his job back, not because the process of termination was wrong but because the commission had a long standing objection to using "absent without leave" as a reason for firing.

The quality of public services is dependent upon the effectiveness of the staff who deliver them. The primary role of the civil service commission should be to facilitate recruitment and retention of the best available personnel. It must protect against favoritism and must assure that everyone has an equal and fair chance at employment.

The present system does not do that. We feel this initiative will make the system work better, for the managers, for the employees and for the public.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco government is huge, with a budget of more than $1 billion per year and 25,000 employees. It is expected to solve serious problems. This requires that the City have the ability to hire and promote talented people to do the job.

The present civil service system is so tied up in red tape that jobs remain vacant for six months to a year, and all too often someone who is not capable of doing a good job is hired. Your tax dollars are being wasted, and you are not receiving the quality of services you need and deserve.

Proposition D will modernize San Francisco's civil service system. It separates the personnel department from the Civil Service Commission, and puts the department under the Mayor where it belongs. The Mayor is responsible for balancing the budget and delivering city services as efficiently as possible. She cannot do this unless she can find capable people to do the job. That is the task of the personnel department in any organization.

Proposition D will also insure that the independent Civil Service Commission has sufficient authority to require the personnel system to be fair in its treatment of City employees. The Commission will be able to issue subpoenas and require testimony of witnesses on investigations it conducts. Should it find that discrimination has occurred, it can issue orders that must be obeyed.

Most major American cities, and virtually all cities and counties in California, have the kind of civil service system that will be established by Proposition D. San Francisco's present system is still mired in the past. It hobbles the ability of the City to deliver services and spend your tax dollars efficiently and fairly.

SPUR has not placed a statement in The Voter's Handbook for any other issue over the past 15 years. We feel that Proposition D is so vital for San Francisco's future that we are making this appeal for your support.

Vote "YES" on Proposition D.

SPUR—The San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Reform Initiative, will give San Francisco citizens the HIGH PERFORMANCE GOVERNMENT necessary to meet the many challenges of the future. Proposition D corrects the outdated and inflexible requirements originally written in San Francisco's City Charter in 1931. It will eliminate the problems which prevent San Francisco's personnel system from operating with efficiency the City's voters and taxpayers deserve:

Proposition D insures City jobs will be filled from current lists of the most qualified employees.

Proposition D prevents ungrounded appeals from delaying for years the appointment or promotion of qualified employees.

Proposition D eliminates the repetitive tasks currently monopolizing the Civil Service Commission meetings and directs the Commission to serve as an appellate body to protect the City's good employees.

Proposition D centralizes the day-to-day operation of the civil service system and makes the Director of Personnel responsible to the Mayor.

Proposition D simplifies the budgetary process by making the Mayor the City's chief labor negotiator, responsible for setting working conditions within the City's financial capacity.

Proposition D is the result of years of painstaking review by the most experienced, able and respected management experts in San Francisco. It is a plan intended to move City government out of the 1930s and equip San Francisco to enter the twenty-first century without being burdened by the red tape of the past.

After ten years of commitment to improving our City, the Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee is convinced adoption of Proposition D is one of the most important issues facing the voters. CHANGE IS LONG OVERDUE. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by,
The Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee

David Amacher
Jerome Anderson
Richard Blum
Charles Chapman
Arthur Cooke, Jr.
Benton Dial
James Elgar
Ruben Garcia

Robert Hayden
Walter Hoodley
John Jacobs
Michael McGill
Ellen Newman
Roy Nordman
Frank Tatum
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PERSONNEL MANAGERS SAY YES ON PROPOSITION D

As the personnel managers for City Departments, we are charged with the responsibility of managing the City’s personnel system. The activities include examinations, hiring, training, discipline, union-management relations, affirmative action and compensation. No one knows better than we the frustrations experienced in attempting to monitor an unbelievable sequence of overlapping bureaucratic activities in attempting to get the job done.

Proposition D will bring our personnel system into line with most other public personnel systems. The improved system will create the potential for being more responsive to the needs of operating departments. It will improve labor relations by transferring this function to the executive branch of government where it belongs.

Proposition D will streamline certain routine procedures resulting in a reduction of cost and time. Under the current system delays are experienced due to lengthy appeals during which time the departments’ objectives are delayed.

Proposition D will create an atmosphere of increased accountability for department managers in the areas of affirmative action, discipline and job performance.

Proposition D has been endorsed by the San Francisco Council of Human Resource Managers, the association of over one hundred personnel managers in City government.

Proposition D strengthens merit system principles. Civil Service commissioners will have more time to enforce and protect these principles rather than being bogged down in the day-to-day activities of administration.

Proposition D will help bring about improved methods and practices in personnel administration and should result in a more competent and effective workforce which the citizens of San Francisco have a right to expect.

Alvin W. Schaaf
Personnel Director
Recreation and Park Department

Marilyn Ramirez
Personnel Officer
San Francisco Port

Edward M. Gazzano
Personnel Director
Department of Health

James Horan
Senior Personnel Officer
Department of Social Services

James Hnicki
Personnel Director
San Francisco International Airport

Andrea R. Gourdie
Manager, Bureau of Personnel & Training
Public Utilities Commission

Mori Noguchi
Senior Department Personnel Officer

Mary Smith
Senior Personnel Officer
Laguna Honda Hospital

Thelda Poteet
Senior Personnel Officer
San Francisco General Hospital

John Burke
Personnel Director
Controller’s Office

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will assist the Department of Public Works by streamlining the Civil Service process.

• Under the current system, the duration of eligible lists from 2 to 4 years hampers the Department from hiring graduates of colleges and universities on an annual basis. Consequently, many excellent candidates are not entered into the Civil Service System. Passage of the proposition will improve the quality of the pool of applicants and thereby the quality of public service given by the Department.

• The establishment of a Personnel Director to administer the day-to-day tasks of the system will speed up the decision making process to the advantage of employees and management alike.

• The proposition still calls for checks and balances in that the Commission will continue to hear appeals on discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest. The Commission will act as a watchdog while leaving the general administration to the Personnel Director.

The initiative will make for an improved system for employees, management and the citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Donald Birrer
Director of Public Works

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Passage of this amendment will update our civil service system. These changes will make it comparable to other merit system agencies. Some of these changes are

(A) removal of administrative details from the charter which inhibit timely and effective personnel actions.

The following subjects will be placed in personnel regulations:

• Protests of written questions and answers
• Protests of tentative employment lists
• Promotional examinations

• Examinations for employees on military leave
• Certification of eligibles—Rule of three
• Duration of employment lists
• Temporary employee appointments

(B) allows continuous up-dating of employment lists.
(C) allows equitable treatment of job candidates with same test score.

(D) realigns responsibilities: the Civil Service Commission dealing primarily with compliance and adjudication activities

(continued)
while the Personnel Department administers the day-to-day operation of the merit system.

Equally important the amendment retains important merit system provisions dealing with:
- Employee salary setting procedures
- Positions subject to merit system examinations
- Public hearing and meet and confer requirements
- Penalties for examination fraud
- Seniority, meritorious service and applicable educational credits for promotional examinations in the Police/Fire Dep-

PARTMENTS
- Termination of unsatisfactory employees
- Disciplinary suspensions
- Conflict of interest
- Creation of positions

Proposition "D" merits a 'YES' vote.

John J. Walsh
General Manager Personnel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Initiative, is a long-overdue reform to streamline antiquated hiring practices in San Francisco's fifty-year-old charter. Proposition D will ensure that the best and brightest job candidates are chosen to serve our city, thus promoting excellence in job performance and helping to eliminate incompetence. This initiative builds management accountability in the city system, while giving the Civil Service Commission the independence to protect the rights of women and minorities.

A Better, More Efficient System at Less Cost
Proposition D consolidates personnel functions, including hiring, under a new Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. The Director has final authority over content of examinations given city job applicants, so more flexibility is possible in finding truly qualified candidates.

Proposition D redefines the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit systems appeals board and policy-setting body. The merit principles are spelled out in the Proposition. This allows the Commission to protect the rights of women and minorities at no cost to the public.

More Fair to Everyone
Proposition D greatly improves the city charter. Well-qualified job candidates have a better chance to be hired and well-qualified job holders have a better chance to be promoted. The public is rewarded with the better job performance, efficiency and friendliness one expects from good government employees. All of these improvements are at no additional cost to the taxpayer.

Submitted by
James W. Haas

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service System, as presently constituted, (vintage 1932), is uncivil, and there is nothing "systematic" about it! It's pure, unadulterated municipal lunacy and chaos! Remarkably, BOTH Management and Labor despise it. It certainly is NOT producing the best qualified persons to fill City jobs!

Let's follow Mayor Feinstein's recommendations. If this operation doesn't dramatically improve, there are always FUTURE ELECTIONS where additional, more Draconian changes can be considered by the voters.

As matters now stand, it is far better to light a candle than just sit and curse the darkness! Any changes will be an improvement! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

For more than a half-century, San Francisco Mayors have abided by the employee examination, hiring and promotion policies administered by a strong and independent Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D is a deceptive and dangerous scheme that would give future Mayors and top-level bureaucrats the power to ignore competence and reward political loyalty.

Proposition D would take key Civil Service employment rules out of the City Charter and make them subject to wheeling and dealing by City Hall politicians.

There's an old saying — "if it ain't broke, don't fix it."
Civil Service has worked well for more than 50 years. Proposition D is unnecessary, ineffective and even counter-productive.
It's not just deceptive, it's dangerous.

Joseph L. Alioto
Former Mayor of San Francisco
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Time and time again, different groups have put various propositions on the ballot to weaken our Civil Service System and reintroduce political patronage into City employment practices. And every time the voters have wisely rejected these schemes, no matter how cleverly they have been disguised.

Proposition D is just another power grab by bureaucrats at the top in City Hall.

We've said NO! loud and clear in the past. Let's say NO one more time.

Submitted by:
TAXPAYERS FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT
Thomas Scanlon
City Treasurer, Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “D”!!!

During the eight years while a member of the Board of Supervisors, I fought hard to reform the Civil Service Commission and to bring working conditions and city workers' pay, equitable to both workers and taxpayers. I fought to insure an independent Civil Service Commission that would remain just that—an independent and free from political influence and political patronage of particularly the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

I am truly saddened by the Mayor's insistence in bringing this disastrous Proposition “D” before the voters. Some of the Supervisors rejected this misguided measure for what it is; an unwise consolidation of authority to hire, fire and promote city workers by the Mayor and newly created personnel officer.

My efforts to bring pay equity to both taxpayers and city workers were continually squashed by then Supervisor Feinstein and Supervisor Molinari. Finally, in 1975, shortly after a disastrous city strike, I was able to place on the ballot, for voter approval, a measure that almost eliminates the power of the Mayor and Supervisors to manipulate the pay of city workers. This measure was overwhelmingly passed by the voters that year and we have not had any labor unrest since that date.

Vote No on “D”!

“D” stands for disaster. It will undo many of these reforms. Also, right now, the City is almost broke, thanks to the manipulation of Mayor Feinstein and her chief ally Supervisor Molinari.

If “D” passes the cost of operating our city government will increase in the next 24 months by not less than $60,000,000. Contrary to the provisions of Proposition 13, property taxes would be increased, thus forcing up rents.

Vote No on “D”.

Don’t weaken our Civil Service Commission, whereby least deserving city employees could be promoted because of connection or clout.

Vote No on “D”.

We now almost have more problems than we can handle. We don’t want our city turned into another Chicago, wherefore for nearly half a century a corrupt political system flourished under Mayor Richard Daley.

John Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We join San Franciscans for Fair Employment in opposing the Civil Service Initiative, Proposition D.

This measure will severely hamper the well-being of the San Francisco Fire and Police Departments. These departments are two of the finest in the Country and have consistently protected life and property in a professional manner. They must continue that tradition with a civil service system based on MERIT and not political patronage.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Andrew C. Casper
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Keith P. Callen
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

William F. Murray
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Our present Civil Service system was designed to keep corruption out of government. It has generally served that purpose well. This proposition would dismantle that system and in my opinion open the doors to nepotism, favoritism, patronage and corruption. Better a city government that is bureaucratic than one that is corrupt. Vote NO on D.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is an attack on the merit system and an attempt to return patronage to the Mayor's office by eliminating the authority of the Civil Service Commission and its built in checks and balances.

The present Civil Service system is not perfect, but corrections can be made within the Charter without destroying a system that has worked for over 50 years and has been free from fraud and corruption.

This proposition will do nothing to improve the caliber of police performance and could have the opposite effect. I urge you to vote NO on PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by
The San Francisco Police Supervisors and Investigators Association

Don Goad, Captain SFPD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D could be a dangerous first step toward weakening the independent, impartial administration of our City government.

Proposition D would transfer power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor. The Director's decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline and certification would be final. The Commission would have no right to hear examinations or disciplinary appeals.

With the transfer of duties and responsibilities from the Commission to the Mayor's appointed Personnel Director, the Mayor would have control over personnel functions. Currently, commissioners have independent status and can be dismissed for cause. The Personnel Director could be dismissed at will.

The Merit System could be replaced by a patronage system. Proposition D could open the door to rules permitting the Personnel Director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his or her position on the list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Proposition D is NOT a reform package. The checks and balances for efficient City government would be lopsided, with too much power in the hands of unknown future Mayors.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
John L. Molinari, President
Harry G. Britt
Richard Hongisto
Willie B. Kennedy
Wendy Neider
Nancy Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Beware of PROPOSITION D!

Powerful special interest groups are attempting to remove key City employees from the independent and impartial Civil Service system in the name of 'reform'.

They want instead to make these employees answerable directly to future Mayors and politically-appointed Personnel Directors and department heads.

PROPOSITION D got on the ballot because the Chamber of Commerce and such companies as Pacific Bell and PG&E paid a professional southern California campaign firm, $70,000 to collect signatures.

They're trying to destroy the merit system and replace it with an old-fashioned patronage system.

Department heads will be able to ignore examination scores and reward loyalty rather than competence in promotions and hiring.

Don't let the Chamber of Commerce, big business and their allies in the City bureaucracy dictate who's hired, fired and promoted among public employees.

PROPOSITION D is not just deceptive, it's dangerous!

Vote NO on PROPOSITION D!

Libby Denkebin
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Ron Huberman
Vice-Chairman, Democratic Central Committee
Jim Whelan
Democratic Central Committee
Roberto Esteves
President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Rick Pucar
President, Harvey Milk Lesbian Gay Democratic Club
Walter L. Johnson
Exec. Secy., S. F. Labor Council
Michael Bernick
Linda Post
Sal Roselli
Deborah Stein
John Mehring
Pat Norman
Nancy Walker
Owen Craig
Harry Britt
Louise Minnick
Carole Migden
Agar Jaicks
Jack Morrison
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will lock in all the employees employed in the Mayor's office and will control the appointments of any new staff by the next Mayor elect in 1987 and years thereafter.

Like controlling your estate from the grave.

Vote NO on D.

Marguerite Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service Merit System has served our City well, giving San Franciscans an equal opportunity. It has helped us obtain employment and earn promotions based on objective examinations.

The Civil Service Merit system replaced the old patronage system that rewarded political loyalty more than competence.

Now the supporters of PROPOSITION D want to create a new Personnel Director, accountable only to the Mayor, and give department heads the absolute power to decide who works for the City and who gets promoted.

If PROPOSITION D passes, equal opportunity would give way to opportunity based on membership in the bureaucratic "establishment".

Keep our Civil Service Merit System strong and free from the political abuses of the past.

Vote NO on D!

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly
Ben Toum
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
JoAnne Miller
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
R. Richard Cerda
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Sodonia Wilson
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, President
S. F. Community College Governing Board
Julie Tang
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Alan S. Wong
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Henry Der
Robert "Bobby" Morales
Yuri Wada

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Can you imagine studying for a civil service examination, being rated at the top of the eligible list and never receiving the promotion? That's exactly what Proposition "D" will do should the electorate adopt this amendment.

The civil service merit system has defects, but to totally eliminate the system and replace it with a patronage system where promotions are based on who you know, rather than what you know is scandalous.

Civil service was put into place to prevent scandal and the "favor seeking" individual from getting a paid position because he/she happened to support the right elected official.

Proposition "D" will allow one person, chosen by the Mayor, to decide who will be promoted, hired and fired. This is awesome power for one single individual to have at any level of government.

Our current Mayor may choose a fair person for this position, but will future Mayors be as careful? As each new Mayor assumes office, the civil service system will again change. The potential to favor one individual or group over others is great.

Proposition "D" has a great potential to diminish the quality of services we now provide to our citizens, as the future of how people are hired and promoted in the San Francisco Police Department is completely unknown.

It's true our promotional system is fraught with delays and delays frustrate us all, but Proposition "D" is not the answer. Proposition "D" will only add to our existing problems. Several years ago, our citizens elected a Charter Commission to streamline city government and make civil service work more efficiently. The voters eventually rejected those proposals. The checks and balances that make our government stable were no longer present. It simply went too far.

Proposition "D" goes even further. It brings about a system of patronage and should be defeated lest we want to engage in "free-wheeling and dealing" of civil service jobs and promotions.

We urge a strong No vote against Proposition "D"!

S AN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry, President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The purpose of the Civil Service Commission is to ensure that the merit system would be the only criteria in any examination process.

If Proposition D passes, all authority concerning examinations would be taken from the Civil Service Commission and given to a Personnel Director, who is appointed by the Mayor. This Personnel Director would have the authority to hire and fire at his discretion, with no appeal available. This proposition is contrary to everything the Fire Department and all City employees have strived for over the years.

The Civil Service Commission in its present form was instituted to prevent any possibility of a patronage system, where one person has complete control.

This proposition would do nothing to improve your Fire Department. If you are satisfied with the work and make up of the San Francisco Fire Department in its present form, “Vote No On Proposition D”. You will be doing a service for the San Francisco Fire Department, and the people of San Francisco.

Submitted by the San Francisco Fire Chiefs’ Association
John Flaherty, Battalion Chief SFFD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is bad government and bad politics, changing our independent civil service system into a system dominated by the Mayor:

. . . By shortening the six year terms of Civil Service Commission to conform to the Mayor’s four year term of office.
. . . By transferring most of the Commission’s powers to a Personnel Director who serves solely at the Mayor’s pleasure.

Keep politics out of employment services. Vote NO on Proposition D!

Alice B. Toklas, Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Roberto Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D fails to offer enough new and improved procedures to cure the current defects in the civil service system. Charter sections and civil service rules are repealed without specific known replacements.

Proposition D transfers power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created personnel director appointed by, and to serve at the pleasure of, the Mayor. The director’s decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline, and certification would be final. The commission would have no right to hear examination or disciplinary appeals.

There are hidden costs with Proposition D because the new Personnel Administration Department will employ a personnel director, and other employees “as may be necessary to carry out (its) functions and duties.”

The Merit System could be replaced by an old style Patronage System. Proposition D could open the door to rules which permit the personnel director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his/her position on the civil service testing list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Police and Fire Commissions would lose functions as a result of the personnel director’s new power. The director’s unlawful employment discrimination policy would be binding upon department administrators. The director’s procedure for employee dispute resolution must be used by all department heads and appointing officers.

Proposition D is not the answer. The checks and balances for efficient city government would be lopsided.

I urge a no vote on Proposition D.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, 17th Assembly District
Sala Burton
Congresswoman
Art Agnos
16th Assembly District
Milton Marks
State Senator

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Balboa Reservoir Development Ban

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission declared Balboa Reservoir South (located across Phelan Avenue from San Francisco City College) surplus in 1984 and made the site available for low, moderate and market rate housing. In July 1985, a City-community advisory committee chose a developer to build 203 single-family homes on the 13 acre site. Construction has not yet begun.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would prohibit granting new building permits and would revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site (Assessor’s Block 3180, Lot 1) between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit granting any new building permits and you want to revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to allow building permits to be granted for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

How “E” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for a three-year ban on development of the Balboa Reservoir site had qualified for the June ballot.

Sidney Kass and Jesse David Wall, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 12,430 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 10,012 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 77

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Having been responsible for providing leadership at City College from 1947 to 1977, we cannot stand by and see this site converted to housing. We must speak out. Such a move would preclude forever the logical and much needed campus expansion to what was once our West Campus. We left that site reluctantly to make way for water storage. If it is no longer required for that purpose, let us return it to City College.

Thousands of San Franciscans—high school graduates, dropouts, veterans, re-entering women—representing all of the city’s diverse ethnic groups, have been prepared for transfer to four-year colleges, profitable careers, and have had their lives enriched at the City College of San Francisco. Without City College’s open door and easy access, many would have been deprived of these opportunities.

Its 56 acre campus originally housed 3,000 students. Now it serves over 23,000. This campus, compared to other community colleges, can be best described as cramped, inadequate, and second rate. The condition of the campus is to be contrasted with the excellence of its programs—which are recognized as among the best in the nation.

Lou Baimale
Chancellor 1970-1977
Louis G. Conlan
President 1947-1970

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION ‘E’

We question:
1. Why no EIR was required when the proposed development could have a substantial impact.
2. Whether the future needs of City College for classrooms, housing, and parking have been considered.
3. What the impact on taxpayers is with below market land sale and construction financing by bonds.

This moratorium will permit adequate study of these issues.
Vote YES on Proposition ‘E’.

Bruce Bonacker, President
Board of Directors, Glen Park Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don’t let a developer make a mint on land across from the most overcrowded college in the Bay Area! Parking is already an impossibility for residents near City College...adding 200 homes to this land would make the situation much worse.

It’s simple: a college which can’t find room for more students at a time when more people are returning to education doesn’t serve the community.

This land is being sold at much less than its true value. The development wouldn’t do much to ease the City’s housing crunch, but it would undercut the future of City College and the peace of mind of the neighborhood.

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

You’d probably be upset. We certainly are. Please help us protect our neighborhood. Please vote YES on proposition E.

Westwood Park Residents:
Edna Tooker
Minnie Dorwin
Eugene Eden
Donna Nicoletti
Robert Armstrong
Pauline Armstrong
Joel Martinez
Richard & Lisa Patterson
David Bean
H. Bozzone
William Burke
Richard Bobel
Clyde Theriot
Danae Manus
Esmar Manus

Sunnyside Residents:
Ellen Wall
Melissa Voluntad
David Wall

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let the greedy developers take this potentially picturesque open space.
A yes vote means you want more time to consider its future use. All we ask is time to think and plan.

John Barbagelata
Former member, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Suppose there was a publicly owned open space across the street from the main U.C. Berkeley Campus. Can you imagine for one moment that it would be passed into private ownership? Vote Yes on E for Equality and Excellence in Education

City College Students:
William Lew, Student
Tim McGuire, Student Council Member
Joseph Goldstein, Student Council Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

In 1952, the “Experts” said we needed reservoirs. They felt so strongly that they condemned the City College West Campus, destroyed the buildings, and constructed the reservoirs—all at taxpayer’s expense.
Now, in 1986 with more demand for water, the “Experts” say the reservoir is no longer needed. What is the concerned taxpayer to believe?
When in doubt, the city should hold on to the expensive things already paid for.

Stop the reservoir giveaway. Vote YES on E.

Taxpayers for Preserving the Reservoir.
Richard Patterson
Dorice Murphy
Lucille Carson
Daniel Gutierrez
Franz Wite
Bernhard Scholand
Ruth Hanson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This is a Planning issue
We have been accused of trying to stop housing for poor people. Not true. In the first place, the price levels are certainly middle income and above, but our main objection is that this badly done plan is damaging to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as to the over-crowded community college across the street.

WHAT WE WANT
Even our critics point out that we originally SUGGESTED housing for that site, but they don’t talk about what else we suggested. We want two levels of parking under a City College Library, Bookstore, and Auditorium, with housing on top. Furthermore, let the housing be TRULY affordable—for students and seniors. We are trying to stop the bureaucrats’ subsidized middle income housing project because it makes our dream impossible.
We ask for three years to give the neighborhood and the college a chance to produce a better plan.

SNAP (Sensible Neighborhood Planning Committee)

Helen Crizer, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council, representing 17 neighborhood associations in the area of the surplus reservoir property in question has voted to endorse the three-year stop of private construction on the old West Campus of City College. Dr. Louis Batmale, Chancellor of City College from 1970-1977, has persuaded us that City College needs the lands.

Juanita Raven, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Be a sport.
Give City College a vote of support.

City has 23,000 students and badly needs a library. The only place to put it is in the reservoir site. City College has walked closely with San Francisco for five decades. The reservoir site has always been understood to be reserved for City College.

Until now when someone wants it for housing. Housing is important, but it can be anywhere in town. But a City College library can only be located at the College.

Vote yes to support a book—and a reader.

Reading, studying, writing and research make up our town also.

It is hard to understand criticism of City for wanting to keep this area for a library. Sure, housing sites are at a premium—but even more so a library site for City which is one of the largest schools in the Nation.

Some people blast City for wanting a library because of the need for housing. Housing is needed. But some of those very same people want a big battleship stationed here that will bring in 15,000 new family members.

The Educational and cultural growth of San Francisco mandates living space for the City College library.

If this measure gets a no vote, it means there will be no site for a Library. This is the last chance. Vote YES to help out a book—and a reader.

State financing, when approved, will construct this building. It is the top building priority at City College.

A YES vote here means there will be time to think about the use of the site. During that three year period, cooler heads may realize this is the only site for a Library. If the housing goes in there will be no library there.

Vote yes for a book, for a good school and a better City.

John Riordan, Board of Governors
San Francisco Community College District.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Sunnyside Neighborhood Association is not against housing, but we are trying to stop a hasty and short-sighted plan. We are asking for this moratorium to get time for a better plan that will answer a variety of needs and benefit the entire city as well as our community.

This is a planning issue.

The release of the reservoir property as surplus by the water department came as a surprise to our neighborhood. The June 1984 “Residence Element” of the city’s Master Plan did not even list the land as surplus. By 1985 major decisions were being made for use of the land without adequate neighborhood input.

There were some meetings attended by a few people carefully selected for their zealous pro-housing views or potential financial gain. The resulting plan has gone out of control. Now it benefits only the developer and the lucky few who will get houses on free land.

Proposition E is not an attack on housing.

Please help us save our neighborhood against poor planning by voting YES on Proposition E.

Joe Mahoney, President
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Miraloma Improvement Club urges a YES vote on Proposition E.

Frank Mastro, President
Arnell Rodrigues

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION E

All the talk in the world can’t change the fact that City College has fewer acres of land relative to its student population than any college in the Bay Area.

Enrollment at City College is INCREASING, as is the enrollment of the San Francisco public schools from which City College draws most of its students. It is obvious that City College needs and deserves the reservoir land. The three year moratorium will gave time to produce a better plan which will have input by faculty, students and alumni who know the college’s needs and want to support it.

Sid Kass
Susie Langdon Kass
Phil Kass
City College Student
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The homeowners of Westwood Park, a neighborhood adjacent to the Balboa Reservoir, support the ballot initiative calling for a 3 year development moratorium. We believe that the City and City College should take additional time to determine their needs and how they might be met by using the Reservoir. In the event that City College does not need this property, we support its development as open space or as single family detached housing.

Westwood Park Association
Don C. Swander
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Let's not aggravate the traffic problem around City College before we first develop solutions for the existing problems. A three-year moratorium only buys our neighborhood and elected officials time to find solutions; it doesn't say no to housing. A YES vote is a vote for prudent development. A YES vote helps to preserve the family character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ken Hoegger
Realtor and community Activist

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As representatives of the students of City College, we understand first-hand, the intense need to reserve a site for future school expansion.

Preservation of the Balboa Reservoir, a site directly adjacent to the campus, is particularly crucial. The facilities that CCSF requires, such as a library and an auditorium, are essential to the main structure of the campus. Unlike classrooms, it would be unreasonable to build an auditorium or a library on an off-campus site, since these facilities are integral to the main function of the school.

Jack Lee, Vice President of Associated Counsel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

In short, opposition to the moratorium based on the notion that alternate sites could be secured, is misleading. Once a site near the college is taken, any hope of expansion would be eliminated.

Associated Student Council of City College

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Local 2121 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, representing City College faculty, urges a yes vote on Proposition E.

While this project provides short-term employment for a few, we are more concerned about the thousands of students who would benefit from planning and development that would better serve the community and the college.

Yes on E for continued excellence in community college education.

Anita Martinez, President
San Francisco Community College District
American Federation of Teachers

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is twice as crowded as any community college in northern California. It needs a much larger library, bookstore and auditorium, and more parking.

The college has always expected to use the empty SOUTH reservoir for educational needs. That land is finally surplus. Neither the college Governing Board nor the Chancellor attended the Mayor's planning sessions for the property and the faculty was not informed. When the 12.3 acre site was offered to a developer for $36,900 for subsidized housing, the Chancellor said, "We are at a crossroad and the correct path is for the Board of Supervisors, with the Mayor's support, to deed this surplus land to City College so that the college may continue to serve the city effectively for the next 50 years as it has for the past half century." The Mayor refused. Now only Board member John Riordan supports the correct path.

The Water Department says it need the NORTH reservoir now used for student parking. If that crisis occurs, the Chancellor says, "We'll deal with the situation then." How, if the south reservoir is gone?

(continued)
Balboa Reservoir Development Ban

When land is available other community colleges finance large projects through alliances with civic, athletic and cultural organizations, and through property sales. New methods for public funding are being developed. The faculty would like three years of careful study to unravel misunderstandings and poor management, and to find the best way to be a good neighbor.

Ken Crizer
Lene Johnson
Madeline Mueller
Julia Scholand
Steering Committee,
City College Faculty for Responsible Development

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College needs land now for desperately needed facilities, one of which is a library. City College has an enrollment of 23,000 students but our library has seating for 450. There are other possible locations for new housing, but City College can't be moved. Give us an opportunity to plan a development for the
community and the college.

Ainie M. Young
City College Library Faculty and Staff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty and staff members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Donald Cunningham
Anne Dowd
Beverly Elginer
David Lofting
Alice Morris
Kevin Nakagawa
Thomas Nesbitt
David Spears

Irma Stephenson
Philip Tom
Patricia Vega
Rachel Webb
Alfred Wong
Dennis Wbo
Jason Yasumoto

City College Faculty for Responsible Reservoir

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Darlene Allato
Mary Allen
Mary Amster
Tom Angeloff
Robert Balesstri
Don Baroni
Diana Berstein
Joe Berry
Anna Bratton
Thomas Breden
James Bristol
Richard Brangel
Laurent Brousseau
Philip Brown
Barbara Cohran
John Callen
John Caris
Frank Cerato
Rosemary Clark
Perry Close
Kurt Compton
Walter Cribbs
George Cripps
Patricia Davis
Guy DelPrato
Edward Dinsmurf
Sharans Edwards
Larry Ernst
Mary Erwin
Rudy Fong
William Franke
Terry Greenfield
Bob Griffin
Michael Guthrie
Mary Ann
Yeu Kwang Ho
Peter Hoch
Ronald Hochshe
Myrna Holden
Katherine Handum
Michael Hubbert
Edward Hunt
Frank Ingerson
Elaine Johnson
Wendy Kaufman
Jo Kennedy
Mercedes Kow
Rosenthal Knoke
Don Lefferty
James Lillas
Steve Levinson
Sue Light
Gary Ling
Amelia Lippie
Dave Lubbert
Leon Luoyer
Dusmane Macalou
Marion McNaught
Patricia Madison
Michael Malach
Mary Mari
Maria Marli
Sylvia Marshall
Valerie Meehan
Jose Mejia
Margot Michelmay
Deanne Milian
Cindy Moody
Thomas Munro
David Murhee
Deborah Nagele
Glenn Nance
Herbert Naylor
William Neff
Dennis Piotkowski
Francine Podenskii
Tereze Poydeiss
Salomon Raja
Mary Riondo
Faridor Santee
Marvin Schinnerer
Fred Schneider
Earl Scribner
Andy Seal
Ken Shen
Robert Struckman
MoShue Tam
Edward Taylor
Pierce Thirty
Barbara Thomas
Clar Thompson
Willy Thompson
Mary Thurber
Robert Tricaro
James Truitt
Joanne Tumminia
George VonBoczy
Cherie Wettel
Austin White
Joan Wilson
Rosalie Wolf
Christina Yee

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Water Department has begun a resource study of water use, due for completion in two or three years. The study may well indicate that one or both reservoirs will be needed. The American Water Works Association states that reservoirs should be used in pairs. This is particularly important because it is the only reservoir at an elevation of 305 feet.

The Mayor twisted the arm of the Water Department to declare one of these reservoirs surplus before the water resource study is completed. Don't let her get away with this kind of political manipulation. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Kurt Common
Ken Crizer
Ed Dierauf
Herb Naylor
CCSF Engineering Professors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The South Balboa Basin has been unused since college leased buildings, including a large auditorium, were torn down on that site thirty years ago. We hope that three years of thorough planning would explore the possibility of returning a part of that property to the college for the development of a multi-purpose medium-sized auditorium which could be shared with community groups.

Joseph Alessi
Mary Argentil

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Robert Bocina
Mack Crooks
Bob Davis
Helen Ditworth
Frenz Ercato
Richard Esterman
Richard Fenner
Lawrence Ferrara
Tod Fleming
Peggy Gorham
William Grotskopp
David Hardiman

Judy Hubbell
Charles Hudspeth
Sieglinda Isham
Baruch Klein
John Kingismark
Joshua Law
Steven Lopez
Jerry Mueller
Madeline Mueller
Marvin Tartak
Frank Tomsew
City College Music Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition E. This moratorium is necessary because there are too many worthy uses for this land to make a hasty and potentially very costly decision. Only through careful planning can the limited land available for development be best used.

Nicolos Alexander
Paul Hewitt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Jerome Hosken
Robert Kaar
James Kulick
Duck Lee
Chelcie Liu
William Maynez
Annette Rappleyea
Oleg Resett
David Wall
City College Physics Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, as Physical Education Instructors, have always been committed to a diversified program for our students and community. The reservoir space is a natural land resource for a Multi

Educational and Cultural Center.

Your YES vote on E will allow us the freedom to explore ways that this property could most constructively benefit all.

Gail Barton
Curis Decker
Brad Duggan
Tomoko Higawara
John Hahn
Daniel Hayes

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

William Beaven
Ronald Ceenth, Chairman
Kirk Gibson
Howard Granger
Frank Holden
Michael Kelly

Lene Johnson
Grover Klemmer
Paula McCallum
Art Octavio
Louise Scourtes

George Lanyi
Norbert Ludeley
Charles Mettler
Charles Miller
Marilyn Schmale

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

A YES vote on Proposition E helps STOP a scheme to GIVE AWAY $12,300,000 worth of City land for $1,800,000 (or less) to a Redwood City real estate developer.

A YES vote will SAVE taxpayers $550,000 per year. The housing project will produce $240,000 in taxes, but supplying City services will cost $790,000 per year.

The Controller's cost estimate does NOT account for the $12,300,000 land value, since land sale below value is NOT technically a cost of government. The Controller also is NOT permitted to assume that the housing project will be constructed, since construction has NOT yet been ordered by the Board of Supervisors.

The plan does NOT restrict housing sales to moderate-income first-time buyers. The plan only restricts use of tax-subsidized funds. Any person favored by the developer or politicians can buy these dwellings and get the benefits of the public land giveaway.

The houses are made "affordable" by giving away the land far below market value, by City-backed low interest, and by cutting construction corners.

The real beneficiaries of the subsidized housing project are the financiers (NOT the project dwellers). Bondholders receive 9.6% average tax-free interest, which is equivalent to 24.6% taxable interest at 61% maximum tax. The developer and bond establishment receive $5,340,000; this is $26,300 (or 22.40%) for each $117,400 unit.

The City loses $51,700 worth of land GIVEN AWAY for each unit.

Vote YES on Proposition E for good fiscal management.

William Marquardt
Financial Analyst, SNaP
Helen Crizer, Treasurer, SNaP

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is by far the most crowded community college in the Bay Area. With 22,600 students on a 56 acre campus, it is more than twice as crowded as any of the others.

Given these facts, why does the Governing Board not try to get the old West Campus back? Why don't they support this moratorium to delay the land grab?

The Governing Board is under political pressure from City Hall. They have been threatened with the loss of the north reservoir parking lot and funding for special projects. Forgive them. Vote Yes on E.

Name of College Number of students Campus Area/1000 students
City College of SF 22,624 56 2.47
Laney College, Oakland 9,805 59 6.02
Chabot College, Hayward 18,000 147 8.17
Contra Costa College 8,500 83 9.76
College of San Mateo 13,820 153 11.07
College of Marin 6,663 77 11.56

Friends of City College
David Newton
Glen Simpson
Jack Baker
Thomas Velasquez
Tillie McCullough

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The student population at City College is increasing. This semester's enrollment is up 1,265 students over last semester.

The enrollment in the San Francisco public schools has been increasing by 1,218 per year for the last three years. City College draws most of its enrollment from public schools in San Francisco.

Obviously, City College will have a larger enrollment in the future years, and will be in desperate need of space if we do not give it back its old West Campus.

Please reserve this public land for the college.

Please vote YES on E.

Barbara Holman

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON E

In 1981, I launched a six-point program to expand San Francisco's housing supply and the voters had approved a City policy to add 20,000 new housing units within five years. This Proposition would destroy a major portion of the effort to build affordable, single-family housing in our city.

The Balboa Reservoir Site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now a site for development of 203 new single-family homes, most with three bedrooms and two baths. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed as other homes built under the City's program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom could not afford homeownership. It is believed that these new homes will sell rapidly.

The Balboa Reservoir site is one of the few sites large enough to accommodate a substantial number of new homes. Please do not let a few people stop a major opportunity for new housing. Vote no on Prop E.

Not only would Proposition E halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site, but the 9.8% fixed-rate, 30-year mortgage money set aside for the housing would also be lost.

Nothing constructive is accomplished by this measure—it does not provide additional land or facilities for City College. As a matter of fact, City College has neither plans nor money to use the property. Further, the Community College Board of Directors, the governing body for City College, has voted overwhelmingly to oppose the initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting "No on E."

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the site of the unused Balboa Reservoir and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost.

These homes are desperately needed for San Franciscans who can't afford to buy in the city where the average house is selling for over $160,000. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

The homes would be built on land that belongs to the City. Over two years ago, it was declared surplus and available for housing. It is not part of City College, and City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

We urge you to vote no on Proposition E if you want more affordable housing for San Franciscans.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

In 1980 San Franciscans voted overwhelmingly (63% yes to 37% no) to construct 20,000 housing units. Good progress is underway towards achieving the voter goal. A 1986 report by Mayor Dianne Feinstein states, "In the last five years 3,559 new housing units completed with another 3,000 by 1988 and 20,000 more in 10 to 15 years". Most of this housing will be built in underutilized commercial districts; not in existing residential neighborhoods.

The 203 affordable owner occupied single family units slated for the southern portion of Balboa Reservoir are part of the 1988 total. Our progress in addressing the City's housing shortage will be curtailed if this ill-advised initiative is approved. SUPPORT OWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Housing production is essential to check rising prices and to maintain our social, economic, and ethnic population diversity. AS A SAN FRANCISCO VOTER, YOU CAN BE PART OF OUR HOUSING PROGRESS BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Do not be misled. The Community College Governing Board opposes this initiative. The district does not have any future building plans for this housing site.

WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT THE CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY HOUSING BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt construction of affordable housing at Balboa Reservoir site. This surplus public property empty for 30 years was declared surplus by the City in 1984. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders. The housing is desperately needed. San Franciscans need affordable housing.

Doris M. Ward, Member
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

A critical issue facing San Francisco today is the lack of housing middle class San Franciscans can afford.

That is why I have joined these neighborhood associations to support the Balboa Reservoir neighborhood housing proposal. Those participating in the development of the proposal includes:

- O.M.I. Community Association
- Dorado Terrace Association
- Outer Mission-Ingleside
- Political Action Committee
- Greater Ingleside Community
- Mount Davidson Manor
- Ocean Avenue Merchants Association
- Ingleside Terrace Association
- The San Francisco Open Space Committee
- City College of San Francisco

From early in 1985 I worked closely with these neighborhood groups in the discussions between city government and community leaders concerning the development plans for this desperately needed new housing at the unused Balboa reservoir site.

These are the reasons you should vote no on Proposition E.

1. The neighborhood housing proposal that this initiative seeks to stop is the result of months of hard work by the largest coalition of neighborhood associations ever to join together to plan a housing development in San Francisco.

2. The housing at the Balboa Reservoir site was designed with the involvement of the coalition of neighborhood associations to enhance the surrounding community.

3. The governing Board of the Community College District has made clear that they have no plans for the site and no ownership rights to it. City College does not oppose the construction of this development and opposes this initiative.

4. Self-proclaimed “Friends” of City College want to stop the proposal in order to preserve the site for future faculty parking. A clique of City College staffers involved in a neighborhood association pose as community opposition to this development even though a representative from this organization, the Sunnydale Neighborhood Association, had helped plan and support the proposal.

5. By masquerading as concerned neighbors these self-appointed “friends” of City College hope to prevent the construction of 204 critically needed units of housing and pull off one of the biggest land grabs in San Francisco’s history.

Don’t be fooled. Vote no on Proposition E.

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Residence Element of the Comprehensive Plan of the City and County of San Francisco assesses the City’s housing needs and lays out specific steps to meet those needs. This document was adopted by the City Planning Commission in 1984 after extensive public review at neighborhood meetings and public hearings, and consideration of the detailed Environmental Impact Report.

The first objective of the Housing Element is “to provide new Housing for all income groups” in locations appropriate for residential development. To meet this goal, development of housing is to be aggressively pursued and encouraged on surplus, underused and vacant public land.

Proposition E would halt construction of affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site. This public property, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City in 1984. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

If you want more affordable housing in San Francisco vote no on Proposition E.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Susan J. Bierman, City Planning Commissioner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on E.
Proposition E deprives San Franciscans of one of their last real chances to become homeowners at an affordable price. At the South Balboa Reservoir we have City-owned land on which 203 units of three-bedroom, two-bath homes can be built at low prices which average San Franciscans can afford to pay. These homes need to be built now, not in three years. In three years the low interest rates on mortgages and the bond financing will be gone. Two hundred families will have lost the opportunity to become homeowners, and the City will have lost the opportunity to ease the tight market in rental housing.

Nor does this ill-conceived initiative help City College in any way. City College does not need this land. Speculation that the College may at some future date find a use for the land is not founded on fact. The College may never be able to build on the reservoir. Their enrollment has dropped by over 4000 students in the last few years.
This initiative is designed to confuse you. It will make our housing shortage worse for three long years. If you support affordable housing in our City, Vote NO on Proposition E.

Bill Maher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Balboa Reservoir site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now planned for development of 203 new single family homes. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed—other homes built under this program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom would not otherwise be able to afford home ownership.
San Francisco has the most expensive housing in the nation where last year the average home sold for over $160,000. Housing is difficult to produce because the obstacles are great—little land on which to build, high construction costs and uncertain interest rates.

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost. The initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional land or facilities for City College. The Community College Board, the governing body of City College, in fact recently voted to oppose this initiative.
If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No” on Proposition E.

John L. Molinari

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

In 1980, the voters of the City and County of San Francisco approved a measure making it City policy to add 20,000 new units of housing within five years. In 1984 in an effort to satisfy this objective, the Board of Supervisors adopted a policy encouraging the expansion of the City’s housing supply. Making surplus City-owned land, such as the site at Balboa Reservoir, available for affordable housing was an important part of that policy. A proposal to build 203 homes on the unused Balboa Reservoir site was advanced to help implement the pro-housing policy.
Approval of Proposition E would HALT construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.
The Balboa Reservoir homes would be built on land currently belonging to the City and County of San Francisco. The property IS NOT part of the City College, and City College has neither plans or money to buy the property and convert it for City College use.

The only debatable issue is the future of affordable housing on the Balboa Reservoir site.
As we are all aware, San Francisco has the most expensive homes in the United States. The average cost of a home is $152,000. Not many can afford such prices. However, the housing proposed for the Balboa Reservoir will give many more citizens the opportunity to become homeowners. The homes to be built will be sold to first-time buyers at prices ranging from $83,000 to $143,000.
Other homes built in San Francisco under the direction of similar affordable housing programs have been snapped up quickly by San Franciscans. Without the program, most would not have been able to purchase the home and become homeowners.
Again, if you desire to preserve the construction of more affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site, vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Willie B. Kennedy
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Additional single family housing is undeniably San Francisco's most acute social need.
When some vacant surplus City land (12 acres) finally becomes available for 203 additional new private homes there will always be some selfish individuals who are in favor of new housing "just so long as it is not built across the street from me!"
This unused, vacant City reservoir land hasn't generated a dime of taxes for over thirty years! Let's add 203 NEW home-owner taxpayers to the City's rolls as quickly as possible.
Stop these self-serving no-growth obstructionists! Please vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Prop E would halt affordable housing construction at the Balboa Reservoir site. Many gay people need affordable housing, too, and we join with other community groups urging you to vote NO on Prop E.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Robert Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E, if approved, would block the construction of 203 badly needed single-family homes on the south portion of the Balboa Reservoir in San Francisco. Sixty percent of these homes would be available for purchase by moderate and middle income families at purchase prices between $80,000 and $120,000. They would be constructed on surplus public land and financed by the sale of mortgage revenue bonds to enable the developer to sell the homes at below market prices.
A neighborhood group headed by two city college faculty members is responsible for placing Proposition E on the ballot. The group contends that the land which is intended to be used for the project should be made available instead to City College for the construction of new teaching facilities even though enrollment at City College is declining and the City College Board has voted 6 to 1 to oppose the initiative.

Like many other areas of the country, San Francisco suffers from a shortage of housing. Purchase prices here are among the highest in the nation. The use of surplus public lands and revenue bond financing provides a means for making single family homes available to a broad spectrum of families at affordable prices.
The Balboa Reservoir project is supported by the leaders of 8 neighborhood groups in the area surrounding the location of the proposed project and by a majority of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, as well as by Mayor Dianne Feinstein. We urge you to encourage the construction of this type of housing in San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition E.

San Francisco Board of Realtors
William L. Jansen, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

SAVE OUR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS!
BERNAL HEIGHTS SAYS, "VOTE NO ON PROP E!"
We are residents of Bernal Heights in San Francisco. We've worked hard to build affordable family and senior citizen homes in our neighborhood.
We need more affordable housing in our City to survive. The real issue in Prop E is affordable family housing—a "yes" vote prevents the construction of 203 family homes. That's crazy! Join us in preserving what's best in our City. Vote "no" on Prop E!

Sylvia M. Yee, Bernal Heights Community Foundation Board of Directors***
Frank Hutchins, BHCF Board*
Mary Lou Bertoletti, BHCF Board*
Lela Havener, BHCF Board*
Elizabeth Egger, BHCF Board*
Sister Janet Simons, BHCF Board*
Stephen Antonino, BHCF Board*
Lorenzo R. Dill, BHCF Board*
Barbara Bagot, BHCF Board*
Margaret C. Randolph, Northwest Bernal Block Club*
Maureen Lamb, NWBBC*
Tim Molnare, BHCF Planning & Dev't Committee*
Buck Bagot, BHCF P & D Committee*
***Organization for identification purposes only.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco Needs Affordable Housing—
Vote No on Proposition E

Everyone agrees that San Francisco needs affordable housing. The questions are how and where that affordable housing can be built.

The Balboa Reservoir housing development, to be built on the site of a reservoir built thirty years ago and unused since that time, answers those important questions for more than 200 San Francisco first-time homebuying families by providing:
- 203 new affordable three-bedroom, single family homes
- 9.8% fixed-rate financing
- A mix of 30% low-income, 30% moderate-income and 40% market-rate first time buyers
- A convenient site that has been declared “surplus” by the City and “available for development of affordable housing”

The Balboa Reservoir housing development is a small but significant step in the effort to generate affordable housing in our City.

Thousands of San Franciscans from every community, neighborhood group and viewpoint agree that the Balboa Reservoir development is good for San Francisco. Virtually every elected official, including the Governing Board of City College also agree.

All these San Franciscans ask you to say “yes” to affordable housing and “NO” to Proposition E.

San Francisco Coalition for Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar, Executive Director

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The viable plan for affordable single family housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site is being threatened by Proposition E. If Proposition E passes, 203 single family homes will be lost to the citizenry of San Francisco at a time when they are greatly needed.

The facts about the proposed housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site argue strongly against Proposition E. All 203 homes will be for first time home buyers. One-third of the homes will be available to households earning $27,000. Another third of the homes will be available to households earning $36,000. Adequate parking will be provided within the development itself, thus answering any concerns that traffic in the area will be congested.

City College has no need or plan to use South Balboa Reservoir for its facilities. City College’s priority is to develop its existing campus. South Balboa Reservoir should therefore be used for one of the City’s greatest needs: increased and affordable housing which is available to lower and middle income families.

As homeowners who live in the vicinity of South Balboa Reservoir, we welcome its planned use for single family housing and feel it will become an integral and contributing part of the community. We therefore urge you to vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Submitted by:
Stephen Graham, Chairman of the Housing Sub-committee of the Citizen's Committee for Community Development
Roderick A. McLeod, Vice-Chairman of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Our neighborhood wants homes in the South Balboa Reservoir.

Vote No On Prop. E.

Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughney
Submitted by Patricia Vaughney

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

As Merchants as well as residents of Ocean Avenue, Greater Ingleside and San Francisco, we support the Development of the Balboa Reservoir as housing.

A Traffic Survey has stated that there will be minimal impact on the existing patterns of traffic by this development.

Additional City College Parking is being considered on another location off I-280 to keep the college congestion away from the neighborhood’s streets.

City College has 44 more acres in which to expand and existing buildings at City College have viable means to expand.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
We believe that housing on the Balboa Reservoir is the most viable solution to develop a vacant piece of property that is directly adjacent to our stores on a Transpreferential Street.

Affordable housing is in great need in San Francisco and is as much needed here as anywhere. We want to help provide this need. Vote No on Prop. E.

Ocean Avenue Merchants Assoc.
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughney
Submitted by Patricia Vaughney

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction on much-needed affordable, single-family housing at the long vacant south Balboa Reservoir site. This proposition would also block a major housing development that would bring jobs into an area of the city that has little industry or private business.

Sale prices for these units are set at $80,000, $120,000, and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the San Francisco housing market, where the average home is selling for $160,000. Construction of these homes will help all young, first-time home buyers and will require only 5% down, instead of the 20% down payment on houses bought with conventional home mortgages.

This plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by nine nearby neighborhood organizations. If Proposition E is approved and this project is halted, more young adults will purchase their first home in Vallejo or some other outlying area, further draining San Francisco of the young families that every growing community needs.

San Francisco residents will gain apprenticeships, jobs, contracts and subcontracts from this development.

This plan calls for 2 and 3 bedroom, family-sized houses, with space for another bedroom which can be finished when needed. Each house will have 2½ parking spaces in front and would not cause parking problems in the area. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

City College of San Francisco has no plans to buy the property, has no money for institutional expansion, nor any mention of this land in any master plan. Some supporters of this proposition are motivated by racist notions and have said they fear that this development will become another “Geneva Towers.” This type of thinking is similar to support for apartheid practiced in South Africa and must be defeated by progressive San Francisco voters. Property values will increase, instead of a decrease as a result of this project.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition E.

Larry Uihail Johnson-Redd — President, O.M.I. Pilgrim Community Center Inc.
Maria Campbell-Casey — Program Director, Bay Area Engineering Societies Committee for Manpower Training, Inc.
Clara Mills-Bradford — Program Director, O.M.I. Senior Center
John C. Jackson
Linda Rose-Gipson
Jon Still — Secretary, Young Adult Committee
Kenneth Butler

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000, and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided — 2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Affordable Housing Alliance — Mitchell Omerberg, Director
Bay Area Urban League — Gregory Best, Field Representative
Bernal Heights Community Foundation — Andre Lennell Daye
Community Educational Services — Dorothy Chen, Executive Director
Japanese Community Youth Council — St. Francis Square Apartments, Inc. — Sandra Mayor-Jenkins, Secretary
Minority Contractors Association of Northern California — James
Haugabook, Secretary, Board of Directors
National Community Congress — Dr. Eddie C. Welban
Parkmerced Residents Organization, Inc. — Ricardo A. Callejo, Esq.
Pursero Hill Neighborhood House — Enola Maxwell
San Francisco Building Trades Council — Stan Smith
San Francisco Housing & Tenants Council — Joseph Lacey
San Francisco Tenants Union — Jim Faye
Rev. Amos C. Brown — Local Pastor & Community Servant
Greg Day — Chairman, Citizens Committee on Community Development
Phyllis Marshall — Commissioner, San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
Regina A. Steed
Jim Wachob — San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Michael E. Willis, AIA — Fleming Corporation
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided—2 1/2 parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Greater Ingleside Political Club — Frank Noro, Treasurer
Housing Conservation and Development Corporation — Lonnie Lawson, Board of Directors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided—2 1/2 parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Bayview Baptist Minister Fellowship — Rev. N. B. Mills, President
Bread of Life Missionary Baptist Church — Rev. S. A. Bailey
Cosmopolitan Baptist Church — Rev. A. Ray Gentile
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Raymond M. Howard Sr.
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Carole Nelson
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Cornelius P. O'Reilly
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Paul G. Theiss
Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee — Charles Gale, Chairman
St. Peters Housing Committee — Tessa Rouxler

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON’T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
Compensated Advocacy 
& Campaign Limits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: With certain exceptions, City officers, including elected officials and commission members, may represent clients before City boards and commissions other than their own, and be paid for their services. State legislators may represent clients before City boards and commissions, and be paid for their services. Any person may contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would prohibit City officers from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay. This proposition would prohibit State legislators from appearing before City boards, commissions and departments on behalf of clients for pay. City officers would be prohibited from discussing with these officers and legislators matters that the City is deciding. Proposition F would also prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit City officers and State legislators from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to allow City officers and State legislators to represent clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to allow any person to contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 77

How “F” Got on Ballot

On February 26 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for limitations on compensated advocacy and campaign contributions had qualified for the June ballot.

Quentin Kopp, Marth Gillham and Cheryl Arenson, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 9,400 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,986 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The purpose of Proposition F is to cut campaign contributions by large contributors (and thus reduce campaign spending) and eliminate undue influence by officeholders retained as paid lobbyists for projects requiring City approval.

Let's take a minute to analyze the untruth arguments against Proposition F.

• The opponents claim that Proposition F will force half the City's Commissioners to resign. In fact, Proposition F does not force any Commissioner to resign. It simply says they can't be a paid lobbyist and a City Commissioner at the same time. Does a commissioner value making money by lobbying more than public service?

• Some have also alleged that Proposition F will prevent duly-elected union leaders from serving as City Commissioners. No it won't. Proposition F prohibits "compensated advocacy" — that means lobbyists hired by an organization, not members of the organization itself. Proposition F does not apply to salaried employees of labor unions, corporations, or non-profit agencies. Moreover, Section 8.105 of the Charter precludes it specifically from applying to any member serving as a representative of any profession, trade, business, union or association on any board or commission which requires membership of representatives of specific professions, trades, businesses, unions or associations.

• Another untrue argument against Proposition F is that it prohibits City officials only from discussing pending issues with other City officers or State Legislators who are also acting as paid lobbyists in a matter and doesn't stop those officeholding lobbyists from writing City officials about their clients' objectives. That's not so. Proposition F applies to all such lobbying, written or oral. (The dictionary defines "discuss" as "to examine by means of speech or writing ".)

End government decision-making by "insiders" and reduce the influence of money on local campaigns.

VOTE YES ON F.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
San Franciscans for Good Government

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

In all our years of observing San Francisco City government, we have found one maxim to be true time after time: a good idea gets copied, especially among politicians.

For no sooner did Quentin Kopp promise to bring Proposition F to the voters than did Mayor Feinstein come up with an informal, administrative version of her own. Fine, you say (and the Mayor says), then why vote Yes on Proposition F?

(1) The Mayor's remedy of asking City Commissioners who also act as lobbyists before City agencies to resign is nothing more than a hand slap, and is good only as long as she is mayor. It's not binding on future mayors and could be changed without any vote of the Board of Supervisors, let alone the people of San Francisco. Proposition F prohibits this kind of conflict-of-interest, and it will be the law, no matter who is mayor.

(2) The Mayor's action did nothing to state legislators who can also act as lobbyists before City Boards and Commissioners, nor did her action stop the law or business partners of City Commissioners from picking up the slack in big-money lobbying. Proposition F will stop these practices in their tracks.

(3) What about the other half of Proposition F, which reduced the campaign contribution limit to $500 so that all San Franciscans can enjoy equal access to City officials, not just the ones with the big bucks? The Mayor can't do anything about this, and she hasn't. Only a Yes vote on Proposition F will reduce the weight of big money and ensure our full voice in City elections and City government.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. If it's important enough for the Mayor to copy part of it administratively, it's important enough to do the job right and make it a law.

John J. Barbagelata  Robert Arenson
Harry Aleo  Rudolph Lohnes
June Cahn  Janet Wentworth
Dorothy Partridge

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The worst and most persistent problem in American politics is that politicians and political races can be "bought". Reducing the size of campaign contributions will be a step forward in reducing the role of money in elections. Vote yes for more honest government.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

RESTORE to the people their rightful and equal power as individual voters by reducing the monetary clout and influence of private interests who make the laws and the policies as City officials and Commissioners or State legislators.

TELL the special interests that their money and influence can no longer interfere with representative government.

TELL the special interests that the voters will no longer tolerate the influence-buying which comes with large campaign contributions.

TELL the special interests that this measure will encourage highly talented citizens to serve San Francisco honestly and responsibly.

VOTE YES ON F.

Cheryl Arenson
Anne Renfrew
David Pacheco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

"Government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

These noble words from Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, cast in bronze at the entrance to City Hall, seem to have escaped the attention of some City officials who pass by them every day. For in San Francisco City government, Lincoln's simple formula for representative government would read quite differently: "Government of the powerful, by the lobbyists, and for the wealthy."

Government of, by, and for the privileged few is bad government. Government of, by, and for all the people is good government. It's as simple as that—as simple as Lincoln first put it.

Proposition F, the Good Government Initiative, will help San Franciscans maintain control of their government and will prevent undue influence by City officeholders.

To reduce undue influence, Proposition F outlaws the practice of City Commissioners and State Legislators representing special interests for pay before City Commissions and Boards. City Commissions should render their decisions deliberately and impartially, not be swayed by the political clout of the lobbyists appearing before them, or by any political favors those lobbyist/politicians might promise. "I'll scratch your back if you scratch my back" bargains do not belong in government. And until such backroom bargains are made illegal, City government will not belong to the rest of us either.

Proposition F also reduces the maximum amount that anyone can give to a local candidate from $1,000 to $500. If large contributors and other special interests can't give as much money, they can't buy as much influence with elected officials. And the lower the contribution limit, the less campaign spending and the more City government will be responsive to all San Franciscans.

You can "buy back" City government from the privileged and powerful with the most precious of all political commodities: your vote.

VOTE YES on Proposition F.

Mary Lohnes
Peter Fatooh
Judith Thorson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F, an initiative of the people, is needed to protect the voters and the integrity of the legislative process from being corrupted by the power of money and influence. It prevents City officials and State Legislators from lobbying the City on behalf of high-powered special interests. It also lowers the campaign contribution limit from $1,000 to $500, thus reducing the influence of those same special interests over our elections and elected officials.

The bogus argument that the Mayor won't be able to find qualified people to serve on City commissions if Proposition F is adopted ignores the plain fact that there are 700,000 people in San Francisco, a pool of civic-minded citizens more than large enough to accommodate the 250 commission appointments available in our City government. For example, there are plenty of architects to fill the one architectural appointment on the Art Commission, just as there are plenty of non-lobbyist business people and lawyers available to serve on other commissions.

Thousands of San Franciscans, not just the "insiders", are ready, willing, and able to serve the public.

Proposition F deserves your vote. Restore integrity to City government. Restore the confidence of the citizens of San Francisco in that government. Let's have no more Wilkes Bashford situations.

VOTE YES ON F.

Oscar Sutro
Martha Gillham
Marguerite Warren

Oscar Sutro
Martha Gillham
Marguerite Warren

Leonel Monterey
Tony Kilroy
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE "NO" ON F

This proposition disguises itself as "good government" but, in reality, would drive good people out of government. It is so crudely drawn — so sweeping in its implications — that it would bar from government almost anyone with even a remote business or community tie to government.

It would purge from City commissions anyone who “directly or indirectly” receives compensation from any “interests” with an issue before any City agency. Effectively, this could discriminate against employees from community and neighborhood groups, civil rights organizations, non-profit corporations, labor unions, merchant and business groups, as well as architects, lawyers and other professionals.

Actually, there currently are no commissioners who represent any clients before any City agency. All who are appointed in my administration sign a statement saying they will not advocate for any paying client before any official body of the City while they are commissioners. This proposition simply is not necessary.

Proposition F also would lower the limit for any individual campaign contribution from $1000 to $500. Although this sounds good, it would permit a wealthy person with various businesses and numerous family members to contribute many thousands of dollars through different sources. This would encourage “hidden” contributions. We must strive for disclosure of contributions, not a system which drives contributions underground. Candidates must be able to raise funds enough to put their message before the voters. Reducing the contribution limit can be a tactic to discourage persons from challenging incumbents.

Vote no on Proposition F.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition F purports to achieve a noble objective: The removal of “influence peddling” from City Hall. In fact, Proposition F is so poorly-crafted, it may have exactly the opposite effect on City government. It is not a “good government” initiative. It is bad legislation.

Proposition F provides no definitions and no standards for the public to judge whether City officials comply with its restrictions. Its uncertainties will be chaotic and lead to endless, needless lawsuits.

A measure similar to Proposition F was rejected by the Board of Supervisors because no public hearings were ever held on the legislation. If the public had had a chance to comment on this initiative, it might not have the critical shortcomings, deficiencies and uncertainties that now warrant its rejection by responsible San Franciscans.

In the coming months, the Board will review good government measures that are comprehensible, effective and, most important, certain. Proposition F is a misguided disaster.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

This should properly have been titled the “SINK WILLIE BROWN ORDINANCE”! The “meat of the coconuts” is in Section 4.

Supervisor Kopp’s intentions are good, however this sloppily drafted and incomprehensible measure succeeds in “burning down the barn” to eliminate a couple of rats!

Under this proposal, to avoid any potential INDIRECT conflict of interest, (which is undefined), one would have to be a destitute, unemployed welfare recipient to qualify for service on any City Board or Commission! The Mayor has already solved this “hired advocacy” problem with the “conflict of interest” affidavits she demands IN ADVANCE from any prospective appointee.

Quentin’s proposed $500.00 campaign contribution limit is an “inside joke” and he, of all people, knows it! It merely obliges a heavy contributor to have his wife, children, business associates, or friends send in SEPARATE $500.00 checks if he wants to contribute more than $500.00 to a politician’s campaign.

These proposals require additional City employees for enforcement and wind up doing far more harm than good. Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O’Keefe, Sr., President
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Union members and labor officials have legitimate reasons for meeting with City officers. It is unfair and wrong to lump them in the same category as special interest lobbyists, yet that's exactly what Proposition F does. Working people deserve representation on City boards and commissions. VOTE NO!

Walter Johnson  
Secretary-Treasurer  
San Francisco Labor Council  
LeRoy King  
James Elliot  
Keith Eickman  
Reeva Olson

Jeff Greendorfer  
Stan Smith  
Larry Griffin  
Steve Bahlsan  
Terrence Ryan  
Jack Beggs  
Tony Marovich

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

If you want to ban business owners and executives from serving on City boards and commissions, then vote for Proposition F.

If you think board members of non-profit corporations and employees of community agencies have nothing to contribute to City government, then vote for Proposition F.

If you believe union members and labor officials should not have a voice at City Hall, then vote for Proposition F.

But if you share our belief that these individuals have legitimate concerns and expertise that is valuable in running major City departments, then join us in voting NO on Proposition F.

Proposition F is a simplistic, sloppily-drafted, meat axe approach to a problem already resolved by Mayor Feinstein's ban on commissioners lobbying on behalf of private clients.

Proposition F is not good government and it is not reform. Proposition F is bad legislation. VOTE NO.

Hon. Douglas Engmann  
Hon. Eugene Friend

Hon. Charlotte Berk  
Hon. Phyllis Lyon

Donald Disler  
Jim Wachob  
Anne Daley  
Linda Pest  
Lynne Williams  
Todd Dickinson  
Peter Hanson  
Herbert Kurtlin  
William Scorsit  
Van Hart  
Iris Fluellen  
Noam Rand  
John Schmidt  
James Mock  
Thomas Karwaki  
Wendy Goldberg  
Joseph Schwartz  
Belle Lazarus  
Antonio Barrios  
Bruce Barrett  
Charles Howell  
Walter McGuire  
Sharon Davall  
Joyce Mauriello

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

We're sympathetic to the need for political reform. But it's a complicated problem, and Proposition F just isn't the way to go.

Frankly, we can't tell who is and isn't affected by this measure. While a handful of people sometimes might abuse their positions, that's no reason to question the integrity of so many solid citizens who give tirelessly to public service. Proposition F is simply the wrong approach. Please join us in voting NO.

William E. McDonnell  
Frances May McAteer  
N. A. Sapunar  
Caroline and Michael Figoni

Martin D. Murphy  
Eugene C. Payne III  
Suzanne B. McCarthy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Concerned about elected officials spending $400,000 to run for supervisor and $1 million on a mayor's race? Then vote NO on Proposition F.

That's right. NO.

Proposition F isn't going to do anything about campaign spending. Prop F simply limits the size of contributions, reducing the current limit from $1,000 to $500. Supervisors can and will continue spending outrageous sums on their re-election campaigns. With Proposition F they'll just spend twice as much time raising money from twice as many sources, and that makes special interests even more powerful. They can always find ways around campaign limits.

We need campaign spending reform, but Proposition F doesn't provide it. Please join us in voting No on F.

District 8 Democratic Club  
Stephen L. Taber  
Ruth Gravani  
Alan Razich  
Miriam Blaustein

Linda Chapman  
Dale Carlson  
James Firth  
Debra Barnes  
Leo Serbin  
Debra Stein
Compensated Advocacy
& Campaign Limits

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

When campaign contributions are limited, political freedom suffers. Your right to free speech includes not only your right to express your views, but also your right to support as much as you want, any candidate who speaks for you.

Minority viewpoints depend heavily on the contribution of a few dedicated supporters to get your message out. To limit your financial support of your beliefs is to silence your political voice.

Only incumbents, who have many opportunities for free media exposure benefit from this assault on free speech. The dangers of a campaign contribution limit far outweigh any possible benefit from this proposition. **Defeat Proposition F!**

San Francisco Libertarian Party
Michael R. Fowler, Secretary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

You may think Prop F only applies to big-time lawyers and a few legislators who represent developers. Think again!

Prop F would prohibit many community leaders from public service. If it passes, board members and employees of community and charitable organizations could be banned from serving on City boards and commissions.

We appreciate the public need for a government free of “influencing peddling.” But restrictions on “compensated advocacy” ought to be clearly and carefully crafted to protect the voices of community leaders who argue on behalf of the public interest, not private special interests.

Vote No.

Hon. Juana Del Carlo
Mission Hiring Hall

Bob Ross
Publisher, Bay Area Reporter

Hon. Jeffrey Ken Mori
Japanese Community Youth Council, Inc.

Bill O’Callahan
American Red Cross

Hon. George Sancin
Horizons Unlimited

Hon. Jean Rita Alviar
Mission Education Project

Hon. Greg Day
Punk Street Town Hall

Hon. Naomi Gray
Hon. James Foster

Carol Wong
Marlena Marseille

Lee Woods
Jo Daly

Dennis Collins
Hon. H. Welton Flynn

(Organizations listed only for purposes of identification.)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will have no effect on developers’ lawyers.

None.

It won't make any difference to state legislators either.

Don't kid yourself. This is not “reform” and it isn't “good government.” Proposition F will allow the special interests and influence peddlers to continue exercising influence over our elected officials. It has so many loopholes, lobbying will actively continue, untouched, in the back rooms of City Hall.

And developers will always find ways around campaign contribution limits. As Common Cause has noted, Prop F simply makes tracing their dollars more difficult for the public.

Real reform would directly attack the source of huge contributions—the developers and other special interests that employ the lobbyists to peddle their influence.

**VOTE NO.**

Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
David Looman
Michael Mason

Rich Waller
Susan Klugerman
Rene Cazanave
Margie O'Driscoll

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION G

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?  

YES  300

NO  301

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has adopted an ordinance prohibiting the City, with certain exceptions, from purchasing goods or services from companies doing business with South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a declaration of policy that says the City must try to avoid doing business with companies that significantly profit from or help maintain the Apartheid system in South Africa. It calls on other public bodies and private groups to adopt similar policies. It directs the Board of Supervisors to identify the companies which have the greatest ties to Apartheid so that the public can also boycott those companies.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to avoid doing business with companies that help maintain Apartheid, and you want a public boycott of those companies.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

“The proposed Declaration of Policy be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

POLLs CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.

How “G” Got on Ballot

On November 6, 1985 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for the City to boycott businesses with significant ties to South Africa had qualified for the June ballot.

Arlo Hale Smith, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,546 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on October 11.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,941 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:

It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This measure calls for a public boycott of companies that aid apartheid.

Any claim of "conflict" between Proposition G and existing anti-apartheid legislation is imaginary: It is the legislative intent of supporters of this measure that it can be construed as a directive for making existing law tougher.

Personal attacks have no legitimate place in a ballot measure campaign. As proponent of this measure, I repudiate all such tactics.

Vote NO on apartheid. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Arlo Hale Smith

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Boycotts are grassroots politics. They've helped the farmworkers, they've helped win integration, and they can help end the legal racism called "Apartheid".

A Gallup poll found 77% of South Africa's black majority favoring international economic boycotts to force the Apartheid regime to accept reform peacefully.

After the Boycott Initiative made the ballot, the San Francisco Supervisors unanimously passed a similar city purchasing policy. The issue that remains is whether to call on the general public to join in, boycotting companies identified by the Supervisors as the worst offenders in each industry.

The companies that would be targeted consider profits to be the "bottom line". Economic pressure is all they understand.

The AFL-CIO, NAACP, and NOW have called a boycott of Shell Oil because of its profiteering from South Africa's oppressive economic conditions. Proposition G supports that and would put the same pressure on other industries as well.

This proposition is supported by the elected county central committee of the Democratic Party, the Peace-and-Freedom Party and the Humanist Party, and by leading attorneys, such as Terry Francois, Terence Hallinan, Tony Serra, Lewis Hope Lee, Marc Van Der Hout, Abby Ginsberg and Terence Redmond.

If South Africa were a democracy, its majority would long ago have voted to end Apartheid. We need to vote Yes—because they can't.

Atty. Arlo Hale Smith, Democratic Party County Central Committee
Paul Kangas, Peace and Freedom Party
Lois Salisbury, Public Advocates*
Dr. Kevin Danaher, Food First*
Jesse James, Mission Rebels
Terry Collins, Community Activist
Stony Gebert, Election Action
Robert McCull, Hotel & Restaurant Employees
Executive Board Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Attorneys speak out against Apartheid:

South African police can arrest anyone without charge. They can hold you incommunicado—no contacts with family, lawyers or press.

They regularly censor news, books, music. They have banned Christmas caroling, funerals and other peaceful gatherings. Groups which criticize the government are forbidden to hold meetings.

Blacks are subject to legal segregation; their property and employment rights are greatly restricted; often, they are simply murdered.

As attorneys, we help people who have legal rights that are being violated. But what can we do for those who have no legal rights?

Boycotts and other economic sanctions are the only way to make the Apartheid government accept reform peacefully.

In the Court of World Public Opinion, Apartheid has been convicted of crimes against humanity. By imposing a sentence of economic isolation, we can end Apartheid.

Vote Yes—take a stand for justice.

Terence Hallinan
Arlo Hale Smith
Terry Francois
Karen Anderson Ryer
Robert R. Bryan

Ann Manssche
Rachel Ginsburg
Leo Pioli
Gabriel Gesmer
Orna Fouchonvick
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is a moderate, responsible but effective proposal to bring economic pressure on the South African government to establish constitutional rights for all of its citizens.

Vote Yes.

Terence Faulkner, Republican
Mike Garza, Republican

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

All decent Americans abhor apartheid. However, boycotting U.S. investment in South Africa is counterproductive; it only penalizes the actual victims of apartheid.

U.S. international firms have acted as progressive agents for change through the Sullivan principles. Their investments have improved the social and economic condition of the labor force.

It is improper to penalize their positive contributions.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

We are individuals and organizations working actively to end the racist system of apartheid in South Africa. And we are voting NO on Proposition G.

Why?

(1) Because Proposition G will weaken San Francisco’s present divestment law. This law requires companies doing business with the city to sign affidavits that they will make no new contracts with South Africa.

Proposition G has no such provision.

(2) Proposition G provides no mechanism or funding to carry out its declared purpose of “boycotting” South Africa.

Proposition G will not stop South African products from entering the Port of San Francisco.

Vote against this useless, confusing, and deceptive initiative.

Preserve the stronger divestment law San Francisco already has.

Vote NO on Proposition G!

Yvonne Golden
Geraldine Johnson
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
AFT 2121 Anti-Apartheid Committee
Artists Against Apartheid
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Coalition of Conscience
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club Executive Committee
ILWU 10 and SEIU 250 Southern Africa Liberation Support Committees
National Conference of Black Lawyers
San Francisco Anti-Apartheid Committee
Southern Africa Freedom Committee/All Peoples Congress

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1983 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!
PROPOSITION H

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?

YES 303
NO 304

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Several city and private agencies conduct various programs related to AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a declaration of policy that says San Francisco should support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council, consisting of a Committee on Education and a Fund-Raising Committee. The Research Committee would make recommendations on the most useful AIDS research projects and try to prevent duplication of efforts. The Education Committee would inform the public about the latest research and about ways to prevent AIDS. The Fund-Raising Committee would seek donations and grants for AIDS research and education projects.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

“The proposed Declaration of Policy for an AIDS research and education council and the formation of advisory committees of civic leaders would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, additional expenditure of public funds for AIDS research may result, the amount of which cannot be determined.”

How “H” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for AIDS research had qualified for the June ballot.

Stony Gebert, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 10,540 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on December 6, 1985.

A check of each signature on the petition showed that 7,564 of the signatures were valid. This is more than 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We need a council to expose and address major AIDS issues without the impasse of present medical/political bias.

As taxpayers, we are subsidizing a treadmill of continual AIDS casualties. There are major oversights where AIDS is concerned. Only recently was it learned that CDC statistics suggest 79% of early AIDS cases appear drug-related. We hear AIDS is 100% fatal. Perhaps that is because death may also be drug-related in the way of immuno-suppressive antibiotic and radiation overloads to already compromised immunity systems. Prevailing medicine is both tunnel- visioned and high-profit motivated. Also well-funded. This solution may be part of the problem. Some physicians are beginning to feel where AIDS is concerned many current practices are ethically, medically bankrupt.

Remissions occur. Largely through immunity-enhancing, holistic medicine. Significantly, only 1% of AIDS cases occur among people at risk in the Asian community. Perhaps this is due to less drug abuse or use of an unfunded, ignored resource: herbology as part of diet. More options: homeopathy, acupuncture, etc.

If, as anticipated, upwards of 40% of those testing positive come down with AIDS, we may become overburdened. To ignore all of the above becomes part of the problem. Vote Yes on Proposition H.

Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Rich Mckerkeby, Former Orderly,
  Marketing Associate, Pacific Bell
Joseph P. Clady, AIDS Hospice, Shanti Counselor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There is great need for research and education about AIDS and related conditions.

We need to attack the disease, not its victims.

Knowledge is the only vaccine available today.

Vote Yes.

John Lorenzini, President,
  People With AIDS Alliance
Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Jan Beck, Steven Russell, Eugene Ewins, ARC/AIDS Vigil

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There are many possible treatments for AIDS and related conditions which are not being examined by the federal government, especially therapies based on natural substances and processes.

Vote Yes for an AIDS Research Council open to all viewpoints.

Scott Gregory, M.D.
Paul Kangas

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A tape recording (Talking Book) of the San Francisco Voter Information pamphlet is available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name__________________________________________________________

Address__________________________________________________________ Apt. #________

Telephone No. (required)__________________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): ______________________________

Second choice locations (if any)______________________________________

Signature________________________________________________________
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

PROPOSITION I
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?

YES 307
NO 308

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the Freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a policy statement asking whether or not the Embarcadero Freeway should be torn down.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City’s policy to remain as it is, and you want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to change the City’s policy, and you do not want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway demolished, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by at least $10.2 million in local funds. Potential private sector financing and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “I” Got on Ballot

On March 3 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy placing the question of demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway before the voters had qualified for the June ballot.

Richard Hongisto, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 11,119 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,720 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land now under the Broadway ramps is put back on the tax rolls, with low-rise buildings limited by restrictive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when united with Proposition J, recognizes these facts:

1) The Embarcadero Freeway is what is left of a never-completed elevated freeway that would have ringed the City through North Beach and Marina neighborhoods to the Golden Gate Bridge.

2) Today this massive freeway, which separates us from our waterfront, would never be built.

3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.

4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman’s Wharf will be preserved.

5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked for this new system.

6) Only that portion of the Embarcadero Freeway east and north of the Main and Beale Street ramps — basically the portion directly on the waterfront — will be removed to make way for the new system. The removal cost, approximately $10 million to be paid for with privately-generated new revenues, is a relatively small part of the overall new system.

As for Proposition I, vote “YES, let’s tear down the Embarcadero Freeway.” Then turn to Proposition J and support the plan for a beautiful waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Removing the Embarcadero Freeway will allow San Francisco to:

- Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero.
- Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway.
- Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula.
- Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero.
- Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.
- Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won’t benefit San Francisco. Don’t let outsiders determine our future. Vote YES on I.

Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Jack Whaley
Roger Boyer
A. Lee Knight
Robert Brad福特
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Donald A. Crosby, AIA
Ray Y. Okamoto
Robert Meyers
Ralph Hurtado
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Douglas G. Wright
Anita Sanchez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON I

This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY—VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds — without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city’s fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT— VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will further decrease the city's ability to transport goods and people. Travel within the city would be slowed down at all hours. Vote no to the destruction of the freeway.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

As the population increases, so does the need for transportation. Add to this the fact that the Golden Gate Bridge is the only way to get into the city from the north. Do NOT be misled.

Freeeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I
In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as landback on the tax rolls, with protective waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when used with these facts:
1) The Embarcadero completed elevated freeway through North Beach and Gate Bridge.
2) Today this massive

FROM:

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACIÓN?)

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON I
This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY—VOTE YES ON I
Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds—without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city’s fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT—VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to 15.7 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown, Fisherman's Wharf and the financial district would be reduced.

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
- Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
- Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
- If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
  — By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
  — Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
  — MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
  — Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Tear it down? The concept is preposterous! There are 70,000 cars a day whizzing by on this high speed downtown elevated waterfront freeway! Where will they all go?

Aside from the outrageous demolition costs involved, (some engineers estimate $40,000,000 of taxpayer money!), eyeball observation, logic, and just plain "common sense" dictates that ground level "total gridlock" will result if this expensive freeway is now destroyed.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled.
Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

— LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic? 

YES 310

NO 311

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a policy statement that says that the City would replace the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt a policy statement which says that the Embarcadero Freeway would be torn down if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt a policy statement to replace the Embarcadero Freeway under these conditions.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway replaced with a tree-lined six lane boulevard and other traffic and transit improvements, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by approximately $27.5 million. This includes a one-time freeway demolition cost of $10.2 million plus $17.3 million required to match potential federally-funded transit improvements. Potential financing by the State and private sector and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “J” Got on Ballot

On March 5 a declaration of policy regarding the future of the Embarcadero Freeway was delivered to the Registrar from the Mayor and several supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows the Mayor or four or more supervisors to submit a declaration of policy to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

In addition to Mayor Feinstein, the March 5 document was signed by Supervisors Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker, Molinari, Kennedy and Nelder.

POLLS ARE OPEN
FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans now have a chance to remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with an at-grade, six-lane parkway, which will open our waterfront and restore views blocked for years by this large freeway.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for traffic and transit improvements:

• New, shorter freeway ramps connecting directly with The Embarcadero;
• A tree-lined, at-grade, 6-lane Embarcadero Boulevard, with a new waterfront Muni line, a jogging and bicycle path from Fisherman's Wharf to Mission Bay;
• Extension of Muni Metro south to the Caltrain station at 4th and Townsend;
• New ramps connecting I-280 with The Embarcadero;
• Changes in traffic flow and improvements to existing freeway ramps.

Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf will be preserved and enhanced.

The Board of Supervisors has specified that the Embarcadero Freeway will be torn down only if preliminary engineering during the next two years confirms — as traffic and environmental studies already have — that removal of the freeway will not result in more problems than it solves.

San Francisco became eligible for $88 million in federal highway funds for this new system when the Supervisors approved the plan in 1980. The $10.2 million cost of freeway demolition itself can be paid from revenues from low-rise development of the parcels now under the Broadway ramps and the increased values of nearby properties. Strict waterfront zoning limits the size of any development.

Traffic and environmental studies by the California Department of Transportation since 1980 clearly indicate that the new waterfront transportation system will be vastly superior to the existing situation, and that traffic congestion levels will not be notably different with the elevated structure removed.

Vote Yes on J and let's remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with a parkway and transit system — once again let us see our waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J gives the voters a chance to be heard on an important and timely issue. This issue is the replacement of a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway as one element of a comprehensive package of transportation improvements in the Waterfront area.

Last fall, the Board of Supervisors adopted for further study a set of traffic and transit improvements for the Waterfront. These improvements include:

• a new landscaped surface-level boulevard
• replacement of the Clay/Washington and Broadway on and off ramps with new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom
• removal of the unused stub of I-280 and construction of new ramps connecting the new waterfront boulevard to Route I-280
• a new light rail transit line linking Fort Mason with the Caltrain Depot
• extension of the Muni Metro to the train depot, improving the Peninsula Commute Service

A YES vote on Proposition J does not allocate funds for these projects. It does allow for further design and engineering studies, including cost analysis, assessment of impacts on traffic, and other matters. The studies will then be presented to the Supervisors so that they can make an informed decision on the plan. If the studies prove positive, San Francisco will be able to transform its Waterfront for the benefit of all.

Proposition J will insure that the City will not proceed with the removal of any of the Freeway until all the studies are completed and all potential consequences are assessed. This is the responsible approach. Vote YES on J.

SPUR
League of Women Voters
Embarcadero Citizens Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SAN FRANCISCO'S NEIGHBORHOODS ASK YOU TO VOTE YES ON J.

REDUCE TRAFFIC CONGESTION — YES ON J!
Traffic backed up by the Embarcadero Roadway slows travel and creates congestion in North Beach and other nearby neighborhoods. J will speed traffic flow.

IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION — YES ON J!

Proposition J will provide regular streetcar service along the Embarcadero and extend Muni Metro service to the south, ultimately extending to Bayview-Hunters Point.

PPROMOTE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY — YES ON J!
If Proposition J does not pass, San Francisco could lose $88 million in federal funds for traffic improvements.

(continued)
RESTORE THE WATERFRONT — YES ON J:
San Francisco's waterfront could become a focal point for the city, graced by a grand promenade, instead of the dismal, deteriorating eyesore it is now.
San Francisco's neighborhoods join together to ask your support for an improved Embarcadero. We guarantee the freeway will not be removed unless it is replaced by facilities that assure a smoother, more efficient traffic flow. YES ON J!
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Robert Bradford
Ruth Gravasis
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Anita Sanchez
Nancy Katz
Robert Katz
Beverly Mills
North Beach Neighbors
John Behanna
Herbert D. Kosovitz
Jerry Hurando
Gregory E. Jones
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors
Dale A. Carlsen
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Ralph Hartudo
Hon. Susan Bieman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Chuck Forester
David M. Hartley
Donald P. Black
Mrs. Bland Platt
Richard Reinhardt
James W. Hoas
James Ream
Jill M. Jones
Peter J. Locke
Marjorie G. Stern
John B. Lowry
Lawrence Ferlinghetti
Nancy Peters
Steven Tabor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J
SUPPORT PUBLIC TRANSIT — VOTE YES ON J.
SAVE SAN FRANCISCO FROM GRIDLOCK — VOTE YES ON J.
The revitalization of the Northeastern Waterfront...as included in San Francisco's Master Plan and transit plans, as overwhelmingly approved by the Board of Supervisors and as urged by Mayor Feinstein...will allow almost $90 million in unused federal highway funds to be used for vital downtown and waterfront transit and street improvements which will be a key to reducing needless auto congestion in San Francisco.
PROPOSITION J SUPPORTS IMPORTANT TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS TO THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT. It will:
— extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific/CalTrain depot
— create a new rail line (possibly using historic streetcars) to connect the entire waterfront from Mission Bay to the Ferry Building to Fisherman's Wharf and Fort Mason
— set the stage for a possible streetcar line along Third Street
Since the city of San Francisco adopted the Transit First policy in the early 1970's, transit investments in the Muni Metro,
in new electric trolley an articulated bus service, and in BART and Golden Gate Transit, have saved downtown San Francisco from gridlock!
IF you are concerned about the future of transit in San Francisco, IF you are concerned about reducing needless auto congestion, THEN we urge you to join Mayor Feinstein and the majority of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in voting Yes on Proposition J.

Norman Rolfe
San Francisco Muni Coalition
California Transit League
Jack Wholey
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Regina Sneed
Tony Kilroy
Hon. Jack Morrison
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Bay Area Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Hon. Amy Meyer, Recreation and Park Commissioner
Alan Lubliner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J
A SOUND BUSINESS PROPOSITION — YES ON J!
Common sense and good business demand we make the most of our resources. San Francisco's waterfront is an economic and civic asset unrivaled anywhere — yet much of it is cut off by an ugly, noisy, elevated roadway. The traffic improvements called for by Proposition J will benefit workers, tourists, property owners, neighborhoods, ...and business.
— Traffic flow and transit will move quickly on a realigned, reorganized Embarcadero Roadway, allowing easier, more pleasant access to waterfront businesses.
— An improved and beautified Embarcadero will create new commercial opportunities and increase the value of existing property and businesses.
— New jobs and an expanded tax base will generate increased revenue for the city as several lots now covered by freeway ramps return to productive private ownership. Though limited to low rise development (40 to 65 feet), tax revenues from development will more than make up the city's share of the project.

Robert Meyers
Dennis J. Potts
Kenneth B. Learch
M. Arthur Gentler, Jr., PAI
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones
Randall Rossi
Karl A. Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkena
Jon. Quickeill
Pritz Arko
Michael J. O'Shea
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J OFFERS RESIDENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO A ONCE IN A LIFETIME OPPORTUNITY TO RECAPTURE THEIR WATERFRONT.

Converting the Embarcadero into a tree-lined boulevard and building a new streetcar line will make the waterfront more pedestrian and transit oriented, that is, more people oriented.

A freeway structure that is a source of objectionable noise and casts a pall over a large part of the waterfront will be removed. The waterfront will be opened up to sunlight and fresh air and made more inviting and cheerful to those who wish to walk on one of the world’s outstanding waterfronts. Air pollution that is now retained by the existing elevated structure will be dissipated.

The transit orientation of the new waterfront will encourage energy conservation. Proposition J will:

— Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero
— Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway
— Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula

— Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero
— Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line
— Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won’t benefit San Francisco. Don’t let outsiders determine our future.

VOTE YES ON J FOR A BETTER SAN FRANCISCO.

Sierra Club
Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage
Willinda McCrea*
Bob Cramer*
Rebecca Evans*
Richard Livingston*
Marilyn Clements*
Jennie Lew*
Jeffrey Hennes*
Jane Winslow*
Roger Bayer

A. Lee Knight
HON. Toby Rosenblatt
Patrick S. Mohin
Monica Halloran
Walter K. Morris
Lisa Klairmont
Jeffrey Heller
Bob Ianuscon
George T. Ruckwe, FAIA
Jon Twichell
Marc Kasky

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J GIVES US A CHANCE TO CORRECT A COLossal MISTAKE!

The Embarcadero Freeway should never have been built. The original plan was to build a freeway from bridge to bridge, destroying the Northern Waterfront, Fisherman’s Wharf, Fort Mason, and Marina Green in the process. When the people of San Francisco saw what was happening, they stopped it in mid-air — literally.

Walk under it. Hear the noise. Feel the gloom. See how it cuts out light.

It’s time to remove this mistake.

The new waterfront plan will give us a tree-lined boulevard, a new streetcar line, and a Muni Metro extension to the Southern Pacific/Caltrain depot. It will give us a transit and pedestrian oriented waterfront that will give us pride and pleasure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J!

San Francisco Tomorrow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, with a membership of 1700 working architects in San Francisco, urges a “YES” vote on Proposition J. In 1968 the citizens of San Francisco stopped highway planners from ringing our waterfront with freeways. Today voters have another opportunity to return the waterfront to our citizens. Removal of the Embarcadero Freeway is one part of a carefully researched transit plan for San Francisco. This proposition supplies an unique opportunity to carry out a broad range of transportation improvements that will have many positive effects on the City of San Francisco.

Removal of the freeway will:

1. Return the waterfront to the people by removing this barrier to access and view.
2. Facilitate needed MUNI improvements.
3. Encourage development of the Embarcadero as a grand civic boulevard unifying the City of San Francisco.

The members of the American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition J and “YES” on Proposition J.

Donald Kennedy, FAIA
President
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans love their City, the ambiance, the Bay, waterfront, the views, the healthy neighborhoods. Freeway builders did their damnest to destroy the City and divide our neighborhoods.

Now we can remove that damned spot, the concrete dinosaur, the hideous barrier that destroys our scenic views, the fence that keeps us from the Bay, the concealer of the Ferry Building. Correct a mistake.

VOTE YES ON J.

Miriam Blaustein
Charlene Clark
Marie Cleasby
Zach Cowan
Dick Grosboll
Rick Hauptman

Tony Kilroy
Jean Kortum
Ira Karlander
Jack Morrison
Andy Nash
Norman Rolfe

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

NO ON PROPOSITION J.

"J" is for JOKE—a cruel joke on us. What will J really do? Add traffic to every street east of Gough. Delay the construction of waterfront streetcar service. Cost millions in local dollars needed to improve MUNI. Create a ground-level freeway on the waterfront as big as Van Ness, with more cars.

I'm a private citizen who's concerned about traffic and what it's doing to our City. If you are too, vote NO on Proposition J.

Steve Colman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:

- Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
- Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
- If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
  - By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
  - Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
  - MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 63% increase in person hours of travel.
  - Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Blair C. Pascoe

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by boldface type; deletions are indicated by single underscores.

7,100 Materials, Supplies and Equipment

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreements for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract. All purchases in excess of one thousand dollars ($1,000) shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases and a permanent record of all such quotations shall be kept. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) for materials, supplies or equipment, or all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fis-
bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing thereof, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid by departments for similar or substantially similar articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall direct the rejection of all articles which may be below standards, specifications or samples furnished. He shall not approve any bill or voucher for articles not in conformity with specifications, or which are at variance with any contract.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall also have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for and in use in all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the mayor, the chief administrative officer, and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer, of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.

7.03 Requisition, Contract and Payment

All purchase orders and contracts shall be based on written requisitions, or, for materials, or supplies in common use in the various departments, on the purchaser's records of average use by all departments. Purchase orders and contracts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) to fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) must be approved by the chief administrative officer. Beginning with fiscal year 1978-79, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall approve all bids and vouchers for materials, supplies, equipment, and contractual services before the controller shall draw and approve warrants therefor. All contracts for the purchase of materials, supplies and equipment shall be made after inviting sealed bids by publication. All sealed bids received shall be kept on file. When an award of contract is made, notice that the same has been made shall be given by one publication, and any interested person inquired the bids and records at the purchaser's office.

The purchaser of supplies shall by rules and regulations, approved by the chief administrative officer and the controller, designate and authorize appropriate personnel within the purchasing department to exercise the purchaser's signature powers for purchase orders and contracts approved as provided in this charter.

7.200 Public Works and Purchasing Contracts

The construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works, improvements, and the purchasing of supplies, materials and equipment, when the expenditure involved in each case shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), shall be done by contract, except as otherwise provided in this section. In an emergency, provided an actual emergency be declared by the board of supervisors to exist, and when authorized by resolution of said board, any public work or improvement may be executed in the most expeditious manner. Notwithstanding any other provision in this section or this charter contained, upon the approval of the chief administrative officer declaring the work to be emergency in character, there may be expended by the department of public works the sum not to exceed five hundred dollars ($500) for new construction of any type in or upon unimproved or unoccupied streets.

Any public work or improvement estimated to cost less than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) may be performed under contract or as work of the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county. Any public work or improvement executed by the city, other than routine repair work, shall be authorized by the chief administrative officer when the cost exceeds fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or by the heads of departments not under the chief administrative officer, only after detailed estimates have been prepared and submitted by the head of the department concerned.

There shall be separate accounting for each work or improvement so executed, which accounting shall include all direct, indirect and supervisory elements of cost chargeable to such work or improvement, and each cost accounting shall be reported to the chief administrative officer, or to the mayor when such work shall have been performed by departments not under the chief administrative officer. All such accounts shall be reported to the controller. Any public work or improvement costing less than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) and not performed by the city and county labor, materials, and supplies shall, if not performed under contract, be covered by written order or agreement which shall be based on not less than three bids, notice of which shall be given by three days posting. Records of such bids shall be kept by the department.

When the expenditure for any public work or improvement shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), the same shall be done by contract, except as otherwise provided in this section. The head of the department in charge of or responsible for the work for which a contract is to be let, or the purchaser of supplies in the case of purchases of materials, supplies and equipment, shall let such contract to the lowest responsible and reliable bidder not less than ten days after advertising by one publication for sealed proposals for the work, or purchase contract contemplated. Such advertisement shall contain the reservation of the right to reject any and all bids. The officer responsible for the awarding of any such contract shall require from all bidders information concerning their experience and financial qualifications, as provided by general law relative to such investigations authorized by department of public works.

The purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer for bids in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or the department head concerned, with the approval of the board or commission to which he is responsible, may reject any and all bids and re-advertise for bids.

The department head or the purchaser of supplies, as the case may be, shall have power to sign such contract for the estimated expenditures thereunder not in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000). Any contract involving the expenditure of more than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), if for the purchase of materials, supplies or equipment, shall require the joint approval of the purchaser of supplies and the chief administrative officer. If such contract is for any public work or improvement, it shall require the joint approval of the department head and the chief administrative officer for amounts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), relative to departments under his jurisdiction, or the signature of the department head and the approval by resolution of the board of county commissioners for departments not under the chief administrative officer.

The board of supervisors, by ordinance, shall establish procedure whereby appropriate city and county departments may file sealed bids for the execution of any work to be performed under contract. If such bid is the lowest, the contract shall be awarded to the department. Accurate units costs shall be kept of all direct and indirect charges incurred by the department under any such contract, which unit costs shall be reported to and audited by the controller monthly and on the completion of the work.

In any case where the lowest gross price or unit cost bid is not accepted, and a contract is entered into with another bidder, written report shall be made to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the controller by the officer authorized to execute the contract, with the reasons for failure to accept such lowest bid.

If any provision of this section is in conflict with any provision of section 7.100 of the charter, the provision contained in section 7.100 shall govern and control.

Beginning with fiscal year 1978-79, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.

7.201 Public Works Contract Procedure by Ordinance

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter and, in particular, the provisions of section 7.200, the board of supervisors shall by ordinance determine the monetary limits not to exceed fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), within which the construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements may be done by contract or by written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county, consistent, save as to monetary limits, with the manner provided for in section 7.200 and section 7.100.

Beginning with fiscal year 1978-79, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.
point two commissioners to terms of one-year each, one commissioner to a term of two years, one commissioner to a term of three years and one commissioner to a term of four years. Thereafter, the terms of the commissioners shall be for four years from the commencement thereof. Not less than one-fourth members of said commission shall be of the same sex and one member shall have prior experience representing labor and one member shall have prior experience representing management. The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county commissioner, an appointment of appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration.

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of one hundred dollars ($100).

—Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of considering and adopting examination questions—shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission, after the regular—daily—working-hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Such person or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

In accordance with section 3.600, the commission shall have the power and it shall be its duty to appoint an executive assistant to be the administrative head of the affairs under its control who shall serve at its pleasure; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of assistant secretary to the civil service commission on the effective date of this section as amended shall continue to have civil service status in the civil service under the civil service provisions of this charter.

3.661. General Powers and Duties.
(a) The civil-service commission shall be the employment and personnel department of the city and county and shall determine appointments on the basis of merit and fitness, as shown by appropriate tests.
(b) The civil-service commission shall classify, and from time to time, may—reclassify, in accordance with duties and responsibilities of the employment, and training and experience—required, all places—of—employment in the departments and offices of the city and county not specifically exempted by this charter from the civil-service provisions thereof, or which may be created thereafter, by general—law— and not—specifically exempted from said civil-service provisions. The commission shall likewise classify all other positions or other places of employment in the city and county service—specifically exempted from the civil-service provisions of this charter, but which—by the provisions—of—section 4.801, thereof—are made subject to classification for salary—standardization purposes on the basis of duties and responsibilities of the employment and training and experience required. The civil-service commission shall be the judge of such classification.
(c) The civil service commission may hear appeals from an action of the personnel director with respect to:

1. Allegations of discrimination. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the personnel service commission regarding allegations of discrimination shall forthwith be enforced by every officer and employee;
2. Allegations of fraud; and
3. Allegations of conflict of interest, pursuant to section 8.105.
(d) No action by the personnel director which is the result of a personnel service commission shall be stayed during an appeal process except by the unanimous vote of the civil service commission.
(e) The commission shall be notified of the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal of personnel regulations and may comment on such proposals. The adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing fraud or allegations of discrimination within 60 days of receipt. The commission's failure to act shall be deemed approval.

3.662. Department of Personnel Administration. There is hereby established a department of personnel administration which shall consist of a personnel director and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the civil service commission and whose job function is placed under the department of personnel administration shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job function had not, by amendment to this charter, been placed under the department of personnel administration.

The department of personnel administration shall be the personnel department for the city and county, and shall provide a means to recruit, select, certify, appoint, train, evaluate, promote career development, classify positions, administer salaries, administer employee discipline, discharge and other related personnel activities in order to maintain an effective and responsive work force.

3.663. Personnel Director. (a) A personnel director shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the mayor; provided, however, that the personnel director shall be selected from candidates nominated by the board of supervisors and confirmed by vote of the board of supervisors. The mayor may be appointed acting personnel director pending confirmation. The person so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointment by any body of public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of personnel director in the spirit of this declaration."
(b) The personnel director shall conduct appropriate examinations for employment, establish eligible lists based on their results and provide for certification of eligibles. The action of the personnel director on employment matters including,
but not limited to, announcements, minimum qualifications, classes of applicants, components, construction, weighting, content, type, list length, duration and certification shall be final.

(c) The personnel director shall adopt personnel regulations which, except as otherwise provided in this charter, shall govern both the administrative and the exercise of the authority granted in this section, including, but not limited to, recruitment; applications; examinations; eligibility; duration of eligible lists; certification of eligibles; permanent, temporary and provisional appointments; regular performance evaluations; seniority; layoffs or reduction in force due to lack of work or lack of funds, reorganization, retraining or completion of work; and classification. No personnel regulations shall be adopted, amended or repealed without a prior public hearing upon at least two weeks' public notice by the personnel director and after meeting and confer sessions with recognized employee organizations as required by state law. All civil service commission rules relevant to the foregoing as well as the provisions of former sections 8.322, 8.323, 8.326, 8.328, 8.329, 8.330, 8.331, 8.332 and 8.340 of this charter shall become personnel regulations on the effective date of this charter.

(d) The personnel director shall conduct the salary surveys for the civil service commission as set forth elsewhere in this charter.

(e) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall establish procedures to review and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, creed, color, national origin, ethnicity, physical handicap, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the personnel director shall forthwith be enforced by every employee and officer, unless the decision is appealed to the civil service commission in accordance with personnel regulations.

(f) The personnel director shall investigate all employee complaints concerning job related conduct of City and County employees and shall promptly report to the source of the complaint.

(g) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall promote effective and efficient management through personnel programs that encourage high productivity and exemplary performance.

(h) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall provide a procedure for resolution of employee disputes which shall be consistent with other provisions of this charter and shall be utilized by all department heads and appointing officers upon the expiration of the existing term of any otherwise binding agreement.

(i) Consistent with the foregoing and other applicable provisions of this charter, the personnel director shall delegate to the various appointing officers appropriate personnel responsibilities, including but not limited to appropriate disciplinary procedures, and consult with appointing officers with respect to personnel regulations affecting their operations.

(j) Personal services contracts shall be reviewed and approved by the personnel director in accordance with the provisions of appropriate personnel regulations. Personal services contracts reasonably expected to involve payment by the city and county of more than twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000) shall be reviewed and approved by the personnel director in advance. Failure of the personnel director to act within thirty days of submission of the contract by the personnel director shall be deemed to constitute approval by the commission.

(k) The personnel director shall establish a system of job classification. The provisions of section 8.200 shall govern whenever new classifications are created or existing positions are reclassified. The personnel director shall be the judge of such classification determinations.

(l) From the regulation of the appointing officers, or other department of personnel administration, the department of personnel administration shall determine whether a position within a classification is, "in character", temporary or permanent. Appointments may be made on a permanent, temporary or, where confirmation is required, a provisional basis.

(m) Excepting sections 3.505, 3.660, 3.661, 8.105, 8.107, all the second and third paragraphs of section 8.341, section 8.346, the last sentence of section 8.406, all but the last three words in the first sentence of the third paragraph of section 8.401, section 4.403, section 4.404, section 8.405, section 8.406, section 8.407 and this section, wherever the words "civil service commission" or "commission" appear in the personnel provisions of this charter, they shall be replaced by the words "department of personnel administration", "department", "personnel director" or "director" as the context permits, the word "rule" or "rules" shall be replaced by the words "personnel regulation" or "regulations," the word "civil service" or "service" or "secretary of the civil service commission" shall be replaced by the words "personnel director" and the words "section 3.661" shall be replaced by the words "section 3.662" or "section 3.663," as appropriate.

The clerk of the board of supervisors, after consultation with the city manager, is hereby directed to conform the language of the last paragraph of this section as herein amended when next the charter is submitted for republication.

9.322 Protest of Written Questions and Answers

9.322 Protest of Written Questions and Answers — After the written portion of a civil service examination has been held, the questions used and the answers thereto shall be available for review by the participants. This review period shall not apply to questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written test. During the review period, participants shall have an opportunity to protest questions or answers they believe to be incorrect or improper. After the official rating has been made and after the official rating key has been adopted, and the identification sheets have been opened, further changes in the rating key shall not be made.

9.323 Protest of Tentative List of Eligibles

9.323 Protest of Tentative List of Eligibles — Following the completion of any examination, a tentative list of eligibles shall be posted for the inspection of the public and of participants. The posting period shall be for a minimum of three days. Days for the examination or for five (5) working days of promotional or combined entrance and promotional examinations. During this period a fee of $2.00 for the inspection of the papers of each eligible shall be charged by the civil service commission. The amount of such fee is fixed by ordinance of the board of supervisors. The fee shall be waived for eligibles who wish to inspect their own papers. Inspection of papers shall include all documents supporting the eligibles rank and score except whether the identity of the examiner giving any mark or grade in an oral examination or the questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written test shall be provided. Only participants in the examination may review the questions used in the examination. If no protests are received during the posting period the eligible list is automatically adopted. If protests are received during the posting period the investigation and action of the general managers personnel shall be expedited so that final adoption of the eligible list is not delayed beyond sixty (60) days after the date of posting. Eligibles who, as a result of their ranking, would receive a notice of appointment regardless of the outcome of the protest(s) may be offered employment from the list pending the resolution of any protest(s) and amendment to the adopted eligible list.

9.326 Promotions in General

9.326 Promotions in General — As provided for in section 9.327, the Civil Service Commission shall provide for examinations on an entrance, promotional or combination entrance and promotional basis. Consideration shall be given to permanent employees in separate promotional examinations and in promotional examinations which are combined with entrance examinations. City and county service in the promotional grade mark has been attained and may include evaluation of work performance and other credits. When an examination announcement is issued for a class on both a promotional and entrance basis, there shall be one resulting list of eligibles which shall include all successful candidates both on competitive and entrance basis.

9.327 Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave

9.327 Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave — Employees under permanent civil service appointment who, because of absence on duly authorized military leave after June 27, 1950, did not participate in a promotional examination held after June 27, 1950, and during the time of war as defined in section 8.324 of this charter shall be entitled to participate in a promotional examination. Failure to file written request to participate in a promotional examination as herein provided shall be deemed a waiver of all rights of the employee to participate in such promotional examination.

9.328 Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave

9.328 Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave — Employees under permanent civil service appointment who, because of absence on duly authorized military leave after June 27, 1950, did not participate in a promotional examination held after June 27, 1950, and during the time of war as defined in section 8.324 of this charter shall be entitled to participate in a promotional examination. Failure to file written request to participate in a promotional examination as herein provided shall be deemed a waiver of all rights of the employee to participate in such examination. Provided that persons and employees who were on leave without pay are eligible for an eligible list, shall, for the purpose of this amendment, be deemed to be eligible in their classifications from the time their names were reached for permanent certification while in the military service.

9.329 Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave

9.329 Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave — In order to qualify for participation in a similar promotional examination as herein provided the employee must be actively engaged in military service. In order to qualify for participation in a similar promotional examination as herein provided the employee must be actively engaged in military service. In order to qualify for participation in a similar promotional examination as herein provided the employee must be actively engaged in military service.
more than the minimum passing mark established by the civil service commission for inclusion on the list of eligibles resulting from the original promotional examination, his name shall thereupon be entered on the eligible list resulting from the original promotional examination. Such an employee shall be entitled to permanent appointment on a permanent basis and shall be considered for promotion to a higher position in the same classification whenever such opportunity may arise. The employee's name shall be removed from the list of eligibles upon the expiration of a period of four years after the date on which his name was entered on the eligible list and before eligibles procuring standing through examinations held subsequent to the original promotional examination.

It is determined by the civil service commission that examination in accordance with the rules and regulations of this chapter for permanent appointments shall be held as a result of the original promotional examination during the term of military service without the consent of the employee, and such examination shall be held as soon as practicable after the end of the employee's term of service. The examination shall be conducted by the civil service commission in accordance with the rules and regulations of this chapter.

8.330 Duration of Lists of Eligibles

The civil service commission may remove all names from the list of eligibles after they have remained on the list for a period of four years, and all names on said list shall be removed at the expiration of four years from the date of the final examination.

8.331 Limited-Tenure Appointments

When in time of war declared by the Congress of the United States the eligible list shall be used for the appointment of temporary employees and the eligible list shall be used for the appointment of permanent employees for the duration of the war.

8.332 Certification of Eligibles—Rule of Three

When a position is controlled by the civil service commission, the position shall be held in accordance with the provisions of this chapter, and the position shall be held in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

8.333 Certification of Eligibles—Rule of Three

When a position is controlled by the civil service commission, the position shall be held in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.
8.340 Dismissal During Probation Period

Any person appointed to a permanent position shall serve a probationary period. The civil service commission personnel director shall by rule establish a probationary period of not less than six months' service and up to a maximum of twelve months' service for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed ranks of the police department, fire department, sheriff's department and San Francisco International Airport police force shall be for twelve months except that no probationary period of not less than six months' service and up to a maximum of twelve months' service from the day following completion of the prescribed department field training officer program, but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment; provided further that probationary members of the uniformed ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in section 8.343 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four months may be established for executive and management positions during the probationary period the appointing officer may terminate the appointment upon giving written notice of such termination to the employee, and to the civil service commission specifying the reasons for such termination. Except in the case of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments the civil service commission shall have full review of the termination. The civil service commission shall by rule establish the procedures for such review. If the appointment resulting from an entrance examination the commission may declare such person dismissed or may return the name to the list of eligibles under such conditions for further appointment as the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall be final. Immediately prior to the expiration of the probationary period the appointing officer shall report the civil service commission as to the competence of the probationer for the position, and if competent, shall recommend appointment. Failure of the appointing officer to make the report shall preclude the civil service commission from reviewing terminations for the purpose of future employability including terminations in the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments.

8.407 Definition of Generally Prevaling Rates of Wages

Notwithstanding any provision of section 8.401 or any provision of any other section of this charter to the contrary, generally prevailing rates of salaries and wages for those employees covered by section 8.401 of the charter shall be determined by the civil service commission as set forth below.

The civil service commission personnel director shall conduct a comprehensive investigation and survey of basic pay rates and wages and salaries in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment for like work and like service, based upon job classifications as provided in section 3.666-3.662 of this charter and shall make its findings, based on facts and data collected, including those that are generally prevailing basic pay rates for each benchmark class of employment solely in the manner hereinafter provided. A benchmark class is defined as a "key class" within an occupational grouping selected as the class for which a representative sample of data will be collected.

Basic pay rate data for public and private employment shall be collected solely from the Bay Area counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, San Francisco and Santa Clara; provided, however, that for any benchmark class of employment for which the civil service commission personnel director determines there is insufficient data from Bay Area public jurisdictions the commission personnel director shall collect data from private agencies in the state employing such class, major public agencies to be defined as those employing more than 3,000 persons.

The commission personnel director shall collect basic pay rate data for like work and like service from Bay Area public jurisdictions as follows:

(a) The cities of Berkeley, Contra Costa, Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara.

(b) The ten most populous cities in these five Bay Area counties based on the latest federal decennial census.

(c) Agencies of the state and federal governments and from school districts and other special districts in the Bay Area as determined by the bay area civil service commission personnel director. The commission personnel director shall collect private basic pay rate data from recognized governmental Bay Area salary and wage surveys of private employers in the city and county of San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara. All pay data collected shall be limited to basic rates of pay and salaries actually being paid by public and private employers for like work and like service.

The term "prevailing rates of wages" for employers governed by charter section 8.401 and this section shall be defined as the rate ranges developed from the weighted average midpoint of the basic pay rates, excluding fringe benefits for surveyed public employers and the median of the pay rates for private employment to be determined as follows:

1. Multiply the medians from the private and the midpoints from public employers data base by the number of employees in the given classification from each data base.

2. Add the products of (1).

3. Divide the sum in (2) by the total number of employees surveyed for that classification.

4. Extend this figure by 10 percent to establish the maximum of the range and reduce this figure by 10 percent to establish the minimum.

When fixing rates of compensation the board of supervisors shall fix basic pay rates as close as reasonably possible to prevailing rates, provided, however, that the board of supervisors shall not set the maximum rate of pay for any class in excess of the maximum prevailing rate for that class; provided further, however, that no employee shall have his basic pay rate reduced to conform to prevailing rates except as provided for in section 8.406. For those classifications of employment in which the practice is customary, the schedules of compensation shall provide for minimum, not less than three intermediate, and maximum salary steps and for a method of advancing the salaries of employees from minimum to intermediate to maximum with due regard for seniority of service.

The term "basic pay rate" as used in this section is hereby defined as applying only to the basic rate of wages, with included range scales, and does not include any other benefits of employment or working condition benefits.

It is the declared intent of the qualified electors of the county and the cities of the county, and mayors and members of the board of supervisors or the mayor have any line power to provide any benefits of employment except those enumerated already provided for in the charter and. Any addition, deletion or modification of benefits of employment enumerated in the charter shall be submitted, as a charter amendment, to the qualified electors of the county and cities of county. Such qualified electors expressly state that they understand that benefits of employment are sometimes referred to as "fringe benefits" of employment and the qualified electors expressly reserve the right to either grant or deny such benefits except those conditions of employment commonly referred to as "working conditions". Any reference to "working conditions" shall mean basic compensations which must necessarily be provided in order for the employee to perform his job description duties efficiently and safely, and shall include but not be limited to such working conditions and benefits as are typically included in the administrative provisions of the state's standardization ordinances and the state's labor law.

The board of supervisors or the mayor, in his or her discretion, may provide working condition benefits for employees covered under this section and section 8.401 of this charter only in accordance with the following provisions:

(a) The civil service commission personnel director shall certify and recommend to the board of supervisors or the mayor that the working condition benefit is equitable or necessary for the efficient and safe performance of the employee's duties as enumerated in his job description.

(b) The working condition benefit, as recommended by the civil service commission personnel director, shall be provided to employees covered under this section for like work and like service to that provided for the job classification and is provided to not less than 50 percent of the employees of the class in the jurisdiction covered by the salary survey.

9.108 Initiative, Referendum, and Recall

(a) The registered voters shall have power to propose by petition, and to adopt or to reject at the polls, any ordinance, act or other measure which is within the power conferred by the provisions of this charter or, in the absence of such provisions, any ordinance or act which is within the power conferred upon any other board, commission or officer to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinance, act, charter amendment or other measure may be so proposed by filing with the registrar a petition setting forth said measure in full, signed by registered voters of the city and county as many in number as the percentages hereinafter required of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor cast at the last preceding regular municipal election.

Any declaration of policy may be submitted to the electors in the manner provided for the submission of a measure by petition, and when such a measure is submitted by a majority of the qualified electors voting on said declaration, it shall thereupon be the duty of the board of supervisors to enact an ordinance or ordinances to carry such policies or principles into effect, subject to the referendum provisions of this charter.

Any ordinance which the supervisors are empowered to pass may be submitted to the electors by a majority of the board at a general election or at a special election called for the purpose, said election to be held not less than thirty days from the date of the call. Such an ordinance may be proposed by one-third the supervisors, or by the mayor, and when so proposed shall be submitted to the electors at the next succeeding general election. No ordinance passed by the supervisors granting any public utility franchise
TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION E

NOTE: All sections are new.

Be it ordained by the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. This ordinance may be called the "City College Public Lands Preservation Ordinance." Section 2. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall disapprove or deny, WITH NO EXEMPTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS, any building permit application for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, which consist of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

Section 4. The term "building permit" includes building permits, site permits and any other permits for the performance of construction work.

Section 5. Any part of this ordinance for any reason be held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of the ordinance shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. No provision of this ordinance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent implementation of the policy stated above.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION F

NOTE: All sections are new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The People of the City and County of San Francisco desire and are entitled to a local government whose officers do not engage in, assist or promote compensated advocacy on behalf of private interests before City and County commissions and boards while also serving as City and County officers.

Section 2. No officer of the City and County may, during the term of office, engage in compensated advocacy before any City and County board or commission, or any member of the board or commission or its staff, in order to represent any private interest, for which representation the officer receives, directly or indirectly, any compensation, reward or gift.

Section 3. Officers of the City and County shall not discuss matters pending before their commission or department with other City and County officers or state legislators when those other officers or state legislators are acting as compensated advocates for a private interest.

Section 4. No member of the California State Legislature shall appear before any City and County board, department or commission as a compensated advocate representing a private interest.

Section 5. In the financing of city and county campaigns (a) No person other than a candidate shall make, and no campaign treasurer shall solicit or accept, any contribution which will cause the total amount contributed by such person with respect to a single election in support of or opposition to such candidate, including contributions to political committees supporting or opposing such candidate, to exceed $500.00. (b) If any person is found guilty of violating the terms of this section, each campaign treasurer who received part or all of the contribution or contributions which constitute the violation shall pay promptly, from available campaign funds, if any, the amount received from such person in excess of the amount permitted by this section to the City and County Treasurer for deposit in the General Fund of the City and County. (c) This section shall not apply to any in-kind contribution of television or radio airtime to any candidate or committee granted to said candidate or committee pursuant to the "Fairness Doctrine" articulated in Comstock Broadcasting, 40 FCC 576 (1963).

Section 6. Any person violating the terms of this ordinance shall be subject to the penalties set forth in San Francisco Charter Section 8.185. Such penalties shall include, but not be limited to, removal from office.

Section 7. If any provision of this ordinance, or its application to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, it is the expressed intent of the people of the City and County of San Francisco that the remainder of the ordinance, or the application of such provision, or any other provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.
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rates and the same shall be in lieu of said annual compen-
sation, notwithstanding any other provisions
of this charter to the contrary, said rates shall become
effective and be payable as if adopted prior to April 1,
of any year.

The provisions of sections 3.100 and 3.100-1, relat-
ing to the emergency powers of the mayor, shall not be
applicable to the provisions of subsection (b) of this
section.

11.05 Effective Date of Amendments
The effective date of the amendments, additions
and deletions to the civil service provisions of the
charter shall be ninety (90) days after the accep-
tance and filing thereof with the Secretary of
State.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED
PROPOSITION G

We the people of San Francisco declare this to be
our policy:

1) IT IS IMPROPER TO PROFIT FROM OR PROVIDE SUPPORT TO THE RACIST POLITICAL
AND ECONOMIC SYSTEM IN SOUTH AFRICA, KNOWN AS APARTHEID.
Therefore it is necessary to sever commercial ties
to South Africa, until people of all races obtain equal
rights in that country, including equal voting rights.

2) COMPANIES HAVING SUBSTANTIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH APARTHEID MUST BE
CONSIDERED IRRESPONSIBLE.
(a) The Board of Supervisors must determine
which companies doing or seeking business with the City
have the greatest ties to Apartheid. Companies that
have a significant involvement in profiting from or
maintaining the Apartheid system, may, on that ba-
isis, be deemed "irresponsible bidders."
In purchasing goods and services and awarding
other contracts, the city must give priority to avoiding
such companies; the degree of the preference must be
in proportion to the company's complicity with
Apartheid, according to the following criteria:
—how much business the company does in or with
South Africa;
—how much the company profits from that
business;
—how much support the company provides the
Apartheid government in taxes, loans, payments or
other funding;
—the nature of the company's South Africa
business;
—the degree of the company's cooperation with
South African political censorship or secrecy
agreements;
—the degree to which the company provides the
South African government with the technology,
materials, or other means to maintain and enforce
Apartheid.
(b) City funds must not be deposited or invested
with any bank or other company which does business
in or with, or makes loans to, South Africa.
(c) If any exception to the above policies is found to
be necessary or appropriate, the responsible official
must promptly and publicly report it to the Board of
Supervisors, clearly describing the exception and the
reasons for it.
(d) The term "city" includes all agencies, depart-
ments, officials, employees, units and subunits of the
city and county of San Francisco, and all funds ad-
ministered by or on behalf of the city or county.

3) WE CALL ON ALL OTHER PUBLIC BODIES AND PRIVATE OR COMMUNITY ORGANI-
ZATIONS TO ADOPT SIMILAR POLICIES.
(4) WE CALL A GENERAL PUBLIC BOYCOTT, FOCUSING ON THOSE COMPANIES
HAVING THE GREATEST TIES TO APARTHEID.
The Board of Supervisors must determine and an-
nounce which company or companies are the worst
offenders within each major industry, so that the pub-
lic can focus its boycott on those companies.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED
PROPOSITION H

The leadership and support of such an effort is
everyone's responsibility;
While San Francisco's role in the overall effort
against AIDS has been viewed as a positive example
to other areas, the continued rapid increase in the
spread of the disease means that we cannot afford to
rest on our laurels or leave further responsibility to
others.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:
We call on all appropriate government bodies as
well as medical, professional, charitable and commu-
nity organizations and concerned individuals to join
together in an all-out effort to stop AIDS;
We call for support to an organized united effort
along the lines of an AIDS RESEARCH AND EDU-
CATION COUNCIL, including, in some form:
—A COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, to provide
informed evaluations as to priorities among research
projects and proposals, recommending those which
are most cost-effective and most likely to produce
clear results useful in the prevention or treatment of
the disease, to avoid unnecessary duplication of ef-
forts or neglect of promising approaches, and to pro-
vide the council with complete and up-to-date
information regarding comparative results of ex-
perimental treatments, prevention programs and
other existing research;
—A COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, to inform
the public regarding prevention and other research
findings, and to inform relevant government officials
and the general public, concerning the factual basis
for a re-ordering of current public funding priorities
and the increased war against disease, including re-
search and education against AIDS and related
conditions;
—A FUND-RAISING COMMITTEE, to solicit
donations, lobby for grants, organize benefits and
other fund-raising projects spreading the financial
burden by appealing to many sources;
We ask the council and committees to be respon-
sive and accessible to public input, to include
representation of all interested groups, to consider all
viewpoints, and to be capable of prompt action;
We ask appropriate city officials to determine
whether a suitable form of such a council already ex-
ists; if it does, we wish the city to support it actively;
if not, we wish the city to seek to encourage its forma-
tion by such means as may appear proper.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED
PROPOSITION I

SUMMARY: This initiative asks "Shall we tear down
the Embarcadero Freeway?" The Board of Supervi-
sors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolu-
tion calling for the removal of the elevated portion
of Route 480 known as the Embarcadero Freeway. This
initiative declaration of policy will give the voters the
opportunity to establish the official policy of the City
and County of San Francisco regarding the proposed
teardown of the Embarcadero Freeway.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED
PROPOSITION J

Shall the City replace a portion of the Embarcadero
Freeway if and only if such replacement would open
up the Waterfront to its citizens, improve the tax base,
and create a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new
waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of
traffic?
Candidates

FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER
JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: The Bill of Rights guarantees that every person accused of a crime shall have the effective assistance of counsel. Whether an individual is rich or poor, that person is entitled to a competent and dedicated attorney.

In San Francisco it is the duty of the Public Defender to uphold this sacred right. In every case, we provide the client with the best defense under the law.

In the last 7 years, my outstanding staff has done this work with the highest degree of professionalism. In the next 4 years, that same strong, professional, independent and ethical representation will continue.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:

Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John D. Birdis, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Sara Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative In Congress, 5th District
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
George Christopher, 1770 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Clerk
Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Artist/Community Organizer
Brian Getz, 55 22nd Ave., Attorney
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson, Sheriff of San Francisco
Thomas E. Horn, 95 Rockshales Dr., Attorney
MATT J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., International Vice President, IJGWH
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for Children & Youth
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070 26th Ave., Executive Assistant to Sala Burton M.C.
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Community Health Director
Linda Ann Past, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative
Jim Rivaldo, 430 Steiner St., Political Consultant
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Member, SF Community College District
Governing Board
Yuri Wada, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel W. Walker, 562 Campbell Ave., President—Local 250-A Transport Workers Union
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hillary Ave., Minister
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor
C. R. Zuniga, 3666 Pacific Ave., Auto Repair Proprietor

FOR ASSESSOR
SAM DUCA

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I was elected your Assessor in 1978 and re-elected in 1982. My years in the Assessor’s Office were spent in a professional appraisal capacity personnel and administration. I have two university degrees, the coveted MAI designation, and am the recipient of a special Congressional Advisory Board award from the United States Congress. I have served in an advisory capacity, both nationally and internationally, in property tax administration and will continue to serve the taxpayers of the City and County of San Francisco in dealing with Article XIII A of the State Constitution. My community involvement includes participation in cultural, civic business organizations.

Sam Duca

The sponsors for Sam Duca are:

Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
Eugene L. Friend, 2910 Lake St., Investor
Nancy Felusi, 40 Presidio Ter., Housewife and volunteer in politics
Walter H. Shorestein, 740 El Camino del Mar., Chairman, Milton Meyer & Co.
Stanley Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Emma W. Louie, 1257 Jackson St., Housewife
Alfred S. Wilsey, 2590 Jackson St., Chr. of Exec. Comm. of Diversified Holding Co.
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hinckley Walk, Physician
Gerson Bakar, 2310 Hyde St., Investor
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management
Jane McKaskele Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired
Joseph C. Orenco, Sr., 866 Faxon Ave., Publicity Dept.—S. F. Giants
James A. Scates, 101 2nd Place, Chairmen of the Board, Scates York Co.
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher
Frances May McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Recreation & Park Commissioner
Frederick F. Campagnoli, 2609 Larkin St., Attorney
Betty Brooks, 1738 26th St., Field Representative
JESS TERRUEL ESTEVA, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Businessman
Cyril I. Magnin, 994 California St., Merchant
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John H. Swanson, 145 Lake Merced Hill South, Bowling Alley Owner
Frances G. Goldman, 743 El Camino Del Mar, Child Guidance
Erna M. Bernardo, 2162 24th Ave., Housewife
Leo J. Murphy, 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Charles M. Cunningham, 475 Connecticut St., Self Employed
Lawrence V. Eppine, 815 Fell St., Conf. Secretary
Mary M. O’Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Volunteer & Homemaker
Elizabeth R. Duca, 16 Wawona St., Homemaker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Application for Absentee Ballot
is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

Name

Residence Address

Mailing Address

Signature

If the person to whom this pamphlet is addressed no longer resides at this address, please draw a diagonal slash (/) through the address label and drop the pamphlet in the mailbox.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods. Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
June 3, 1986
Primary Election
Eleccion Primaria

Vote for One
請選1人

赞成 反對
SI NO

Vote par Uno
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YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 5, 1986.

Q — Who can register to vote?
A — You can register to vote if you:
   • are a U.S. Citizen,
   • are at least 18 years of age on election day,
   • are a resident of California, and
   • are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q — How do I register?
A — Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417. You will be sent a form.

Q — Do I have to belong to a political party?
A — Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.”

Q — If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A — At a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, such as this one, you can only choose among the candidates of your party.

Q — Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A — Only if you have moved.

Q — If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A — Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q — What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A — Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Senator, State Assemblymember, County Central Committee, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Your polling place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q — If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q — When do I vote?
A — The election will be Tuesday, June 3, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q — What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A — Call 558-3061.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A — Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q — What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A — Ask the workers and they will help you.

Q — Can a worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A — No.

Q — Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A — Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q — Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A — Yes. You can vote early by:
   • Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
   • mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see enclosed card).

Q — What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A — An application form is not necessary. You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q — What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A — You must write:
   • your home address,
   • the address where you want the ballot mailed,
   • then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q — When do I mail by absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A — You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 3, 1986.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS CONCERNING VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

STEP 1

A 第一步

GET A BALLOT CARD FROM THE VOTOMATIC MACHINE.

B 第二步

请取得自動投票機的選票插入。

C 第三步

将選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

NOTE: If you make a mistake, return your card and get another.

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, mete la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coincidan con las dos cabezitas rojas.

D 第三步

請把選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perforar con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

E 第四步

投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。

After voting, withdraw the ballot card and place it inside the envelope pocket, with the stub showing.

STEP 4

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y pongala bajo el cierre del sobre.
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO."

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO ÚNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfure la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfure la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfure la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SI" o después de la palabra "NO."

Todas las marcas o borraduras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfura, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

請用附在投票紀錄器上之打孔針在選單上打孔；千萬不要用鋼筆或鉛筆。

選 民 須 知:

投選你所選擇的任何其他候選人，請在選單上箭頭所指之候選人名打孔。如果有兩個或以上
候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上箭頭所指之所有候選人中，選擇你要投票的候選人打孔，但不
要超過選舉的規定人數。

投選合職的非候選人候選人，請在非候選候選人選票信封所附的預留空白上填上該候選人
所競選的職位和性的姓名。

投選任何候選人，請在選票上箭頭所指 "YES" 或 "NO" 字樣打孔。

選票上如有摳着內紙或破損者，選票即作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔錯了，撕破或弄濁了，或折疊了，撕破了非候選候選人的選票信封，應
把該選票退回選票區的監票員，另行取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

請在下頁開始投票

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>GEORGE “DUKE” DEUKMEJIAN</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governor, State of California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gobernador, Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILLIAM H.R. “BILL” CLARK</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical Engineer/Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingeniero Electrico/Contratista</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>H.L. “BILL” RICHARDSON</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Businessman/State Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hombre de Negocios/Senador Estatal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIKE CURB</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>RALPH E. WINKLER</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retired Major, USAF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comandante Retirado, Fuerza Area Estadounidense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MICHAEL CYRUS</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market Analyst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analista de Mercados</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRUCE NESTANDE</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orange County Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor del Condado de Orange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
<td>Vote #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>MARZ GARCIA</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILLIAM CAMPBELL</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAN STANFORD</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DON A. SEBASTIANI</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>(WRITE-IN)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>(WRITE-IN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRUCE GLEASON</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAWRENCE J. STRAW, JR.</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DUNCAN M. JAMES</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td>(WRITE-IN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLAUDE W. PARRISH</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. JOHN SHIMMON</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED ZSCHAU</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL ALLEN</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM H. PEMBERTON</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH WILLIAM KNOWLAND</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTHUR B. &quot;ART&quot; LAFFER</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE C. MONTGOMERY</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELDRIDGE CLEAVER</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN W. SPRING</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOBBI FIEDLER</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED DAVIS</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE HERSCHENSOHN</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT W. NAYLOR</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Write-in) To vote for a candidate not on the ballot, write the name and office title on the long side of your ballot.
### United States Representative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRANKLIN “HARRY” ERNST III</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONY AVILA SAMPSON</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(VOTE FOR ONE) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

### Member of the State Assembly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIMOTHY C. WIKLE</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFF CORINO</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(VOTE FOR ONE) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Position/Notes</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DONALD DONALDSON</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo 现任州中央委员</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE S. DOLSON</td>
<td></td>
<td>College Professor Profesor de Colegio Universitario</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH HEIZER</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oil Company Officer Oficial de una Compañía de Petróleo 石油公司法媒介員</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.E. O'KEEFFE, SR.</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo 现任州中央委员</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAMONA ALBRIGHT</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Central Committee Woman Miembro del Comité Central del Estado 女州中央委员</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDIE WALLACE</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent</td>
<td>Nombrado para el cargo 受任州中央委员</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESLIE “LES” PAYNE</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo 现任州中央委员</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNA M. GUTH</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En posesión del cargo 现任州中央委员</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM KREMEN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Real Estate Executive Ejecutivo de Bienes Raíces 房地产高级人员</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. MARTIN KELLER</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Central Committeeman Miembro del Comité Central del Estado 州中央委员</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS J. MARK</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accountant, Businessman Contador, Hombre de Negocios 商人</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT McGUIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Businessman, Party Veteran Hombre de Negocios, Veterano del Partido 商人、党党员</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAY SANDERS</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent</td>
<td>Nombrado para el cargo 受任州中央委员</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 205
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</strong></td>
<td><strong>DANIEL NUSBAUM</strong>&lt;br&gt;Teacher&lt;br&gt;Maestro&lt;br&gt;<strong>JEANNE BAIRD</strong>&lt;br&gt;Educational Project Advisor&lt;br&gt;Asesora para Proyectos Educativos</td>
<td>211 → 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Superintendent Estatal de Instrucción Pública</strong></td>
<td><strong>BILL HONIG</strong>&lt;br&gt;State Superintendent of Public Instruction&lt;br&gt;Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública</td>
<td>215 → 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessor</strong></td>
<td><strong>SAM DUCA</strong>&lt;br&gt;Incumbent&lt;br&gt;En posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>222 → 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Defender</strong></td>
<td><strong>JEFF BROWN</strong>&lt;br&gt;Incumbent&lt;br&gt;En posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>229 → 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $850,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>COMMUNITY PARKLANDS ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for acquiring, developing, improving, rehabilitating, or restoring urgently needed local and regional parks, beaches, recreational areas and facilities, and historical resources.</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>WATER CONSERVATION AND WATER QUALITY BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $150,000,000 to provide funds for water conservation, groundwater recharge and drainage water management, and clarifies language in the Clean Water Bond Law of 1984.</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>DEPOSIT OF PUBLIC MONEYS IN CREDIT UNIONS. Authorizes Legislature to provide for deposit of public moneys in any credit union. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect. Legislation already approved implementing measure could result in greater interest income to state and local governments.</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. Provides exception to property tax limit when acquisition or improvement of real property approved by two-thirds of voters. Fiscal Impact: By itself, measure has no fiscal effect. No increase can occur in local property tax rate unless bond issue is approved by two-thirds vote. State costs for tax relief programs could increase. State income tax revenues could decline as taxpayers deduct greater amounts for property tax payments.</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>ALLOCATION OF VEHICLE LICENSE FEE TAXES TO COUNTIES AND CITIES. Requires allocation of Vehicle License Fee taxes to local governments. Fiscal Impact: Measure would have no direct fiscal effect. Prevents Legislature from changing the law to take vehicle license fees away from counties and cities. Measure would not prevent state reducing other forms of aid to local governments or changing existing formula for dividing vehicle license fee revenues between counties and cities.</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>LEGISLATORS’ AND JUDGES’ RETIREMENT SYSTEMS. Limits retirement allowances for persons entering Legislators’ and Judges’ Retirement Systems after January 1, 1987. Fiscal Impact: Minor savings to state in future years if rate of inflation exceeds increase in salaries paid to current officeholders.</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>49</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>51</th>
<th>52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NONPARTISAN OFFICES.</td>
<td>YES 262</td>
<td>NO 263</td>
<td>YES 266</td>
<td>NO 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibits a political party or party central commit-tee from endorsing, supporting, or opposing a candidate for nonpartisan office. Fiscal Impact: No direct state or local government fiscal impact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MULTIPLE DEFENDANTS TORT DAMAGE LIABILITY. Plaintiff’s non-economic damage recovery limited to defendant’s liability based on defendant’s percentage of fault. Fiscal Impact: Substantial savings to state and local governments. Savings could be several millions of dollars in a year, varying significantly from year to year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. DISASTERS. Base-year value of property damaged or destroyed by disaster transferable to comparable replacement property in same county. Fiscal Impact: Local property tax revenues would decrease by an unknown amount. County assessor and tax collectors would have nonsignificant higher administrative costs. State would replace revenues lost by school and community college districts. State income tax revenues could increase due to lower property tax deductions on replacement properties. These state costs and revenues cannot be estimated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county correctional facilities and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of four hundred ninety-five million dollars ($495,000,000).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY &amp; COUNTY PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgements against the City?</td>
<td>YES 278</td>
<td>NO 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?</td>
<td>YES 281</td>
<td>NO 282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C**

PROPOSITION C HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THE BALLOT BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.
| DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES |
|---|---|
| **262 SI** | 263 NO |
| CARGOS NO PARTIDARIOS. Prohiba a un partido político o a un comité central de un partido político patrocinar, apoyar o oponerse a un candidato a un cargo no partidario, impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo a los gobiernos estatal o locales. |

| **266 SI** | 267 NO |
| IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE DESABAST. El valor en valor base de propiedad inmueble debida a destrucción por desastre puede ser transferible a propiedad inmueble de reemplazo comparable en el mismo condado, impacto Fiscal: Los reajustes preventivos de impuestos locales a la propiedad desastrenarías en un sentido desconocido. Los tasadores y recaudadores de impuestos del condado tendrán insignificantes costos administrativos más altos. El estudio reemplazará los réditos que los distritos escenarios y de colegios de educación superior dejan de percibir. Los réditos del Impuesto estatal a la renta podrían aumentar debido a menores deducciones en el Impuesto a la propiedad en las propiedades de eximidad. Estos costos y réditos estatales no pueden ser calculados. |

| **273 SI** | 274 NO |
| RESPONSABILIZACIÓN CIVIL DE MULTIPLES PARTES DEMANDADAS EN JUICIOS DE AGRARIOS INDEMINIZABLES. Limita la indem- nización que puede recibir el demandante por daños no económicos a la responsabilidad del demandado basándose en el porcentaje de la cuantía del daño. Impacto Fiscal: Ahorros sustanciales para los gobiernos estatal y locales. Las ahorros podrían ser algunos millones de dólares al año, que variarían significativamente de año en año. |

| **278 SI** | 279 NO |
| ACTA DE BONOS PARA DESEMBOLO DE CAPITAL PARA INSTA- LACIONES CORRECCIONALES DE CONTRADICION DE 1986. Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelación y reemplazo de instalaciones correctivas de las condados y la ejecución del mantenimiento diferido en las mismas en conformidad con una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos noventa y cinco millones de dólares ($405,000,000). |

| **281 SI** | 282 NO |
| OFICIALMENTE ELIMINADA |

**PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONTADO**

- **278 SI**
- **279 NO**

- **281 SI**
- **282 NO**

**OFICIALMENTE ELIMINADA**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?</td>
<td>YES 288</td>
<td>NO 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?</td>
<td>YES 292</td>
<td>NO 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?</td>
<td>YES 296</td>
<td>NO 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?</td>
<td>YES 300</td>
<td>NO 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?</td>
<td>YES 303</td>
<td>NO 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?</td>
<td>YES 307</td>
<td>NO 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?</td>
<td>YES 310</td>
<td>NO 311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSITIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

288 SI 贏成
289 NO 反對

"¿Debería la Ciudad transferir la administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil a un departamento de administración de personal que tenga poder para cambiar las normas del servicio civil que el presente contiene en la Constitución?"

292 SI 贏成
293 NO 反對

"¿Debería la Ciudad negar o revocar cualquier permiso de construcción para edificar en la Reserva Balboa en los Avenidas Ocean y Paseo en los próximos tres años?"

VOTER SELECTION CARD

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 236 237</td>
<td>A 278 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 239 240</td>
<td>B 281 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 242 243</td>
<td>C 288 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 246 247</td>
<td>D 292 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 249 250</td>
<td>E 295 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 254 255</td>
<td>F 300 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 258 259</td>
<td>G 303 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 262 263</td>
<td>H 307 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 266 267</td>
<td>I 310 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 270 271</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 273 274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR CANDIDATE SELECTION

311 NO 反對

¿Cabe el reporrtar parte de la Autopista Embacadero, el esto aumentara el acceso del publico a la zona de los muelles y mejorara el tráfico?"
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

D Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?  
YES 288
NO 289

E Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?  
YES 292
NO 293

F Shall the City prohibit competing in any city contract before any city commission, and prohibit any candidate for municipal office from holding an interest in any firm bidding on a city contract?  

G Shall it be the policy of the people of San Diego to support the policy of the people of South Africa?  

H Shall it be the policy of the people of San Diego to support the policy of the people of the United States of America and private organizations to extend trade and commerce with South Africa?  

I Shall it be the policy of the people of San Diego to extend support of South Africa by extending support to the National Assembly and private organizations?  

J Shall it be the policy of the people of San Diego to extend support of South Africa by extending support to the National Assembly and private organizations to extend trade and commerce with South Africa?  

CANDIDATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>County Central Committee*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate</td>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td>10.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. Public Inst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to your sample ballot for the number of County Central Committee members to be elected. The number varies with each district.

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR PROPOSITIONS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Apoyo</th>
<th>Oposición</th>
<th>Texto del Pregunto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>&quot;¿Deberá la Ciudad transferir la administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil a un departamento de administración de personal que tenga poder para cambiar los normas del servicio civil que el presente consta en la Carta Constitucional?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>&quot;¿Deberá la Ciudad negar o revocar cualquier permiso de construcción para edificar en la Represa Balbín en las Avenidas Ocean y Paseo en los próximos tres años?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>&quot;¿Deberá la Ciudad prohibir la defensa remunerada efectuada por ayuntamientos de la ciudad y legisladores estatales ante cualquier comisión de la ciudad, y limitar la cantidad con lo que una persona puede contribuir para un candidato a una oficina municipal en 8000?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>&quot;¿Debería ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el beneficio las empresas que tengan mayor vinculación con la segregación racial sudacaricano?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>&quot;¿Debería ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el apoyo a todas las organizaciones apropiadas, públicas y privadas, para establecer y mantener un Consejo para la Investigación y Educación sobre S.I.D.A. (AIDS)?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>&quot;¿Debería ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el demolir el Autopista Embarradero?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>&quot;¿Debería ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el repartir parte de la Autopista Embarradero, el esto aumentará el acceso del público a la zona de los muelles y mejore el tráfico?&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

BALLOT—An official list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

MEASURE—Another name for proposition.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

SUPERVISORS—Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

CHARTER AMENDMENT—The charter is the basic set of laws for the city government. A charter amendment changes one of those basic laws. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE—A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

DECLARATION OF POLICY—A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, the supervisors must carry out the policy, to the extent legally possible.

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

PERMIT (noun)—A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building. Proposition E concerns the issuance of a permit.

COMPENSATED ADVOCACY—Compensated means being paid for doing something; Advocacy means speaking or writing on behalf of someone else. Proposition F concerns the issue of compensated advocacy.

RISK MANAGEMENT—This field covers two areas: (1) deciding on when it is better to buy insurance and when it is better to be self insured or uninsured, then shopping for the insurance; (2) identifying hazardous conditions on one's property and seeing that they are corrected so that liability and damage claims will be avoided. Proposition A concerns risk management.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.
PROPOSITION A

Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgments against the City?

YES 278  
NO 279  

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Consultants hired by the Chief Administrative Officer are available to City departments that have questions about "risk management", such as how to keep damage claims to a minimum and how to find the best insurance rates. In some cases, the departments use these consultants. In other cases, the departments make their own decisions. When damage claims are filed, some are handled by the City Attorney's Office and some are handled by City departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would amend the City Charter to create an Office of Risk Management, under the Chief Administrative Officer. The office would set risk management guidelines for all City departments, boards and commissions. Proposition A would also establish a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration in the City Attorney’s Office. The bureau would be responsible for investigating, evaluating and processing all damage claims made against the City, except those claims made against the Public Utilities Commission and the Police Department. The bureau would also have the power to investigate potential suits against the City and to make settlements within dollar limits to be set by ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer and a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want damage claims and risk management decisions to continue to be handled the way they are now.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not affect the cost of government. However as a result of its potential future application and the exemption of certain employees from the civil service provisions of the Charter, costs may be affected in an amount presently indeterminate."

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On March 10 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted "No."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 71
VOTE YES ON A

Last fiscal year, over 6,400 claims and law suits were filed against the City, costing us more than $10 million in settlements. I believe that it is time to change the way we handle our claims, secure insurance, prevent risks and settle legitimate claims against the City.

Last summer, we appointed a task force of citizens, under San Francisco Bar President Jerry Falk, to make recommendations on how to streamline our procedures and save money at the same time. The present system is very slow, costly, and inefficient.

Currently, all claims are investigated by the department involved. The City Attorney cannot act on any claim until the department is ready. This results in delay and duplication of effort and increased costs. A centralized and accountable Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney would be more efficient, cost-effective, and professional.

It would enable the City to settle many claims quickly, before litigation is begun, saving the City the costs of defending itself in court and lowering the average cost of settling a case.

This can be accomplished without creating new jobs by simply moving into one office the city positions presently scattered throughout the government.

Proposition A. Reduce the cost of City government.

Adoption of this measure would also formally establish responsibility for Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer, where it has been unofficially since 1978. With this strengthened authority, the Risk Management Office would be responsible for the gathering of claims data on a City-wide basis, the creation of incentives for both reducing the possibility for injuries and damage and the number of claims for each department, the coordination of insurance purchasing and specific suggestions to avoid and reduce risk.

This amendment is presented with the recommendation of the Mayor's Task Force on Claims and Judgments, the Chief Administrative Officer, City Attorney, the President of the San Francisco Bar Association, and the President of the Lawyers' Club of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Each year the City spends almost $10 million to settle damage claims. It is estimated that the overall costs to the City for all risk-related activities exceed $125 million a year. It is time for action to be taken to reduce these huge expenditures. This charter amendment is designed to do just that.

Claims Investigation and Adjustment

Right now, the City's claims investigation process is decentralized and largely unorganized. Each department investigates its own claims. Investigators may or may not be specially trained for their duties. There is no uniformity of investigation procedures or claims reporting. In only a few departments do investigators contact injured parties within days of an accident in order to settle the claim quickly and economically.

This amendment will establish a claims investigation and adjustment bureau in the Office of the City Attorney. Claims investigation and adjustment activities will be centralized, economized and made much more efficient. The new bureau will be able to respond immediately to accidents and claims, providing quick compensation to deserving persons while at the same time producing a prompt, professional investigation. This reform is greatly needed.

Risk Management

Presently, there is no overall plan for the management of the City's risk exposure: insurance purchasing, avoidance of industrial accidents, gathering data on accident patterns, etc. Again, risk management as a function is fragmented among the various City departments. As a consequence, departments cannot develop the necessary expertise to manage themselves to reduce risk-related costs.

This measure will establish a risk manager under the Chief Administrative Officer. For the first time, overall City planning will be possible in order to control risk. Departments will be told what activities are producing injuries or damage and advised on corrective measures. Private industry has been utilizing risk managers of this type for years. It is time that the City did the same.

This amendment will reduce the cost of government and insure a more efficient delivery of City services to all San Franciscans. We urge you to give it your unqualified support.

Board of Supervisors

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This charter amendment was proposed by a citizens' task force appointed by Mayor Feinstein. Its mission was to propose ways of reducing the number and financial costs of claims and lawsuits against the City.

The amendment has two principal features. The first is to centralize within the City Attorney's office the investigation of claims filed against city departments. This will allow for improved training and supervision of the investigators, who presently are scattered throughout city government. The result will be more efficient, cost-effective and professional investigation of claims. By improving the quality of claims investigation, the City can identify those claims which have merit and attempt to reach early—and less costly—settlements. Meritless claims will be denied with greater confidence that if suit is filed it can be defended successfully.

The second major feature of the amendment will establish a Risk Management office under the Chief Administrative Officer. Risk management is a concept widely used in private business. Risk managers are professionals skilled in reducing the overall cost of claims. The Risk Manager would be responsible for coordinating the City's insurance program, data collection, and correcting problems within the City which lead to claims. The Risk Manager would review those claims which have been filed against the City. Where it appears that an unsafe condition or practice has led to a claim, the Risk Manager would suggest to the affected department that corrective measures be taken. Reports to the Mayor and to the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors of the recommended corrections and the actions taken would ensure that the various departments will be responsive.

The City cannot eliminate claims and lawsuits against it. But it can limit its exposure by managing the claims process more effectively. This measure will reduce injuries and reduce claims, and that is good for everyone.

Jerome B. Falk, Jr.
Chair, Mayor's Task Force on Claims and Judgments Against the City

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, May 31, 1986

12 Noon State Senate, Assembly, Congress and State Propositions
1:00 Proposition A—Risk Management & Claims
1:15 Proposition B—Purchaser & Contracts
1:30 Proposition D—Civil Service
2:15 Proposition E—Balboa Reservoir
2:30 Proposition F—Compensated Advocacy
3:00 Proposition G—Apartheid
3:20 Proposition H—AIDS
3:30 Propositions I, J—Embarcadero Freeway
3:50 Statewide Candidates

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Purchaser & Contracts

PROPOSITION B

Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchaser must get the approval of the Chief Administrative Officer before signing certain contracts for more than $15,000. Only the voters may change that dollar limit. The Purchaser must personally sign every contract that comes through his office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would raise the limit on contracts requiring the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval to $50,000. It would also allow the Board of Supervisors to change that limit by ordinance. Proposition B would also permit the Purchaser to name certain people in his office to sign contracts on his behalf.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval only on contracts for more than $50,000. You also want the Purchaser to be able to name certain people in his office to be able to sign contracts on his behalf.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to require the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval on contracts for more than $15,000. You also want him to sign all contracts himself.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

“Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 3 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON B!

The City's Charter requires that a permanent, non-elected City official, the Chief Administrative Officer, review all purchases and contracts above $15,000. Of course, CAO approval of major contracts is very important. But, due to inflation, the number of contracts that have to go to the CAO for approval is always increasing. Today there are too many documents requiring CAO approval. This slows down the purchasing process, occupies staff time—and ultimately costs the City money. Proposition B will raise the CAO approval level to $50,000, and help the City to improve the efficiency of its purchasing operations.

The City's budget includes more than $250 million for purchases on tens of thousands of contracts. At the current $15,000 review limit, the CAO must approve thousands of documents every year—a costly, time-consuming process. In the long run the City loses money because of the inordinate length of time required to complete all the paperwork.

An adjustment must be made to remove the smaller contracts from this cumbersome process. Review and approval of contracts under $50,000 should be under the responsibility of the City Purchaser, a highly trained and experienced professional, who reports directly to the CAO. By changing the present $15,000 to $50,000, it will be possible for the CAO to give each document that comes to him the attention it requires. And, by placing its orders and paying its bills faster, both the City and businesses will benefit—especially small business and those owned by minorities and women.

Proposition B will allow future adjustments to the limit to be made by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility will ensure the City's ability to adjust to inflation and changes in the market.

This amendment comes to you with the recommendation of auditors, controllers, bankers, and others who exercise top fiduciary responsibility within their own organizations.

VOTE YES ON B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will make essential changes to update the purchasing and payment procedures under the Chief Administrative Officer. These measures are necessary and desirable because they will save the City money by significantly increasing our management efficiency.

Right now, the City loses because it takes too long for contracts to be reviewed and payments okayed, which means that early payment incentives go unutilized. The CAO has to approve every contract greater than $15,000—and with City purchases last year over $250 million, the paperwork logjam is vast and overwhelming.

An increase in the review limit from $15,000 to $50,000 will make an adequate adjustment for inflation—$50,000 now is only about $15,000 in 1967 dollars. Proposition B will also enable the City Purchaser, who reports to the CAO, to maximize potential savings through early payments by designating appropriate personnel to approve contracts up to $50,000. These "Good Business" amendments are consistent with private sector practices and should be incorporated by the CAO in the City's best interests.

Finally, Proposition B will give the City the ability to respond quickly to changes in the market place by allowing changes in the CAO review limit by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility is necessary to ensure that in the future we will not lose money because of institutional rigidity. Control is maintained with the necessity of Board action and Mayoral approval to adjust the review limit, and this same feature will allow for change when desired.

Vote yes on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
Civil Service

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the civil service system of the City of San Francisco. The structure of the civil service system and certain rules governing its operation are written into the Charter and can only be changed by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would make major changes. A Department of Personnel Administration would run the Civil Service system and would be able to change rules with Commission approval. Major features of Proposition D are described below. The complete charter amendment is printed in this voters' handbook.

Department of Personnel Administration

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Certain civil service rules governing the general operation of the system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs, are written into the Charter and carried out by the Civil Service Commission. Only the voters can change these rules.

THE PROPOSAL: A department of Personnel Administration would be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. A Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor would run the Department. Certain rules governing examination, selection and appointment would be taken out of the Charter. The Personnel Director would be able to change these rules with the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

Civil Service Commission

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the general operation of the civil service system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs. The Commission also hears and decides appeals on civil service matters.

THE PROPOSAL: The Civil Service Commission would no longer be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. The Commission could investigate the operation of the system, approve rule changes proposed by the Personnel Director, and hear and decide appeals only on claims of job discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest.

Employee Relations

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors appoints an Employee Relations Director to negotiate contracts with City employees; the Board approves all contracts.

THE PROPOSAL: The Mayor or his or her agent would negotiate with City employees; the Board of Supervisors would still approve all contracts.

What your vote means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing civil service system.
Controller's Statement on "D"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not directly affect the cost of government, as it removes many civil service policy setting functions from the Charter and an independent Civil Service Commission and transfers responsibility for personnel matters, including labor negotiations, to the Mayor.

"As a product of its inherent flexibility and possible future application, costs could be affected or savings realized in amounts presently indeterminate but probably substantial."

Civil Service

How "D" Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative Charter amendment rewriting the civil service provisions of the Charter had qualified for the June ballot.

Robert Bradford, Jonathan Bulkley, Lee Munsen and Mary Hilton, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 36,049 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 25,027 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

POLS CLOSE AT 8:00 p.m.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisanship, political, social or other considerations. Consistent with the City's and County's affirmative action goals, no applicant or employee shall be selected, appointed, reduced in rank, removed or in any way favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, union activities, political affiliation or sexual orientation.

(b) The purpose of the civil service system is to obtain for the city and county the best qualified persons to fill city and county positions in a timely and economical manner, using professional, fair and equitable personnel selection and personnel management practices with consideration of the following merit principles:

1. Recruiting, selecting and advancing employees on the basis of their ability, knowledge, skills and performance relative to the work to be performed.

2. Establishing equitable and adequate compensation, as provided elsewhere in this charter.

3. Training employees, as needed, to promote productivity and high quality performance and to facilitate career development.

4. Retaining employees during good service and separating employees for good cause.

5. Assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration, with proper regard for their privacy and constitutional rights; and assuring equal employment opportunity, based on the person's ability to do the job.

6. Assuring that employees are protected against coercion for political purposes and are prohibited from using their official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the outcome of an election or a nomination for office.

(c) This charter does not limit the power of departments, agencies, or other subdivisions of the city and county in their exercise of management prerogatives including but not limited to:

1. Directing employees in the performance of their duties;

2. Hiring, promoting, transferring and assigning employees from those qualified;

3. Classifying positions in accordance with Section 3.663 (h);

4. Disciplining employees;

5. Laying off employees because of lack of work, lack of funds or other reasonable cause; and

6. Determining the mission of its departments and divisions, and its budget, organization, the number of its employees, and the numbers, types, classifications and grades of positions or employees assigned to an organization unit, work project, shift or tour of duty, and the methods and technology of performing its work.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisanship, political, social or other considerations. No person shall in any way be favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, age, religion, national origin or other non-merit factors.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in subsection (a) or any other provisions of this charter, it shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, consistent with policy of acquiring qualified personnel for the service of the city and county, to encourage the hiring of blind persons. It shall further be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that no otherwise qualified blind person shall be discriminated against in examination, re-examination, appointment, re-appointment, waiver of eligibility, appointment or re-appointment, promotion or de-motion in any class, subclass or position in the civil service unless oversight is indispensable for the performance of the duties and responsibilities of the class, subclass or position. It shall be the duty of the commission to classify, and from time to time it may reclassify, places of employment in the civil service the duties of which may be efficiently performed by qualified blind persons and to conduct appropriate examinations which will fairly test the capacity of blind persons as well as sighted persons to perform such duties.

2.203-2 Employee Relations Director

Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 3.150 of this charter, the employee relations director shall be appointed by the board of supervisors and shall hold office at the pleasure of said board.

3.102 Employee Relations

It shall be the duty of the mayor to meet and confer with employee representatives on behalf of the city and county and all its constituent boards, commissions, departments and agencies as required by applicable law. These duties may be performed by a designee of the mayor who shall serve at the pleasure of the mayor. Nothing herein shall limit the mayor from contracting for the performance of these duties.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the mayor shall submit all memoranda of understanding or ordinances to be enacted pursuant to Article VIII of this charter herein to the Board of Supervisors for its approval or rejection.

3.660 Commission; Composition; Meetings

There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county shall have the general powers and duties set forth in section 3.661.

The civil service commission shall consist of five members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and this charter section as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the terms of the respective terms of the commissioners who shall hold office on the effective date of this section as amended shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date. Thereupon, the mayor shall appointments on page 73
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Vote YES and join 34,000 San Franciscans who signed petitions to get this crucial reform on the ballot. "D" clears the way to modernize Civil Service so that it is fair and efficient. The present system is a 50-year conglomeration of rules that tie the City's hands—

- A protest by one applicant can hold up hiring for an entire job classification for months—even years.
- Often tests cannot be given frequently enough to maintain current tests of qualified employees. This leads to delays and temporary appointments that make hiring top candidates all but impossible.
- Appointments to jobs are restricted to the top three names on a list even though more than three people have the same score!
- Many provisions are out of date. Some deal with hiring during the Korean War. Others limit our ability to carry out affirmative action.

"D" would remove archaic rules from the Charter so they could be changed as the times require—subject to meet and confer and public hearings. Job tests could be expedited; hiring and promotions speeded up; opportunities opened to women and minorities.

Specifically, Proposition D:
1) Creates a Department of Personnel Administration at no additional cost. Like other U.S. cities, day-to-day administration would be the responsibility of a director, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Supervisors.
2) Makes the Civil Service Commission the oversight body to set policy and hear appeals. Rulings would have to be within 60 days, eliminating endless delays.
3) Moves the office of labor relations from the Supervisors to the Mayor, who must make the tough-minded decisions to balance the budget. Never again could the Board give labor $27 million for "comparable worth."

This reform is the product of years of work with SPUR, League of Women Voters, Chamber of Commerce. Members of the Board of Supervisors could have put the reform on the ballot last year but bowed to some labor leaders, and 34,000 San Franciscans had to do the job for them.

Proposition D will enable City government to work better for you. Vote YES.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON 'D'

Proposition D is a complex proposition with a simple goal: remove the archaic restrictions on the hiring, promotion, or firing of city employees and bring San Francisco's personnel system into the modern age.

Archaic is the only way to describe a system that keeps equally qualified people from competing for a job, and that takes months—sometimes years—to fill vacancies.

For example, if 50 people score equally high on a competitive examination, shouldn't they all have a chance for any job for which they are eligible? Not under the current system, which requires complicated tie-breaking rules not at all related to a person's qualifications or abilities.

Or what about being able to hire the best person available for a given job? Currently, eligibility lists are frozen for two years and every person on each list, including the lowest-scoring, must be offered a job before the highest-scoring person on a more recent list. Private businesses couldn't function saddled with such absurdities.

Proposition D cuts through the red tape. It creates a modern personnel department, with a director responsible for carrying out rules to ensure fairness and efficiency. Accountable to the Mayor, the director would be selected from a list provided by the Civil Service Commission, and subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.

The Civil Service Commission remains an independent body, with the right to approve new personnel rules and hold hearings on abuses. Also under 'D', negotiations with employee unions would be under the Mayor, subject to approval by the Supervisors, providing checks and balances in balancing our budget.

With greater accountability and continued checks and balances, Proposition D will open the way to more efficient government in our City.

Bill Maher, Supervisor
Louise Renne, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON 'D'

Proposition D is a necessary reform to the City's Civil System. As the City's Chief Administrative Officer for almost ten years, I have found that quality employee hiring is difficult and the process causes long delays.

The current system is:
- inflexible. The City cannot hire and promote the most qualified persons.
- inefficiently administered by a commission. Other large
(continued)
cities do not have such a bureaucratic process.
- antiquated. Civil service rules represent practices of the
1950s rather than the 1980s.

The new system:
- allows the Mayor to appoint an effective personnel director,
who controls administration and procedures.
- allows efficient procedures to be developed with review of
the Civil Service Commission.
- eliminates cumbersome and dated rules and practices.
- expedites City hiring and promotion procedures.
I urge a Yes vote on Proposition D.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

It's 1986 and we're still trying to manage City business as if it
were 1932. As heads of City departments, charged with the daily
responsibility of putting out fires, fighting crime, maintaining
hospitals, parks, libraries and providing other essential serv-
ces, we know from bitter experience about shortcomings of the
existing Civil Service System.

Enacted with the City Charter in 1932, the system is suffering
in red tape. Outdated procedures are the subject of endless
challenges. Tests are put off; vacancies go unfilled; promotions
delayed; any appeal, however groundless, stops the process in
its tracks.

Proposition D would take old procedures out of the Charter so
they could be changed in an orderly process by the Civil Service
Commission, which also would hear appeals.

Day-to-day administration of the tests—the content, scoring,
all the myriad details of complex systems, would be
put into a modern, highly professional personnel office. Tests
would be speeded up. Hiring would keep pace with need. Pro-
motions would be on the basis of competence. High perform-
ance would be the standard. Discipline could be imposed with
working rights fully protected, and women and minorities
would be assured equal opportunity.

Proposition D will help improve management and the quality
of City services. Vote Yes on D.

Frank Jordan, Chief of Police
Emmett Condon, Fire Chief
Don Birrer, Director, Public Works
Mary Burns, General Manager, Recreation & Park
John Frantz, City Librarian
Gene Garland, Director, Port
Marvin Geisstinger, Purchaser
Wilbur Hamilton, Executive Director, Redevelopment Agency
Claire Issacs, Director, Arts Commission
Ray King, Director, Parking Authority
Dean Macris, Director, City Planning
Grant Mickins, Director, Human Rights Commission
Rudy Nowthenberg, General Manager, PUC
Joyce Ramsey, Director, Aging
Ed Sutfield, General Manager, Social Services
Thecla Shelley, Managing Director, War Memorial
Moira So, Executive Director, Community Development
Louis Turpen, Director of Airport
Dr. David Werdegar, Director, Health Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The hiring practices outlined in San Francisco City Charter
have been virtually unchanged since 1931, a severe handicap in
running a modern city. Proposition D is designed to streamline
the charter and ensure that the rights of present city employees
and candidates for city jobs are protected, while improving the
hiring process itself. The initiative also builds management ac-
countability in the city system.

Proposition D Is More Fair, More Efficient,
More Economical

The day-to-day personnel functions, including hiring, will be
consolidated under a Director of Personnel Administration, who
is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Sup-
visors. Decisions of the Director of Personnel on examination
content and administration are final, unless a decision is stayed
during the appeal process by a unanimous vote of the Civil Ser-
vice Commission.

Proposition D will make it easier to modernize the many ar-
chaic Civil Service rules and procedures now included in the
Charter, while maintaining a strong and independent Civil Ser-
vice Commission to safeguard the merit system and protect the
rights of city employees. Many detailed rules will come out of
the Charter and will become personnel regulations. These regu-
lations can then be modernized, but only through a process
which includes public hearings and meet and confer sessions
with the union involved. In addition, the Civil Service Commis-
sion must approve any changes or new regulations governing
merit system principles on classification, examinations, ap-
pointments, promotions, transfer, resignation and terminations.

Proposition D Will Improve Performance And
Public Confidence

The openness and fairness of the proposition will benefit
everyone. Well-qualified job candidates will have a better
chance of being hired, and well-qualified job holders will have
a better chance of being promoted. This means generally better
job performance in all departments, resulting in higher em-
ployee morale and more public confidence in city government.

Submitted by
Louis Hop Lee, President
Civil Service Commission
Lee Munson, Member Civil Service Commission and
Treasurer, San Franciscans for Fair and Efficient Government

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Cities can survive only with strong management. The greatest budgetary restraint must be exercised to assure that full value is received for each tax dollar spent.

With firm limits on what it can spend and faced with a possible loss of Federal funds next year, the City must be managed with the greatest possible efficiency.

Essential to greater efficiency is the need for Civil Service reform. As members of City Commissions, we constantly confront the torturous delays and confused rules that gridlock the present system. The present system simply can't respond to the City's personnel needs.

Qualified applicants become frustrated and seek employment elsewhere. Promotions are blocked. Morale suffers. Temporaries fill in; overtime mounts. The ability to plan is crippled; management is weakened.

Proposition D would put the system on a business-like basis. A personnel department would handle day-to-day administration. The Civil Service Commission would be the watchdog to assure the integrity of the merit system.

This streamlined system would replace what is now inflexible and cumbersome. Testing could be accelerated; hiring made more efficient and promotions made on time. The result would be greater efficiency and elimination of costly waste.

Vote Yes on D.

Jerry E. Berg, President, Board of Permit Appeals
Henry Berman, President, Fire Commission
Moe Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Hector Chinche, Rent Board
Rev. Harry Chuck, Housing Authority
Dr. Arthur Coleman, President, Port Commission
Owen Davis, Police Commission
J. Edward Fleishh, Airports Commission
H. Welton Flynn, President, Public Utilities Commission
James Foster, Health Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation & Park Commission
James Fussell, President, Housing Authority
Anne Halsted, Port Commission
Tommy Harris, Recreation & Park Commission
Tom Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Walter Jebe, Public Library Commission
Jeffrey Lee, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Philip Lee, President, Health Commission
Bruce W. Lillienhal, Small Business Advisory Commission
Jacqueline Nemirovski, President, Arts Commission
Toby Rosenbloom, President, Planning Commission
Dr. David Sanchez, President, Police Commission
Jean San Jule, Housing Authority
John Patrick Short, President, Parking Authority
Marjorie G. Stern, President, Public Library Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D contains civil service reform measures urged by the League of Women Voters since 1969.

Proposition D will:
— Modernize the City's outdated personnel system by creating a Director of Personnel, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors
— Preserve the principles of merit through policies set by the Civil Service Commission
— Create a more responsive Civil Service system at no additional cost to the taxpayer

EFFICIENCY AND FLEXIBILITY

Proposition D transfers authority for day-to-day management of the City's personnel system from the Civil Service Commission to the Director of Personnel. This will:
— Prevent hiring delays
— Ensure only the most qualified individuals are hired and promoted
— Provide City managers with more administrative flexibility

FAIRNESS FOR EMPLOYEES

Proposition D will:
— Safeguard the rights of City workers
— Protect gains made in hiring women and minorities
— Retain the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit appeals board
— Retain the ability of the City's unions to negotiate working conditions
— Create a system that can respond quickly and fairly to the needs of City workers

Proposition D will bring the Civil Service system into the 20th century by making the Mayor accountable for the management of a system employing more than 25,000 people. Hiring by merit is still guaranteed by the Charter. Please join us in voting for this Reform!

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
Esther Marks, Past President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote Yes on Proposition D the Civil Service Modernization Initiative.

Prevent abuse of a system that was intended to serve the public and protect against favoritism. Prevent situations like this: an employee failed to report to work for a week without explanation; he was telephoned, notified by certified mail and a message left under his door; he was terminated 13 days later; he did not appeal the termination and the civil service commission up-
Civil Service

held the termination. Two months later, the employee petitioned the commission for reinstatement. The employee got his job back, not because the process of termination was wrong but because the commission had a long standing objection to using "absent without leave" as a reason for firing.

The quality of public services is dependent upon the effectiveness of the staff who deliver them. The primary role of the civil service commission should be to facilitate recruitment and retention of the best available personnel. It must protect against favoritism and must assure that everyone has an equal and fair chance at employment.

The present system does not do that. We feel this initiative will make the system work better, for the managers, for the employees and for the public.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco government is huge, with a budget of more than $1 billion per year and 25,000 employees. It is expected to solve serious problems. This requires that the City have the ability to hire and promote talented people to do the job.

The present civil service system is so tied up in red tape that jobs remain vacant for six months to a year, and all too often someone who is not capable of doing a good job is hired. Your tax dollars are being wasted, and you are not receiving the quality of services you need and deserve.

Proposition D will modernize San Francisco's civil service system. It separates the personnel department from the Civil Service Commission, and puts the department under the Mayor where it belongs. The Mayor is responsible for balancing the budget and delivering city services as efficiently as possible. She cannot do this unless she can find capable people to do the job. That is the task of the personnel department in any organization.

Proposition D will also insure that the independent Civil Service Commission has sufficient authority to require the personnel system to be fair in its treatment of City employees. The Commission will be able to issue subpoenas and require testimony of witnesses on investigations it conducts. Should it find that discrimination has occurred, it can issue orders that must be obeyed.

Most major American cities, and virtually all cities and counties in California, have the kind of civil service system that will be established by Proposition D. San Francisco's present system is still mired in the past. It hobbles the ability of the City to deliver services and spend your tax dollars as efficiently as possible.

SPUR has not placed a statement in the Voter's Handbook for any other issue over the past 15 years. We feel that Proposition D is so vital for San Francisco's future that we are making this appeal for your support.

Vote "YES" on Proposition D.

SPUR—The San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Reform Initiative, will give San Francisco citizens the HIGH PERFORMANCE GOVERNMENT necessary to meet the many challenges of the future. Proposition D corrects the outdated and inflexible requirements originally written in San Francisco's City Charter in 1931. It will eliminate the problems which prevent San Francisco's personnel system from operating with efficiency the City's voters and taxpayers deserve:

Proposition D insures City jobs will be filled from current lists of the most qualified employees.

Proposition D prevents ungrounded appeals from delaying for years the appointment or promotion of qualified employees.

Proposition D eliminates the repetitive tasks currently monopolizing the Civil Service Commission meetings and directs the Commission to serve as an appellate body to protect the City's good employees.

Proposition D centralizes the day-to-day operation of the civil service system and makes the Director of Personnel responsible to the Mayor.

Proposition D simplifies the budgetary process by making the Mayor the City's chief labor negotiator, responsible for setting working conditions within the City's financial capacity.

Proposition D is the result of years of painstaking review by the most experienced, able and respected management experts in San Francisco. It is a plan intended to move City government out of the 1930s and equip San Francisco to enter the twenty-first century without being burdened by the red tape of the past.

After ten years of commitment to improving our City, the Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee is convinced adoption of Proposition D is one of the most important issues facing the voters. CHANGE IS LONG OVERDUE. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by,
The Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee

David Anache
Jerome Anderson
Richard Blum
Charles Chapman
Arthur Coake, Jr.
Benton Dial
James Edgar
Ruben Garcia

Robert Hayden
Walter Hoadley
John Jacobs
Michael McGill
Ellen Newman
Roy Nordman
Frank Tatum

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PERSONNEL MANAGERS SAY YES ON PROPOSITION D

As the personnel managers for City Departments, we are charged with the responsibility of managing the City's personnel system. The activities include examinations, hiring, training, discipline, union-management relations, affirmative action and compensation. No one knows better than we the frustrations experienced in attempting to monitor an unbelievable sequence of overlapping bureaucratic activities in attempting to get the job done.

Proposition D will bring our personnel system into line with most other public personnel systems. The improved system will create the potential for being more responsive to the needs of operating departments. It will improve labor relations by transferring this function to the executive branch of government where it belongs.

Proposition D will streamline certain routine procedures resulting in a reduction of cost and time. Under the current system delays are experienced due to lengthy appeals during which time the departments' objectives are delayed.

Proposition D will create an atmosphere of increased accountability for department managers in the areas of affirmative action, discipline and job performance.

Proposition D has been endorsed by the San Francisco Council of Human Resource Managers, the association of over one hundred personnel managers in City government.

Proposition D strengthens merit system principles. Civil Service commissioners will have more time to enforce and protect these principles rather than being bogged down in the day-to-day activities of administration.

Proposition D will help bring about improved methods and practices in personnel administration and should result in a more competent and effective workforce which the citizens of San Francisco have a right to expect.

Alvin W. Schaaf  Andrea R. Gourdine
Personnel Director Manager, Bureau of Personnel &
Recreation and Park Department Training
Marsha Ramirez  Public Utilities Commission
Personnel Officer Mori Noguchi
San Francisco Port  Senior Department Personnel
Edward M. Gazzano  Officer
Personnel Director  Mary Smith
Department of Health  Senior Personnel Officer
James Horan  Laguna Honda Hospital
Senior Personnel Officer  Thelma Poteet
Department of Social Services  Senior Personnel Officer
James Buicki  San Francisco General Hospital
Personnel Director  John Burke
San Francisco International Airport  Personnel Director
Controller's Office

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

• The proposition still calls for checks and balances in that the Commission will continue to hear appeals on discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest. The Commission will act as a watchdog while leaving the general administration to the Personnel Director.

The initiative will make for an improved system for employees, management and the citizens of San Francisco. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Donald Birrer
Director of Public Works

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Passage of this amendment will update our civil service system. These changes will make it comparable to other merit system agencies. Some of these changes are

(A) removal of administrative details from the charter which inhibit timely and effective personnel actions.

The following subjects will be placed in personnel regulations:

• Protests of written questions and answers
• Protests of tentative employment lists
• Promotional examinations

• Examinations for employees on military leave
• Certification of eligibles—Rule of three
• Duration of employment lists
• Temporary employee appointments
(B) allows continuous up-dating of employment lists.
(C) allows equitable treatment of job candidates with same test score.
(D) realigns responsibilities: the Civil Service Commission dealing primarily with compliance and adjudication activities

(continued)
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while the Personnel Department administers the day-to-day operation of the merit system.

Equally important the amendment retains important merit system provisions dealing with:
- Employee salary setting procedures
- Positions subject to merit system examinations
- Public hearing and meet and confer requirements
- Penalties for examination fraud
- Seniority, meritorious service and applicable educational credits for promotional examinations in the Police/Fire De-

PARTMENTS
- Termination of unsatisfactory employees
- Disciplinary suspensions
- Conflict of interest
- Creation of positions

Proposition "D" merits a 'YES' vote.

John J. Walsh
General Manager Personnel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Initiative, is a long-overdue reform to streamline antiquated hiring practices in San Francisco's fifty-year-old charter. Proposition D will ensure that the best and brightest job candidates are chosen to serve our city, thus promoting excellence in job performance and helping to eliminate incompetence. This initiative builds management accountability in the city system, while giving the Civil Service Commission the independence to protect the rights of women and minorities.

A Better, More Efficient System at Less Cost

Proposition D consolidates personnel functions, including hiring, under a new Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. The Director has final authority over content of examinations given city job applicants, so more flexibility is possible in finding truly qualified candidates.

Proposition D redefines the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit systems appeals board and policy-setting body. The merit principles are spelled out in the Proposition. This allows the Commission to protect the rights of women and minorities at no cost to the public.

More Fair to Everyone

Proposition D greatly improves the city charter. Well-qualified job candidates have a better chance to be hired and well-qualified job holders have a better chance to be promoted. The public is rewarded with the better job performance, efficiency and friendliness one expects from good government employees. All of these improvements are at no additional cost to the taxpayer.

Submitted by
James W. Haas

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service System, as presently constituted, (vintage 1932!), is uncivil, and there is nothing "systematic" about it! It's pure, unadulterated municipal lunacy and chaos! Remarkably, BOTH Management and Labor despise it. It certainly is NOT producing the best qualified persons to fill City jobs!

Let's follow Mayor Feinstein's recommendations. If this operation doesn't dramatically improve, there are always FUTURE ELECTIONS where additional, more Draconian changes can be considered by the voters.

As matters now stand, it is far better to light a candle than just sit and curse the darkness! Any changes will be an improvement! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

For more than a half-century, San Francisco Mayors have abided by the employee examination, hiring and promotion policies administered by a strong and independent Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D is a deceptive and dangerous scheme that would give future Mayors and top-level bureaucrats the power to ignore competence and reward political loyalty.

Proposition D would take key Civil Service employment rules out of the City Charter and make them subject to wheeling and dealing by City Hall politicians.

There's an old saying — "if it ain't broke, don't fix it." Civil Service has worked well for more than 50 years. Proposition D is unnecessary, ineffective and even counter-productive. It's not just deceptive, it's dangerous.

Joseph L. Alioto
Former Mayor of San Francisco
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Time and time again, different groups have put various propositions on the ballot to weaken our Civil Service System and reintroduce political patronage into City employment practices. And every time the voters have wisely rejected these schemes, no matter how cleverly they have been disguised. Proposition D is just another power grab by bureaucrats at the top in City Hall.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “D”!!!!

During the eight years while a member of the Board of Supervisors, I fought hard to reform the Civil Service Commission and to bring working conditions and city workers’ pay equitable to both workers and taxpayers. I fought to insure an independent Civil Service Commission that would remain just that — independent and free from political influence and political patronage of particularly the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

I am truly saddened by the Mayor’s insistence in bringing this disastrous Proposition “D” before the voters. Some of the Supervisors rejected this misguided measure for what it is; an unwise consolidation of authority to hire, fire and promote city workers by the Mayor and newly created personnel officer.

My efforts to bring pay equity to both taxpayers and city workers were continually squashed by then Supervisor Feinstein and Supervisor Molinari. Finally, in 1975, shortly after a disastrous city strike, I was able to place on the ballot, for voter approval, a measure that almost eliminates the power of the Mayor and Supervisors to manipulate the pay of city workers. This measure was overwhelmingly passed by the voters that year and we have not had any labor unrest since that date.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Vote No on “D”!

“D” stands for disaster. It will undo many of these reforms. Also, right now, the City is almost broke, thanks to the manipulation of Mayor Feinstein and her chief ally Supervisor Molinari.

If “D” passes the cost of operating our city government will increase in the next 24 months by not less than $60,000,000. Contrary to the provisions of Proposition 13, property taxes would be increased, thus forcing up rents.

Vote No on “D”.

Don’t weaken our Civil Service Commission, whereby least deserving city employees could be promoted because of connection or clout.

Vote No on “D”.

We now almost have more problems than we can handle. We don’t want our city turned into another Chicago, wherefor for nearly half a century a corrupt political system flourished under Mayor Richard Daley.

John Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We join San Franciscans for Fair Employment in opposing the Civil Service Initiative, Proposition D.

This measure will severely hamper the well-being of the San Francisco Fire and Police Departments. These departments are two of the finest in the Country and have consistently protected life and property in a professional manner. They must continue that tradition with a civil service system based on MERIT and not political patronage.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Andrew C. Casper
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Keith P. Calden
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

William F. Murray
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Thomas J. Cahill
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired

Donald M. Scott
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired

Our present Civil Service system was designed to keep corruption out of government. It has generally served that purpose well. This proposition would dismantle that system and in my opinion open the doors to nepotism, favoritism, patronage and corruption. Better a city government that is bureaucratic than one that is corrupt. Vote NO on D.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is an attack on the merit system and an attempt to return patronage to the Mayor's office by eliminating the authority of the Civil Service Commission and its built in checks and balances.

The present Civil Service system is not perfect, but corrections can be made within the Charter without destroying a system that has worked for over 50 years and has been free from fraud and corruption.

This proposition will do nothing to improve the caliber of police performance and could have the opposite effect. I urge you to vote NO on PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by
The San Francisco Police Supervisors and Investigators Association

Don Goad, Captain SFPD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D could be a dangerous first step toward weakening the independent, impartial administration of our City government.

Proposition D would transfer power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor. The Director's decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline and certification would be final. The Commission would have no right to hear examinations or disciplinary appeals.

With the transfer of duties and responsibilities from the Commission to the Mayor's appointed Personnel Director, the Mayor would have control over personnel functions. Currently, commissioners have independent status and can be dismissed for cause. The Personnel Director could be dismissed at will.

The Merit System could be replaced by a patronage system. Proposition D could open the door to rules permitting the Personnel Director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his or her position on the list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Proposition D is NOT a reform package. The checks and balances for efficient City government would be lost, with too much power in the hands of unknown future Mayors.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
John L. Molinari, President
Harry G. Britt
Richard Hongisto
Willie B. Kennedy
Wendy Nelder
Nancy Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Beware of PROPOSITION D!
Powerful special interest groups are attempting to remove key City employees from the independent and impartial Civil Service system in the name of "reform".

They want instead to make these employees answerable directly to future Mayors and politically-appointed Personnel Directors and department heads.

PROPOSITION D got on the ballot because the Chamber of Commerce and such companies as Pacific Bell and PG&E paid a professional southern California campaign firm, $70,000 to collect signatures.

They're trying to destroy the merit system and replace it with an old-fashioned patronage system.

Department heads will be able to ignore examination scores and reward loyalty rather than competence in promotions and hiring.

Don't let the Chamber of Commerce, big business and their allies in the City bureaucracy dictate who's hired, fired and promoted among public employees.

PROPOSITION D is not just deceptive, it's dangerous!
Vote NO on PROPOSITION D!

Libby Schaff
Member, S.F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Member, S.F. Community College Governing Board
Ron Huberman
Vice-Chairman, Democratic Central Committee
Jim Wacob
Democratic Central Committee
Robert Estes
President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Rick Paraurus
President, Harvey Milk Lesbian Gay Democratic Club
Walter L. Johnson
Exec. Secy., S.F. Labor Council
Michael Bernick Linda Post
Sal Rosetti Deborah Stein
John Mehring Pat Norman
Nancy Walker Gwen Craig
Harry Britt Louise Minnick
Carole Migden Agar Jankins
Jack Morrison
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D places too much power in the hands of ONE. Proposition D will provide for a personnel director to be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. The Mayor now appoints five members of the Civil Service Commission who also serve at her pleasure.

You work for years to climb the civil service ladder and then somebody comes along with an idea to cut you off at the pockets.

Proposition D will lock in all the employees employed in the Mayor's office and will control the appointments of any new staff by the next Mayor elect in 1987 and years thereafter.

Like controlling your estate from the grave.

Vote NO on D.

Marguerite Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service Merit System has served our City well, giving San Franciscans an equal opportunity. It has helped us obtain employment and earn promotions based on objective examinations.

The Civil Service Merit system replaced the old patronage system that rewarded political loyalty more than competence.

Now the supporters of PROPOSITION D want to create a new Personnel Director, accountable only to the Mayor, and give department heads the absolute power to decide who works for the City and who gets promoted.

If PROPOSITION D passes, equal opportunity would give way to opportunity based on membership in the bureaucratic "establishment".

Keep our Civil Service Merit System strong and free from the political abuses of the past.

Vote NO on D!

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly

Ben Tom
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board

Johanne Miller
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board

A. Richard Corbates
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board

Dr. Sodonia Wilson
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board

Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, President
S. F. Community College Governing Board

Julie Tang
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board

Alan S. Wong
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board

Henry Der

Albert Chang

Rudy Meruz

Robert "Bob" Morales

Yori Wada

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Can you imagine studying for a civil service examination, being rated at the top of the eligible list and never receiving the promotion? That's exactly what Proposition "D" will do should the electorate adopt this amendment.

The civil service merit system has defects, but to totally eliminate the system and replace it with a patronage system where promotions are based on who you know, rather than what you know is scandalous.

Civil service was put into place to prevent scandal and the "favor seeking" individual from getting a paid position because he/she happened to support the right elected official.

Proposition "D" will allow one person, chosen by the Mayor, to decide who will be promoted, hired and fired. This is awesome power for one single individual to have at any level of government.

Our current Mayor may choose a fair person for this position, but will future Mayors be as careful? As each new Mayor assumes office, the civil service system will again change. The potential to favor one individual or group over others is great.

Proposition "D" has a great potential to diminish the quality of services we now provide to our citizens, as the future of how people are hired and promoted in the San Francisco Police Department is completely unknown.

It's true our promotional system is fraught with delays and delays frustrate us all, but Proposition "D" is not the answer. Proposition "D" will only add to our existing problems. Several years ago, our citizens elected a Charter Commission to streamline city government and make civil service work more efficiently. The voters eventually rejected those proposals. The checks and balances that make our government stable were no longer present. It simply went too far.

Proposition "D" goes even further. It brings about a system of patronage and should be defeated lest we want to engage in "free-wheeling and dealing" of civil service jobs and promotions.

We urge a strong No vote against Proposition "D"!

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry, President
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPPOSITION D

The purpose of the Civil Service Commission is to ensure that the merit system would be the only criteria in any examination process.

If Proposition D passes, all authority concerning examinations would be taken from the Civil Service Commission and given to a Personnel Director, who is appointed by the Mayor. This Personnel Director would have the authority to hire and fire at his discretion, with no appeal available. This proposition is contrary to everything the Fire Department and all City employees have strived for over the years.

The Civil Service Commission in its present form was instituted to prevent any possibility of a patronage system, where one person has complete control.

This proposition would do nothing to improve your Fire Department. If you are satisfied with the work and make up of the San Francisco Fire Department in its present form, “Vote No On Proposition D”. You will be doing a service for the San Francisco Fire Department, and the people of San Francisco.

Submitted by the San Francisco Fire Chiefs’ Association
John Flaherty, Battalion Chief SFFD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPPOSITION D

Proposition D is bad government and bad politics, changing our independent civil service system into a system dominated by the Mayor:

. By shortening the six year terms of Civil Service Commission to conform to the Mayor’s four year term of office.
. By transferring most of the Commission’s powers to a Personnel Director who serves solely at the Mayor’s pleasure.

Keep politics out of employment services. Vote NO on Proposition D!

Alice B. Toklas, Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Roberto Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPPOSITION D

Proposition D fails to offer enough new and improved procedures to cure the current defects in the civil service system. Charter sections and civil service rules are repealed without specific known replacements.

Proposition D transfers power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created personnel director appointed by, and to serve at the pleasure of, the Mayor. The director’s decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline, and certification would be final. The commission would have no right to hear examination or disciplinary appeals.

There are hidden costs with Proposition D because the new Personnel Administration Department will employ a personnel director, and other employees “as may be necessary to carry out (its) functions and duties.”

The Merit System could be replaced by an old style Patronage System. Proposition D could open the door to rules which permit the personnel director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his/her position on the civil service testing list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Police and Fire Commissions would lose functions as a result of the personnel director’s new power. The director’s unlawful employment discrimination policy would be binding upon department administrators. The director’s procedure for employee dispute resolution must be used by all department heads and appointing officers.

Proposition D is not the answer. The checks and balances for efficient city government would be lopsided.

I urge a no vote on Proposition D.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, 17th Assembly District
Sala Burton
Congresswoman
Art Agnos
16th Assembly District
Milton Marks
State Senator

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
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Balboa Reservoir Development Ban

PROPOSITION E
Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?

YES 292
NO 293

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission declared Balboa Reservoir South (located across Phelan Avenue from San Francisco City College) surplus in 1984 and made the site available for low, moderate and market rate housing. In July 1985, a City-community advisory committee chose a developer to build 203 single-family homes on the 13 acre site. Construction has not yet begun.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would prohibit granting new building permits and would revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site (Assessor’s Block 3180, Lot 1) between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit granting any new building permits and you want to revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to allow building permits to be granted for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

How “E” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for a three-year ban on development of the Balboa Reservoir site had qualified for the June ballot.

Sidney Kass and Jesse David Wall, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 12,430 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 10,012 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 77
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Having been responsible for providing leadership at City College from 1947 to 1977, we cannot stand by and see this site converted to housing. We must speak out. Such a move would preclude forever the logical and much needed campus expansion to what was once our West Campus. We left that site reluctantly to make way for water storage. If it is no longer required for that purpose, let us return it to City College.

Thousands of San Franciscans—high school graduates, dropouts, veterans, re-entering women—representing all of the city's diverse ethnic groups, have been prepared for transfer to four-year colleges, profitable careers, and have had their lives enriched at the City College of San Francisco. Without City College's open door and easy access, many would have been deprived of these opportunities.

Its 56 acre campus originally housed 3,000 students. Now it serves over 23,000. This campus, compared to other community colleges, can be best described as cramped, inadequate, and second rate. The condition of the campus is to be contrasted with the excellence of its programs—which are recognized as among the best in the nation.

Lou Batmale
Chancellor 1970-1977
Louis G. Conlan
President 1947-1970

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 'E'

We question:
1. Why no EIR was required when the proposed development could have a substantial impact.
2. Whether the future needs of City College for classrooms, housing, and parking have been considered.
3. What the impact on taxpayers is with below market land sale and construction financing by bonds.

This moratorium will permit adequate study of these issues. Vote YES on Proposition 'E'.

Bruce Bonacker, President
Board of Directors, Glen Park Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let a developer make a mint on land across from the most overcrowded college in the Bay Area! Parking is already an impossibility for residents near City College... adding 200 homes to this land would make the situation much worse.

It's simple: a college which can't find room for more students at a time when more people are returning to education doesn't serve the community.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This land is being sold at much less than its true value. The development wouldn't do much to ease the City's housing crunch, but it would undercut the future of City College and the peace of mind of the neighborhood.

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

You'd probably be upset. We certainly are. Please help us protect our neighborhood. Please vote YES on proposition E.

Westwood Park Residents:   Sunnyside Residents:
Edna Toker                 Ellen Wall
Minnie Dorwin               Melissa Volund
Eugene Edon                 David Wall
Donna Nicoletti
Robert Armstrong
Pauline Armstrong
Joel Martinez
Richard & Lisa Patterson
David Bean
H. Bozzone
William Burke
Richard Robel
Clyde Theriot
Dansie Manus
Emma Manus
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let the greedy developers take this potentially picturesque open space. A yes vote means you want more time to consider its future use. All we ask is time to think and plan.

John Barbagelata
Former member, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Suppose there was a publicly owned open space across the street from the main U.C. Berkeley Campus. Can you imagine for one moment that it would be passed into private ownership? Vote Yes on E for Equality and Excellence in Education

City College Students:
William Lew, Student
Tim McGuire, Student Council Member
Joseph Goldstein, Student Council Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

In 1952, the "Experts" said we needed reservoirs. They felt so strongly that they condemned the City College West Campus, destroyed the buildings, and constructed the reservoirs—all at taxpayer's expense.

Now, in 1986 with more demand for water, the "Experts" say the reservoir is no longer needed. What is the concerned taxpayer to believe?

When in doubt, the city should hold on to the expensive things already paid for.

Stop the reservoir giveaway. Vote YES on E.

Taxpayers for Preserving the Reservoir.
Richard Patterson
Darice Murphy
Lucille Carson
Daniel Gutierrez
Franz Wise
Bernhard Scholand
Ruth Hanson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This is a Planning issue

We have been accused of trying to stop housing for poor people. Not true. In the first place, the price levels are certainly middle income and above, but our main objection is that this badly done plan is damaging to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as to the over-crowded community college across the street.

WHAT WE WANT

Even our critics point out that we originally SUGGESTED housing for that site, but they don't talk about what else we suggested. We want two levels of parking under a City College Library, Bookstore, and Auditorium, with housing on top. Furthermore, let the housing be TRULY affordable—for students and seniors. We are trying to stop the bureaucrats' subsidized middle income housing project because it makes our dream impossible.

We ask for three years to give the neighborhood and the college a chance to produce a better plan.

SNAP (Sensible Neighborhood Planning Committee)

Helen Crizer, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council, representing 17 neighborhood associations in the area of the surplus reservoir property in question has voted to endorse the three-year stop of private construction on the old West Campus of City College. Dr. Louis Battmale, Chancellor of City College from 1970-1977, has persuaded us that City College needs the lands.

Juanita Raven, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Be a sport.
Give City College a vote of support.
City has 23,000 students and badly needs a library. The only place to put it is in the reservoir site. City College has walked closely with San Francisco for five decades. The reservoir site has always been understood to be reserved for City College.
Until now when someone wants it for housing. Housing is important, but it can be anywhere in town. But a City College library can only be located at the College.

Vote yes to support a book—and a reader.
Reading, studying, writing and research make up our town also.
It is hard to understand criticism of City for wanting to keep this area for a library. Sure, housing sites are at a premium—but even more so a library site for City which is one of the largest schools in the Nation.
Some people blast City for wanting a library because of the need for housing. Housing is needed. But some of those very same people want a big battleship stationed here that will bring in 15,000 new family members.
The Educational and cultural growth of San Francisco mandates living space for the City College library.
If this measure gets a no vote, it means there will be no site for a Library. This is the last chance. Vote YES to help out a book—and a reader.

State financing, when approved, will construct this building. It is the top building priority at City College.
A YES vote here means there will be time to think about the use of the site. During that three year period, cooler heads may realize this is the only site for a Library. If the housing goes in there will be no library there.

Vote yes for a book, for a good school and a better City.

John Riordan, Board of Governors
San Francisco Community College District.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Sunnyside Neighborhood Association is not against housing, but we are trying to stop a hasty and short-sighted plan. We are asking for this moratorium to get time for a better plan that will answer a variety of needs and benefit the entire city as well as our community.

This is a planning issue.
The release of the reservoir property as surplus by the water department came as a surprise to our neighborhood. The June 1984 “Residence Element” of the city’s Master Plan did not even list the land as surplus. By 1985 major decisions were being made for use of the land without adequate neighborhood input.

There were some meetings attended by a few people carefully selected for their zealous pro-housing views or potential financial gain. The resulting plan has gone out of control. Now it benefits only the developer and the lucky few who will get houses on free land.

Proposition E is not an attack on housing.
Please help us save our neighborhood against poor planning by voting YES on Proposition E.

Joe Mahoney, President
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Miraloma Improvement Club urges a YES vote on Proposition E.

B. Sullivan
Dale Jones
Homer Bradford
Kathryn A. Small
Harry Small
Mr. & Mrs. Henry Taylor
Betty Woo Suen
Susan Piscitelli
Dale Brown

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION E

All the talk in the world can’t change the fact that City College has fewer acres of land relative to its student population than any college in the Bay Area.

Enrollment at City College is INCREASING, as is the enrollment of the San Francisco public schools from which City College draws most of its students. It is obvious that City College needs and deserves the reservoir land. The three year moratorium will give time to produce a better plan which will have in-

put by faculty, students and alumni who know the college’s needs and want to support it.

Sid Kass
Susie Langdon Kass
Phil Kass
City College Student
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The homeowners of Westwood Park, a neighborhood adjacent to the Balboa Reservoir, support the ballot initiative calling for a 3 year development moratorium. We believe that the City and City College should take additional time to determine their needs and how they might be met by using the Reservoir. In the event that City College does not need this property, we support its development as open space or as single family detached housing.

Westwood Park Association
Don C. Swander
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Let's not aggravate the traffic problem around City College before we first develop solutions for the existing problems. A three-year moratorium only buys our neighborhood and elected officials time to find solutions; it doesn't say no to housing. A YES vote is a vote for prudent development. A YES vote helps to preserve the family character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ken Hoegger
Realtor and community Activist

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As representatives of the students of City College, we understand first-hand, the intense need to reserve a site for future school expansion. Preservation of the Balboa Reservoir, a site directly adjacent to the campus, is particularly crucial. The facilities that CCSF requires, such as a library and an auditorium, are essential to the main structure of the campus. Unlike classrooms, it would be unreasonable to build an auditorium or a library on an off-campus site, since these facilities are integral to the main function of the school.

In short, opposition to the moratorium based on the notion that alternate sites could be secured, is misleading. Once a site near the college is taken, any hope of expansion would be eliminated.

Associated Student Council of City College
Jack Lee, Vice President of Associated Counsel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Local 2121 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, representing City College faculty, urges a yes vote on Proposition E.

While this project provides short-term employment for a few, we are more concerned about the thousands of students who would benefit from planning and development that would better serve the community and the college.

Yes on E for continued excellence in community college education.

Anita Martinez, President
San Francisco Community College District
American Federation of Teachers

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is twice as crowded as any community college in northern California. It needs a much larger library, bookstore and auditorium, and more parking.

The college has always expected to use the empty SOUTH reservoir for educational needs. That land is finally surplus. Neither the college Governing Board nor the Chancellor attended the Mayor’s planning sessions for the property and the faculty was not informed. When the 12.3 acre site was offered to a developer for $36,900 for subsidized housing, the Chancellor said, “We are at a crossroad and the correct path is for the Board of Supervisors, with the Mayor’s support, to deed this surplus land to City College so that the college may continue to serve the city effectively for the next 50 years as it has for the past half century.” The Mayor refused. Now only Board member John Riordan supports the correct path.

The Water Department says it may need the NORTH reservoir now used for student parking. If that crisis occurs, the Chancellor says, “We'll deal with the situation then.” How, if the south reservoir is gone?

(continued)
When land is available other community colleges finance large projects through alliances with civic, athletic and cultural organizations, and through property sales. New methods for public funding are being developed. The faculty would like three years of careful study to unravel misunderstandings and poor management, and to find the best way to be a good neighbor.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College needs land now for desperately needed facilities, one of which is a library. City College has an enrollment of 23,000 students but our library has seating for 450. There are other possible locations for new housing, but City College can't be moved. Give us an opportunity to plan a development for the community and the college.

Annie M. Young
City College Library Faculty and Staff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty and staff members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs. Vote YES on Proposition E

Virgie Applin
Bill Carpenter

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs. Vote YES on Proposition E

Darlene Alioto
Mary Allen
Mary Amster
Tom Angellof
Robert Balestreri
Don Buceri
Diana Bernstein
Joe Berry
Anna Bratton
Thomas Brendel
James Bristol
Richard Bruangel
Laurent Broussal
Philip Brown
Barbara Cobral
John Callen
John Carles

Frank Cerrato
Rosemary Clark
Perry Close
Kurt Common
Walter Crabbs
George Crippen
Patricia Davis
Guy DePrimo
Edward Diener
Sharon Edwards
Larry Ernst
Mary Erwin
Kuey Fong
William Funke
Terry Greenfield
Robert Griffin
Michael Guthrie
Mary Hanna
Yen Kuang Ho
Peter Hoch
Ronald Hochade
Myrna Holden
Katherine Houkian
Michael Hulbert
Edward Hunt
Frank Ingersoll
Elaine Johnson
Vindy Kafman
Jo Kennedy
Mercedes Kovak
Rosalline Kwok
Don Lefferty
James Laihas
Steve Levinson
Sue Light
Gary Ling
Amelia Lippin
Dave Lohker
Leon Lucy
Dusmane Macalou
Marion McManus
Patricia Madigan
Michael Malachowski
Mary Merti
Maria Mariani
Sylvia Marshall
Valerie Meahan
Jose Mejia
Margit Michelmayr
Deanne Milan
Cindy Moody
Thomas Munro
David Myhre
Deborah Nagle
Glenn Nance
Herbert Naylor
William Neff
Dennis Piontkowski
Francine Podenski
Therese Poydessus
Salomon Raju
Mary Riordian
Fariborz Sanice
Marvin Schinnerer
Fred Schneider
Earl Scribner
Andy Seal
Ken Shen

Robert Struckman
McShue Tom
Edward Taylor
Pierce Thiry
Barbara Thomas
Clare Thompson
Willie Thompson
Mary Thurtber
Robert Treaceo
James Trainer
Joanne Tuminia
George VonBoszay
Cherie Wetzel
Austin White
Jean Wilson
Rosalee Wolf
Christina Yce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Water Department has begun a resource study of water use, due for completion in two or three years. The study may well indicate that one or both reservoirs will be needed. The American Water Works Association states that reservoirs should be used in pairs. This is particularly important because it is the only reservoir at an elevation of 305 feet.

The Mayor twisted the arm of the Water Department to declare one of these reservoirs surplus before the water resource study is completed. Don't let her get away with this kind of political manipulation.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Kurt Common
Ken Crizer
Ed Dierauf
Herb Naylor
CCSF Engineering Professors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The South Balboa Basin has been unused since college leased buildings, including a large auditorium, were torn down on that site thirty years ago. We hope that three years of thorough planning would explore the possibility of returning a part of that property to the college for the development of a multi-purpose medium-sized auditorium which could be shared with community groups.

Joseph Alessi
Mary Argenti
Neyde Azevedo
John Bischoff

Robert Bozina
Mack Crooks
Bob Davis
Helen Dilworth
Franz Enciso
Richard Esterman
Richard Fenner
Lawrence Ferrara
Ted Fleming
Peggy Gorham
William Grothkopp
David Hardiman

Judy Hubbell
Charles Hudspeth
Sieglinde Isham
Baruch Klein
John Kongsizmark
Joshua Law
Steven Lopez
Jerry Mueller
Madeline Mueller
Marsin Turkal
Frank Townsell
City College Music Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition E. This moratorium is necessary because there are too many worthy uses for this land to make a hasty and potentially very costly decision. Only through careful planning can the limited land available for development be best used.

Nicolas Alexander
Paul Hewitt

Jerome Hosken
Robert Kaar
James Kureck
Duck Lee
Chelcie Liu
William Maynez
Annette Rappleyea
Oleg Reouit
David Wall
City College Physics Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, as Physical Education Instructors, have always been committed to a diversified program for our students and community. The reservoir space is a natural land resource for a Multi Educational and Cultural Center.

Your YES vote on E will allow us the freedom to explore ways that this property could most constructively benefit all.

Nicolas Alexander
Paul Hewitt

Gail Barton
Curtis Decker
Brad Deegan
Tanaka Hugiwara
John Hult
Daniel Hayes

Lene Johnson
Grover Klemmer
Paula McCallum
Art Octavio
Louise Scourges

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, full-time faculty of the Computer and Information Science Department of City College, urge a YES vote to postpone the decision until additional planning and surveys can be conducted. The current proposal would negatively impact the College's enrollment.

William Beaver
Ronald Cernuit, Chairman
Kirk Gibson
Howard Granger
Frank Holden
Michael Kelly

George Lanyi
Norbert Ludkey
Charles Metzler
Charles Miller
Marilyn Schnake
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

A YES vote on Proposition E helps STOP a scheme to GIVE AWAY $12,300,000 worth of City land for $1,800,000 (or less) to a Redwood City real estate developer.

A YES vote will SAVE taxpayers $550,000 per year. The housing project will produce $240,000 in taxes, but supplying City services will cost $790,000 per year.

The Controller's cost estimate does NOT account for the $12,300,000 land value, since land sale below value is NOT technically a cost of government. The Controller also is NOT permitted to assume that the housing project will be constructed, since construction has NOT yet been ordered by the Board of Supervisors.

The plan does NOT restrict housing sales to moderate-income first-time buyers. The plan only restricts use of tax-subsidized funds. Any person favored by the developer or politicians can buy these dwellings and get the benefits of the public land giveaway.

The houses are made "affordable" by giving away the land far below market value, by City-backed low interest, and by cutting construction corners.

The real beneficiaries of the subsidized housing project are the financiers (NOT the project dwellers). Bondholders receive 9.6% average tax-free interest, which is equivalent to 24.6% taxable interest at 61% maximum tax. The developer and bond establishment receive $5,340,000; this is $26,300 (or 22.40%) for each $117,400 unit.

The City loses $51,700 worth of land GIVEN AWAY for each unit.

Vote YES on Proposition E for good fiscal management.

William Marquardt
Financial Analyst, SNaP
Helen Crizer, Treasurer, SNaP

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is by far the most crowded community college in the Bay Area. With 22,600 students on a 56 acre campus, it is more than twice as crowded as any of the others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of College</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Campus (acres)</th>
<th>Area/1000 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City College of SF</td>
<td>22,624</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laney College, Oakland</td>
<td>9,805</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot College, Hayward</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa College</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of San Mateo</td>
<td>13,820</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>11.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Marin</td>
<td>6,663</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given these facts, why does the Governing Board not try to get the old West Campus back? Why don't they support this moratorium to delay the land grab?

The Governing Board is under political pressure from City Hall. They have been threatened with the loss of the north reservoir parking lot and funding for special projects. Forgive them. Vote Yes on E.

Friends of City College
David Newton
Glen Simpson
Jack Baker
Thomas Velasquez
Tillie McCullough

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The student population at City College is increasing. This semester's enrollment is up 1,265 students over last semester.

The enrollment in the San Francisco public schools has been increasing by 1,218 per year for the last three years. City College draws most of its enrollment from public schools in San Francisco.

Obviously, City College will have a larger enrollment in the future years, and will be in desperate need of space if we do not give it back its old West Campus.

Please reserve this public land for the college.

Please vote YES on E.

Barbara Holman

NOTE: YOUR PollING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
Please REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON E

In 1981, I launched a six-point program to expand San Francisco’s housing supply and the voters had approved a City policy to add 20,000 new housing units within five years. This Proposition would destroy a major portion of the effort to build affordable, single-family housing in our city.

The Balboa Reservoir Site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now a site for development of 203 new single-family homes, most with three bedrooms and two baths. These homes would be sold to first-time homeowners at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed as other homes built under the City’s program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom could not afford homeownership. It is believed that these new homes will sell rapidly.

The Balboa Reservoir site is one of the few sites large enough to accommodate a substantial number of new homes. Please do not let a few people stop a major opportunity for new housing. Vote no on Prop E.

Not only would Proposition E halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site, but the 9.8% fixed-rate, 30-year mortgage money set aside for the housing would also be lost.

Nothing constructive is accomplished by this measure—it does not provide additional land or facilities for City College. As a matter of fact, City College has neither plans nor money to use the property. Further, the Community College Board of Directors, the governing body for City College, has voted overwhelmingly to oppose the initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No on E.”

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the site of the unused Balboa Reservoir and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost.

These homes are desperately needed for San Franciscans who can’t afford to buy in the city where the average house is selling for over $160,000. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

The homes would be built on land that belongs to the City. Over two years ago, it was declared surplus and available for housing. It is not part of City College, and City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

We urge you to vote no on Proposition E if you want more affordable housing for San Franciscans.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

In 1980 San Franciscans voted overwhelmingly (63% yes to 37% no) to construct 20,000 housing units. Good progress is underway towards achieving the voter goal. A 1986 report by Mayor Dianne Feinstein states, “In the last five years 3,559 new housing units completed with another 3,000 by 1988 and 20,000 more in 10 to 15 years”. Most of this housing will be built in underutilized commercial districts; not in existing residential neighborhoods.

The 203 affordable owner occupied single family units slated for the southern portion of Balboa Reservoir are part of the 1988 total. Our progress in addressing the City’s housing shortage will be curtailed if this ill-advised initiative is approved. SUPPORT OWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Housing production is essential to check rising prices and to maintain our social, economic, and ethnic population diversity. AS A SAN FRANCISCO VOTER, YOU CAN BE PART OF OUR HOUSING PROGRESS BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Do not be misled. The Community College Governing Board opposes this initiative. The district does not have any future building plans for this housing site.

WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT THE CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY HOUSING BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt construction of affordable housing at Balboa Reservoir site. This surplus public property empty for 30 years was declared surplus by the City in 1984. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders. The housing is desperately needed. San Franciscans need affordable housing.

Doris M. Ward, Member
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

A critical issue facing San Francisco today is the lack of housing middle class San Franciscans can afford.

That is why I have joined these neighborhood associations to support the Balboa Reservoir neighborhood housing proposal. Those participating in the development of the proposal includes:

O.M.I. Community Association
Dorado Terrace Association
Outer Mission-Ingleside
Political Action Committee
Greater Ingleside Community
Mount Davidson Manor
Ocean Avenue Merchants Association
Ingleside Terrace Association
The San Francisco Open Space Committee
City College of San Francisco

From early in 1985 I worked closely with these neighborhood groups in the discussions between city government and community leaders concerning the development plans for this desperately needed new housing at the unused Balboa reservoir site.

THESE ARE THE REASONS YOU SHOULD VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

1. The neighborhood housing proposal that this initiative seeks to stop is the result of months of hard work by the largest coalition of neighborhood associations ever to join together to plan a housing development in San Francisco.

2. The housing at the Balboa Reservoir site was designed with the involvement of the coalition of neighborhood associations to enhance the surrounding community.

3. The governing Board of the Community College District has made clear that they have no plans for the site and no ownership rights to it. City College does not oppose the construction of this development and opposes this initiative.

4. Self-proclaimed “friends” of City College want to stop the proposal in order to preserve the site for future faculty parking. A clique of City College staff involved in a neighborhood association pose as community opposition to this development even though a representative from this organization, the Sunnyside Neighborhood Association, had helped plan and support the proposal.

5. By masquerading as concerned neighbors these self-appointed “friends” of City College hope to prevent the construction of 204 critically needed units of housing and pull off one of the biggest land grabs in San Francisco’s history.

DON’T BE FOOL ED. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Residence Element of the Comprehensive Plan of the City and County of San Francisco assesses the City’s housing needs and lays out specific steps to meet those needs. This document was adopted by the City Planning Commission in 1984 after extensive public review at neighborhood meetings and public hearings, and consideration of the detailed Environmental Impact Report.

The first objective of the Housing Element is “to provide new Housing for all income groups” in locations appropriate for residential development. To meet this goal, development of housing is to be aggressively pursued and encouraged on surplus, underused and vacant public land.

Proposition E would halt construction of affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site. This public property, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City in 1984. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

If you want more affordable housing in San Francisco vote no on Proposition E.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Susan J. Bierman, City Planning Commissioner
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on E.
Proposition E deprives San Franciscans of one of their last real chances to become homeowners at an affordable price. At the South Balboa Reservoir we have City-owned land on which 203 units of three-bedroom, two-bath homes can be built at low prices which average San Franciscans can afford to pay. These homes need to be built now, not in three years. In three years the low interest rates on mortgages and the bond financing will be gone. Two hundred families will have lost the opportunity to become homeowners, and the City will have lost the opportunity to ease the tight market in rental housing.

Bill Maher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Balboa Reservoir site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now planned for development of 203 new single family homes. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed — other homes built under this program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom would not otherwise be able to afford home ownership.

San Francisco has the most expensive housing in the nation where last year the average home sold for over $160,000. Housing is difficult to produce because the obstacles are great — little land on which to build, high construction costs and uncertain interest rates.

John L. Molinari

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

In 1980, the voters of the City and County of San Francisco approved a measure making it City policy to add 20,000 new units of housing within five years. In 1984 in an effort to satisfy this objective, the Board of Supervisors adopted a policy encouraging the expansion of the City’s housing supply. Making surplus City-owned land, such as the site at Balboa Reservoir, available for affordable housing was an important part of that policy. A proposal to build 203 homes on the unused Balboa Reservoir site was advanced to help implement the pro-housing policy.

Approval of Proposition E would HALT construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.

The Balboa Reservoir homes would be built on land currently belonging to the City and County of San Francisco. The property IS NOT part of the City College, and City College has neither plans or money to buy the property and convert it for City College use.

Willie B. Kennedy

The only debatable issue is the future of affordable housing on the Balboa Reservoir site.

As we are all aware, San Francisco has the most expensive homes in the United States. The average cost of a home is $152,000. Not many can afford such prices. However, the housing proposed for the Balboa Reservoir will give many more citizens the opportunity to become homeowners. The homes to be built will be sold to first-time buyers at prices ranging from $83,000 to $145,000.

Other homes built in San Francisco under the direction of similar affordable housing programs have been snapped up quickly by San Franciscans. Without the program, most would not have been able to purchase the home and become homeowners.

Again, if you desire to preserve the construction of more affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site, vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Additional single family housing is undeniably San Francisco’s most acute social need.

When some vacant surplus City land (12 acres) finally becomes available for 203 additional new private homes there will always be some selfish individuals who are in favor of new housing “just so long as it is not built across the street from me!”

This unused, vacant City reservoir land hasn’t generated a dime of taxes for over thirty years! Let’s add 203 NEW homeowner taxpayers to the City’s rolls as quickly as possible.

Stop these self-serving no-growth obstructionists! Please vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Prop E would halt affordable housing construction at the Balboa Reservoir site. Many gay people need affordable housing, too, and we join with other community groups urging you to vote NO on Prop E.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Robert Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E, if approved, would block the construction of 203 badly needed single-family homes on the south portion of the Balboa Reservoir in San Francisco. Sixty percent of these homes would be available for purchase by moderate and middle income families at purchase prices between $80,000 and $120,000. They would be constructed on surplus public land and financed by the sale of mortgage revenue bonds to enable the developer to sell the homes at below market prices.

A neighborhood group headed by two city college faculty members is responsible for placing Proposition E on the ballot. The group contends that the land which is intended to be used for the project should be made available instead to City College for the construction of new teaching facilities even though enrollment at City College is declining and the City College Board has voted 6 to 1 to oppose the initiative.

Like many other areas of the country, San Francisco suffers from a shortage of housing. Purchase prices here are among the highest in the nation. The use of surplus public lands and revenue bond financing provide a means for making single family homes available to a broad spectrum of families at affordable prices.

The Balboa Reservoir project is supported by the leaders of 8 neighborhood groups in the area surrounding the location of the proposed project and by a majority of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, as well as by Mayor Dianne Feinstein. We urge you to encourage the construction of this type of housing in San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition E.

San Francisco Board of Realtors
William L. Jansen, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

SAVE OUR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS!
BERNAL HEIGHTS SAYS, “VOTE NO ON PROP E!!”

We are residents of Bernal Heights in San Francisco. We’ve worked hard to build affordable family and senior citizen homes in our neighborhood.

We need more affordable housing in our City to survive. The real issue in Prop E is affordable family housing—a “yes” vote prevents the construction of 203 family homes. That’s crazy!

Join us in preserving what’s best in our City. Vote “no” on Prop E!

Sylvia M. Yee, Bernal Heights Community Foundation Board of Directors***
Frank Hutchins, BHCF Board*
Mary Lou Bertoloni, BHCF Board*
Lelo Havener, BHCF Board*
Elizabeth Egger, BHCF Board*
Sister Janet Simons, BHCF Board*
Stephen Antonaros, BHCF Board*
Lorenzo R. Dill, BHCF Board*
Barbara Bugor, BHCF Board*
Margaret C. Randolph, Northwest Bernal Block Club*
Maureen Lamb, NWBBBC*
Tim Molinari, BHCF Planning & Dev’t Committee*
Buck Bugor, BHCF P & D Committee*
***Organization for identification purposes only.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Balboa Reservoir Development Ban

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco Needs Affordable Housing — Vote No on Proposition E

Everyone agrees that San Francisco needs affordable housing. The questions are how and where that affordable housing can be built.

The Balboa Reservoir housing development, to be built on the site of a reservoir built thirty years ago and unused since that time, answers those important questions for more than 200 San Francisco first-time homebuying families by providing:
— 203 new affordable three-bedroom, single family homes
— 98% fixed-rate financing
— A mix of 30% low-income, 30% moderate-income and 40% market-rate first time buyers
— A convenient site that has been declared "surplus" by the City and "available for development of affordable housing"

The Balboa Reservoir housing development is a small but significant step in the effort to generate affordable housing in our City.

Thousands of San Franciscans from every community, neighborhood group and viewpoint agree that the Balboa Reservoir development is good for San Francisco. Virtually every elected official, including the Governing Board of City College also agree.

All these San Franciscans ask you to say "yes" to affordable housing and "NO" to Proposition E.

San Francisco Coalition for Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar, Executive Director

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The viable plan for affordable single family housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site is being threatened by Proposition E. If Proposition E passes, 203 single family homes will be lost to the citizenry of San Francisco at a time when they are greatly needed.

The facts about the proposed housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site argue strongly against Proposition E. All 203 homes will be for first time home buyers. One-third of the homes will be available to households earning $27,000. Another third of the homes will be available to households earning $36,000. Adequate parking will be provided within the development itself, thus answering any concerns that traffic in the area will be congested.

City College has no need or plan to use South Balboa Reservoir for its facilities. City College's priority is to develop its existing campus. South Balboa Reservoir should therefore be used for one of the City's greatest needs: increased and affordable housing which is available to lower and middle income families.

As homeowners who live in the vicinity of South Balboa Reservoir, we welcome its planned use for single family housing and feel it will become an integral and contributing part of the community. We therefore urge you to vote "NO" on Proposition E.

Submitted by:
Stephen Graham, Chairman of the Housing Sub-committee of the Citizen's Committee for Community Development
Roderick A. McLeod, Vice-Chairman of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing is a group of neighbors which consists of many of the renters of Westwood Park and Sunnyside neighborhoods as well as owners and renters of Ingleside which are the closest neighbors to the Balboa Reservoir along with some of the students and teachers of City College.

We strongly support the Balboa Reservoir for housing. We believe that the Balboa Reservoir is an ideal spot for housing.

Our neighborhood wants homes in the South Balboa Reservoir.
Vote No On Prop. E.

Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughan
Submitted by Patricia Vaughan

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

As Merchants as well as residents of Ocean Avenue, Greater Ingleside and San Francisco, we support the Development of the Balboa Reservoir as housing.

A Traffic Survey has stated that there will be minimal impact on the existing patterns of traffic by this development.

Additional City College Parking is being considered on another location off I-280 to keep the college congestion away from the neighborhood's streets.

City College has 44 more acres in which to expand and existing buildings at City College have viable means to expand.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
We believe that housing on the Balboa Reservoir is the most viable solution to develop a vacant piece of property that is directly adjacent to our stores on a Transpreferential Street. Affordable housing is in great need in San Francisco and is as much needed here as anywhere. We want to help provide this need. Vote No on Prop. E.

Ocean Avenue Merchants Assoc.
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughney
Submitted by Patricia Vaughney

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction on much-needed affordable, single-family housing at the long vacant south Balboa Reservoir site. This proposition would also block a major housing development that would bring jobs into an area of the city that has little industry or private business.

Sale prices for these units are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the San Francisco housing market, where the average home is selling for $160,000. Construction of these homes will help all young, first-time home buyers and will require only 5% down, instead of the 20% down payment on houses bought with conventional home mortgages.

This plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by nine nearby neighborhood organizations. If Proposition E is approved and this project is blocked, more young adults will purchase their first home in Vallejo or some other outlying area, further draining San Francisco of the young families that every growing community needs.

San Francisco residents will gain apprenticeships, jobs, contracts and subcontracts from this development.

This plan calls for 2 and 3 bedroom, family-sized houses, with space for another bedroom which can be finished when needed.

Each house will have 2½ parking spaces in front and would not cause parking problems in the area. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

City College of San Francisco has no plans to buy the property, has no money for institutional expansion, nor any mention of this land in any master plan. Some supporters of this proposition are motivated by racist notions and have said they fear that this development will become another "Geneva Towers." This type of thinking is similar to support for apartheid practiced in South Africa and must be defeated by progressive San Francisco voters. Property values will increase, instead of a decrease as a result of this project.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition E.

Larry Ural Johnson-Reed — President, O.M.I. Pilgrim Community Center Inc.
Maria Campbell-Casey — Program Director, Bay Area Engineering Societies Committee for Manpower Training, Inc.
Claire Mills-Bradford — Program Director, O.M.I. Senior Center
John C. Jackson
Linda Rose-Gipson
Jon Still — Secretary, Young Adult Committee
Kenneth Butler

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided — 2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Affordable Housing Alliance — Mitchell Onerberg, Director
Bay Area Urban League — Gregory Best, Field Representative
Bernal Heights Community Foundation — Andre Lennell Daye
Community Educational Services — Dorothy Chen, Executive Director
Japanese Community Youth Council St. Francis Square Apartments, Inc. — Sandra Mayor-Jenkins, Secretary
Minority Contractors Association of Northern California — James Haugsebo, Secretary, Board of Directors
National Community Congress — Dr. Eddie C. Welan
Parkmerced Residents Organization, Inc. — Ricardo A. Callejo, Esq.
Potrero Hill Neighborhood House — Enola Maxwell
San Francisco Building Trades Council — Stan Smith
San Francisco Housing & Tenants Council — Joseph Lacey
San Francisco Tenants Union — Jim Paye
Rev. Amos C. Brown — Local Pastor & Community Servant
Greg Day — Chairman, Citizens Committee on Community Development
Polly V. Marshall — Commissioner, San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
Regina A. Sneed
Jim Wachob — San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Michael E. Willis, AIA — Fleming Corporation

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided—2 1/2 parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Greater Ingleside Political Club — Frank Noto, Treasurer
Housing Conservation and Development Corporation — Lonnie Lawson, Board of Directors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided—2 1/2 parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Bayview Baptist Minister Fellowship — Rev. N. B. Mills, President
Bread of Life Missionary Baptist Church — Rev. S. A. Bailey
Cosmopolitan Baptist Church — Rev. A. Ray Gentle
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Raymond M. Howard Sr.
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Carole Nelson
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Cornelius P. O'Reilly
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Paul G. Theiss
Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee — Charles Gale, Chairman
St. Peters Housing Committee — Teresa Rouwerd

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
PROPOSITION F

Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: With certain exceptions, City officers, including elected officials and commission members, may represent clients before City boards and commissions other than their own, and be paid for their services. State legislators may represent clients before City boards and commissions, and be paid for their services. Any person may contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would prohibit City officers from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay. This proposition would prohibit State legislators from appearing before City boards, commissions and departments on behalf of clients for pay. City officers would be prohibited from discussing with these officers and legislators matters that the City is deciding. Proposition F would also prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit City officers and State legislators from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to allow City officers and State legislators to represent clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to allow any person to contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 77

How “F” Got on Ballot

On February 26 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for limitations on compensated advocacy and campaign contributions had qualified for the June ballot.

Quentin Kopp, Marth Gillham and Cheryl Arenson, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 9,400 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,986 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The purpose of Proposition F is to cut campaign contributions by large contributors (and thus reduce campaign spending) and eliminate undue influence by officeholders retained as paid lobbyists for projects requiring City approval.

Let's take a minute to analyze the untrue arguments against Proposition F:

• The opponents claim that Proposition F will force half the City's Commissioners to resign. In fact, Proposition F does not force any Commissioner to resign. It simply says they can't be a paid lobbyist and a City Commissioner at the same time. Does a commissioner value making money by lobbying more than public service?

• Some have also alleged that Proposition F will prevent duly-elected union leaders from serving as City Commissioners. No it won't. Proposition F prohibits "compensated advocacy"—that means lobbyists hired by an organization, not members of the organization itself. Proposition F does not apply to salaried employees of labor unions, corporations, or non-profit agencies. Moreover, Section 8.105 of the Charter precludes it specifically from applying to any member serving as a representative of any profession, trade, business, union or association on any board or commission which requires membership of representatives of specific professions, trades, businesses, unions or associations.

• Another untrue argument against Proposition F is that it prohibits City officials only from discussing pending issues with other City officials or State Legislators who are also acting as paid lobbyists in a matter and doesn't stop those officeholding lobbyists from writing City officials about their clients' objectives. That's not so. Proposition F applies to all such lobbying, written or oral. (The dictionary defines "discuss" as "to examine by means of speech or writing.")

End government decision-making by "insiders" and reduce the influence of money on local campaigns.

VOTE YES ON F.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
San Franciscans for Good Government

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

In all our years of observing San Francisco City government, we have found one maxim to be true time after time: a good idea gets copied, especially among politicians.

For no sooner did Quentin Kopp promise to bring Proposition F to the voters than did Mayor Feinstein come up with an informal, administrative version of her own. Fine, you say (and the Mayor says), then why vote Yes on Proposition F?

(1) The Mayor's remedy of asking City Commissioners who also act as lobbyists before City agencies to resign is nothing more than a hand slap, and is good only as long as she is mayor. It's not binding on future mayors and could be changed without any vote of the Board of Supervisors, let alone the people of San Francisco. Proposition F prohibits this kind of conflict-of-interest, and It will be the law, no matter who is mayor.

(2) The Mayor's action did nothing to state legislators who can also act as lobbyists before City Boards and Commissions, nor did her action stop the law or business partners of City Commissioners from picking up the slack in big-money lobbying. Proposition F will stop these practices in their tracks.

(3) What about the other half of Proposition F, which reduced the campaign contribution limit to $500 so that all San Franciscans can enjoy equal access to City officials, not just the ones with the big bucks? The Mayor can't do anything about this, and she hasn't. Only a Yes vote on Proposition F will reduce the weight of big money and ensure our full voice in City elections and City government.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. If it's important enough for the Mayor to copy part of it administratively, it's important enough to do the job right and make it a law.

John J. Barbagelata
Harry Aleo
June Cahn
Dorothy Partridge

Robert Arenson
Rudolph Lohnis
Janet Wentworth

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The worst and most persistent problem in American politics is that politicians and political races can be "bought". Reducing the size of campaign contributions will be a step forward in reducing the role of money in elections. Vote yes for more honest government.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

RESTORE to the people their rightful and equal power as individual voters by reducing the monetary clout and influence of private interests who make the laws and the policies as City officials and Commissioners or State legislators.

TELL the special interests that their money and influence can no longer interfere with representative government.

TELL the special interests that the voters will no longer tolerate the influence-buying which comes with large campaign contributions.

TELL the special interests that this measure will encourage highly talented citizens to serve San Francisco honestly and responsibly.

VOTE YES ON F.

Cheryl Arenson
Anne Renfrew
David Pacheco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

“Government of the people, by the people, and for the people.”

These noble words from Abraham Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address, cast in bronze at the entrance to City Hall, seem to have escaped the attention of some City officials who pass by them every day. For in San Francisco City government, Lincoln’s simple formula for representative government would read quite differently: “Government of the powerful, by the lobbyists, and for the wealthy.”

Government of, by, and for the privileged few is bad government. Government of, by, and for all the people is good government. It’s as simple as that—as simple as Lincoln first put it.

Proposition F, the Good Government Initiative, will help San Franciscans maintain control of their government and will prevent undue influence by City officeholders.

To reduce undue influence, Proposition F outlaws the practice of City Commissioners and State Legislators representing special interests for pay before City Commissions and Boards. City Commissions should render their decisions deliberately and impartially, not be swayed by the political clout of the lobbyists appearing before them, or by any political favors those lobbyist/politicians might promise. “I’ll scratch your back if you scratch my back” bargains do not belong in government. And until such backroom bargains are made illegal, City government will not belong to the rest of us either.

Proposition F also reduces the maximum amount that anyone can give to a local candidate from $1,000 to $500. If large contributors and other special interests can’t give as much money, they can’t buy as much influence with elected officials. And the lower the contribution limit, the less campaign spending and the more City government will be responsive to all San Franciscans.

You can “buy back” City government from the privileged and powerful with the most precious of all political commodities: your vote.

VOTE YES on Proposition F.

Mary Lofness
Peter Fatooh
Judith Thorson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F, an initiative of the people, is needed to protect the voters and the integrity of the legislative process from being corrupted by the power of money and influence. It prevents City officials and State Legislators from lobbying the City on behalf of high-powered special interests. It also lowers the campaign contribution limit from $1,000 to $500, thus reducing the influence of those same special interests over our elections and elected officials.

The bogus argument that the Mayor won’t be able to find qualified people to serve on City commissions if Proposition F is adopted ignores the plain fact that there are 700,000 people in San Francisco, a pool of civic-minded citizens more than large enough to accommodate the 250 commission appointments available in our City government. For example, there are plenty of architects to fill the one architectural appointment on the Art Commission, just as there are plenty of non-lobbyist business people and lawyers available to serve on other commissions.

Thousands of San Franciscans, not just the “insiders”, are ready, willing, and able to serve the public.

Proposition F deserves your vote. Restore integrity to City government. Restore the confidence of the citizens of San Francisco in that government. Let’s have no more Wilkes Bashford situations.

VOTE YES ON F.

Oscar Suro
Martha Gillham
Marguerite Warren

Leonel Monterey
Tony Kilroy

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE "NO" ON F

This proposition disguises itself as "good government" but, in reality, would drive good people out of government. It is so crudely drawn — so sweeping in its implications — that it would bar from government almost anyone with even a remote business or community tie to government.

It would purge from City commissions anyone who "directly or indirectly" receives compensation from any "interests" with an issue before any City agency. Effectively, this could discriminate against employees from community and neighborhood groups, civil rights organizations, non-profit corporations, labor unions, merchant and business groups, as well as architects, lawyers and other professionals.

Actually, there currently are no commissioners who represent any clients before any City agency. All who are appointed in my administration sign a statement saying they will not advocate for any paying client before any official body of the City while they are commissioners. This proposition simply is not necessary.

Proposition F also would lower the limit for any individual campaign contribution from $1000 to $500. Although this sounds good, it would permit a wealthy person with various businesses and numerous family members to contribute many thousands of dollars through different sources. This would encourage "hidden" contributions. We must strive for disclosure of contributions, not a system which drives contributions underground. Candidates must be able to raise funds enough to put their message before the voters. Reducing the contribution limit can be a tactic to discourage persons from challenging incumbents.

Vote no on Proposition F.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition F purports to achieve a noble objective: The removal of "influence peddling" from City Hall. In fact, Proposition F is so poorly-crafted, it may have exactly the opposite effect on City government. It is not a "good government" initiative. It is bad legislation.

Proposition F provides no definitions and no standards for the public to judge whether City officials comply with its restrictions. Its uncertainties will be chaotic and lead to endless, needless lawsuits.

A measure similar to Proposition F was rejected by the Board of Supervisors because no public hearings were ever held on the legislation. If the public had had a chance to comment on this initiative, it might not have the critical shortcomings, deficiencies and uncertainties that now warrant its rejection by responsible San Franciscans.

In the coming months, the Board will review good government measures that are comprehensive, effective and, most important, certain. Proposition F is a misguided disaster.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

This should properly have been titled the "SINK WILLIE BROWN ORDINANCE"! The "meat of the coconuts" is in Section 4.

Supervisor Kopp's intentions are good, however this sloppily drafted and incomprehensible measure succeeds in "burning down the barn" to eliminate a couple of rats!

Under this proposal, to avoid any potential INDIRECT conflict of interest, (which is undefined), one would have to be a destitute, unemployed welfare recipient to qualify for service on any City Board or Commission! The Mayor has already solved this "hired advocacy" problem with the "conflict of interest" affidavits she demands IN ADVANCE from any prospective appointee.

Quentin's proposed $500.00 campaign contribution limit is an "inside joke" and he, of all people, knows it! It merely obliges a heavy contributor to have his wife, children, business associates, or friends send in SEPARATE $500.00 checks if he wants to contribute more than $500.00 to a politician's campaign.

These proposals require additional City employees for enforcement and wind up doing far more harm than good. Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Union members and labor officials have legitimate reasons for meeting with City officers. It is unfair and wrong to lump them in the same category as special interest lobbyists, yet that's exactly what Proposition F does. Working people deserve representation on City boards and commissions. VOTE NO!

Walter Johnson
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council
LeRoy King
James Elliot
Keith Eickman
Reeva Olson

Hon. Amy Meyer
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Walter Jebe
Hon. Bruce Lilienthal
Hon. Doris Kain
Hon. Yoshio Nakaushima
Hon. Jean Kortum
Hon. Thomas Horn
Hon. Henry Berman
Hon. Robert McCarthy
Hon. Richard Guggenheim
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Hon. Patrick McGrew
Hon. Kirk Miller
Hon. Melvin Lee
Hon. Jerry Berg
Hon. Bonnie Gibson
Hon. Mary Noel Pappas
Hon. Mark Buell
Hon. Tim Carrico
Hon. Jo Hanson
Hon. Kevin Malone
John Sanger
Tom Moore

Jeff Greendorfer
Stan Smith
Larry Griffin
Steve Ballas
Terrence Ryan
Jack Beggs
Tony Marovich

Hon. Douglas Engmann
Hon. Charlotte Berk

Hon. Eugene Friend
Hon. Phyllis Lyon

Donald Dieter
Jim Wachob
Anne Daley
Linda Post
Lynne Williams
Todd Dickinson
Peter Hanson
Herbert Karlson
William Scooritis
Van Hart
Iris Fieulien
Noam Band
John Schmidt
James Mocck
Thomas Korwaki
Wendy Goldberg
Joseph Schwartz
Belle Lazarus
Antonio Barrios
Bruce Barrett
Charles Howell
Walter McGuire
Sharon Davall
Joyce Mauriello

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

We're sympathetic to the need for political reform. But it's a complicated problem, and Proposition F just isn't the way to go.

Frankly, we can't tell who is and isn't affected by this measure. While a handful of people sometimes might abuse their positions, that's no reason to question the integrity of so many solid citizens who give tirelessly to public service. Proposition F is simply the wrong approach. Please join us in voting NO.

William E. McDonnell
Frances May McAteer
N. A. Sapunar
Caroline and Michael Figoni

Hon. Amy Meyer
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Walter Jebe
Hon. Bruce Lilienthal
Hon. Doris Kain
Hon. Yoshio Nakaushima
Hon. Jean Kortum
Hon. Thomas Horn
Hon. Henry Berman
Hon. Robert McCarthy
Hon. Richard Guggenheim
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Hon. Patrick McGrew
Hon. Kirk Miller
Hon. Melvin Lee
Hon. Jerry Berg
Hon. Bonnie Gibson
Hon. Mary Noel Pappas
Hon. Mark Buell
Hon. Tim Carrico
Hon. Jo Hanson
Hon. Kevin Malone
John Sanger
Tom Moore

Donald Dieter
Jim Wachob
Anne Daley
Linda Post
Lynne Williams
Todd Dickinson
Peter Hanson
Herbert Karlson
William Scooritis
Van Hart
Iris Fieulien
Noam Band
John Schmidt
James Mocck
Thomas Korwaki
Wendy Goldberg
Joseph Schwartz
Belle Lazarus
Antonio Barrios
Bruce Barrett
Charles Howell
Walter McGuire
Sharon Davall
Joyce Mauriello

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Concerned about elected officials spending $400,000 to run for supervisor and $1 million on a mayor's race? Then vote NO on Proposition F.

That's right. NO.

Proposition F isn't going to do anything about campaign spending. Prop F simply limits the size of contributions, reducing the current limit from $1,000 to $500. Supervisors can and will continue spending outrageous sums on their re-election campaigns. With Proposition F they'll just spend twice as much time raising money from twice as many sources, and that makes special interests even more powerful. They can always find ways around campaign limits.

We need campaign spending reform, but Proposition F doesn't provide it. Please join us in voting No on F.

Distric 8 Democratic Club
Stephen L. Taber
Burt Gravanis
Alan Raznick
Miriam Blaustein

Linda Chapman
Dale Carlson
James Pirh
Debra Barnes
Lew Serbin
Debra Stein

Martin D. Murphy
Eugene C. Payne III
Suzanne B. McCarthy
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

When campaign contributions are limited, political freedom suffers. Your right to free speech includes not only your right to express your views, but also your right to support as much as you want, any candidate who speaks for you.

Minority viewpoints depend heavily on the contribution of a few dedicated supporters to get your message out. To limit your financial support of your beliefs is to silence your political voice.

Only incumbents, who have many opportunities for free media exposure benefit from this assault on free speech. The dangers of a campaign contribution limit far outweigh any possible benefit from this proposition. Defeat Proposition F!

San Francisco Libertarian Party
Michael R. Fowler, Secretary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

You may think Prop F only applies to big-time lawyers and a few legislators who represent developers. Think again!

Prop F would prohibit many community leaders from public service. If it passes, board members and employees of community and charitable organizations could be banned from serving on City boards and commissions.

We appreciate the public need for a government free of “influencing peddling.” But restrictions on “compensated advocacy” ought to be clearly and carefully crafted to protect the voices of community leaders who argue on behalf of the public interest, not private special interests.

Vote No.

Hon. Juanita Del Carlo
Mission Hiring Hall

Bob Ross
Publisher, Bay Area Reporter

Hon. Jeffrey Ken Mori
Japanese Community Youth Council, Inc.
Bill O'Callahan
American Red Cross
Hon. George Suncin
Horizons Unlimited
Hon. Jean Rita Alviar
Mission Education Project
Hon. Greg Day
Polk Street Town Hall
Hon. Naomi Gray
Hon. James Foster
Carol Weng
Marlena Marseille
Lee Woods
Jo Daly
Dennis Collins
Hon. H. Welton Flynn
(Organizations listed only for purposes of identification.)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will have no effect on developers’ lawyers. None.

It won’t make any difference to state legislators either.

Don’t kid yourself. This is not “reform” and it isn’t “good government.” Proposition F will allow the special interests and influence peddlers to continue exercising influence over our elected officials. It has so many loopholes, lobbying will actively continue, untouched, in the back rooms of City Hall.

And developers will always find ways around campaign contribution limits. As Common Cause has noted, Prop F simply makes tracing their dollars more difficult for the public.

Real reform would directly attack the source of huge contributions—the developers and other special interests that employ the lobbyists to peddle their influence.

VOTE NO.

Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
David Looman
Michael Mason

Rich Waller
Susan Klugerman
Rene Cazenave
Margie O'Driscoll

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!
You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
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PROPOSITION G

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?  

YES 300  NO 301

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has adopted an ordinance prohibiting the City, with certain exceptions, from purchasing goods or services from companies doing business with South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a declaration of policy that says the City must try to avoid doing business with companies that significantly profit from or help maintain the Apartheid system in South Africa. It calls on other public bodies and private groups to adopt similar policies. It directs the Board of Supervisors to identify the companies which have the greatest ties to Apartheid so that the public can also boycott those companies.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to avoid doing business with companies that help maintain Apartheid, and you want a public boycott of those companies.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to adopt this policy.

Controller's Statement on “G”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

“The proposed Declaration of Policy be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “G” Got on Ballot

On November 6, 1985 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for the City to boycott businesses with significant ties to South Africa had qualified for the June ballot.

Arlo Hale Smith, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,546 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on October 11.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,941 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

POLLs CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:
It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This measure calls for a public boycott of companies that aid apartheid.

Any claim of "conflict" between Proposition G and existing anti-apartheid legislation is imaginary: It is the legislative intent of supporters of this measure that it can be construed as a directive for making existing law tougher.

Personal attacks have no legitimate place in a ballot measure campaign. As proponent of this measure, I repudiate all such tactics.

Vote NO on apartheid. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Arlo Hale Smith

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Boycotts are grassroots politics. They've helped the farm-workers, they've helped win integration, and they can help end the legal racism called "Apartheid".

A Gallup poll found 77% of South Africa's black majority favoring international economic boycotts to force the Apartheid regime to accept reform peacefully.

After the Boycott Initiative made the ballot, the San Francisco Supervisors unanimously passed a similar city purchasing policy. The issue that remains is whether to call on the general public to join in, boycotting companies identified by the Supervisors as the worst offenders in each industry.

The companies that would be targeted consider profits to be the "bottom line". Economic pressure is all they understand.

The AFL-CIO, NAACP, and NOW have called a boycott of Shell Oil because of its profiteering from South Africa's oppressive economic conditions. Proposition G supports that and would put the same pressure on other industries as well.

This proposition is supported by the elected county central committee of the Democratic Party, the Peace-and-Freedom Party and the Humanist Party, and by leading attorneys, such as Terry Francois, Terence Hallinan, Tony Serra, Lewis Hope Lee, Marc Van Der Hout, Abby Ginsberg and Terence Redmond.

If South Africa were a democracy, its majority would long ago have voted to end Apartheid. We need to vote Yes—because they can't.

Atty. Arlo Hale Smith, Democratic Party County Central Committee
Paul Kangas, Peace and Freedom Party
Lois Salisbury, Public Advocates*
Dr. Kevin Danaher, Food First*
Jesse James, Mission Rebels
Terry Collins, Community Activist
Stony Geber, Election Action
Robert McCall, Hotel & Restaurant Employees
Executive Board Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Attorneys speak out against Apartheid:

South African police can arrest anyone without charge. They can hold you incommunicado—no contacts with family, lawyers or press.

They regularly censor news, books, music. They have banned Christmas caroling, funerals and other peaceful gatherings. Groups which criticize the government are forbidden to hold meetings.

Blacks are subject to legal segregation; their property and employment rights are greatly restricted; often, they are simply murdered.

As attorneys, we help people who have legal rights that are being violated. But what can we do for those who have no legal rights?

Boycotts and other economic sanctions are the only way to make the Apartheid government accept reform peacefully.

In the Court of World Public Opinion, Apartheid has been convicted of crimes against humanity. By imposing a sentence of economic isolation, we can end Apartheid.

Vote Yes—take a stand for justice.

Terence Hallinan
Arlo Hale Smith
Terry Francois
Karen Anderson Ryer
Robert R. Bryan

Anne Menasche
Rachel Ginsburg
Leo Poli
Gabriel Gesmer
Ora Prouchovnick

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is a moderate, responsible but effective proposal to bring economic pressure on the South African government to establish constitutional rights for all of its citizens.

Vote Yes.

Terence Faulkner, Republican
Mike Garza, Republican

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

All decent Americans abhor apartheid. However, boycotting U.S. investment in South Africa is counterproductive; it only penalizes the actual victims of apartheid.

U.S. international firms have acted as progressive agents for change through the Sullivan principles. Their investments have improved the social and economic condition of the labor force. It is improper to penalize their positive contributions.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

We are individuals and organizations working actively to end the racist system of apartheid in South Africa. And we are voting NO on Proposition G.

Why?

1) Because Proposition G will weaken San Francisco's present divestment law. This law requires companies doing business with the city to sign affidavits that they will make no new contracts with South Africa.

Proposition G has no such provision.

2) Proposition G provides no mechanism or funding to carry out its declared purpose of "boycotting" South Africa.

Proposition G will not stop South African products from entering the Port of San Francisco.

Vote against this useless, confusing, and deceptive initiative.

Preserve the stronger divestment law San Francisco already has.

Vote NO on Proposition G!

Yvonne Golden
Geraldine Johnson
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
AFT 2121 Anti-Apartheid Committee
Artists Against Apartheid
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Coalition of Conscience
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club Executive Committee
ILWU 10 and SEIU 250 Southern Africa Liberation Support Committees
National Conference of Black Lawyers
San Francisco Anti-Apartheid Committee
Southern Africa Freedom Committee/All Peoples Congress

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1983 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!
AIDS Research

PROPOSITION H

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Several city and private agencies conduct various programs related to AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a declaration of policy that says San Francisco should support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council, consisting of a Committee on Education and a Fund-Raising Committee. The Research Committee would make recommendations on the most useful AIDS research projects and try to prevent duplication of efforts. The Education Committee would inform the public about the latest research and about ways to prevent AIDS. The Fund-Raising Committee would seek donations and grants for AIDS research and education projects.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

Controller's Statement on "H"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

"The proposed Declaration of Policy for an AIDS research and education council and the formation of advisory committees of civic leaders would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, additional expenditure of public funds for AIDS research may result, the amount of which cannot be determined."

How "H" Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for AIDS research had qualified for the June ballot.

Stony Gebert, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 10,540 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on December 6, 1985.

A check of each signature on the petition showed that 7,564 of the signatures were valid. This is more than 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We need a council to expose and address major AIDS issues without the impasse of present medical/political bias.

As taxpayers, we are subsidizing a treadmill of continual AIDS casualties. There are major oversights where AIDS is concerned. Only recently was it learned that CDC statistics suggest 79% of early AIDS cases appear drug-related. We hear AIDS is 100% fatal. Perhaps that is because death may also be drug-related in the way of immuno-suppressive antibiotic and radiation overloads to already compromised immunity systems. Prevailing medicine is both tunnel-visioned and high-profit motivated. Also well-funded. This solution may be part of the problem. Some physicians are beginning to feel where AIDS is concerned many current practices are ethically, medically bankrupt.

Remissions occur. Largely through immunity-enhancing, holistic medicine. Significantly, only 1% of AIDS cases occur among people at risk in the Asian community. Perhaps this is due to less drug abuse or use of an unfunded, ignored resource: herbology as part of diet. More options: homeopathy, acupuncture, etc.

If, as anticipated, upwards of 40% of those testing positive come down with AIDS, we may become overburdened. To ignore all of the above becomes part of the problem. Vote Yes on Proposition H.

Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Rich McKirkeby, Former Orderly,
Marketing Associate, Pacific Bell
Joseph P. Clady, AIDS Hospice, Shanti Counselor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There is great need for research and education about AIDS and related conditions.

We need to attack the disease, not its victims.
Knowledge is the only vaccine available today.
Vote Yes.

John Lorenzini, President,
People With AIDS Alliance
Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Jan Beck, Steven Russell, Eugene Ewins, ARC/AIDS Vigil

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There are many possible treatments for AIDS and related conditions which are not being examined by the federal government, especially therapies based on natural substances and processes.

Vote Yes for an AIDS Research Council open to all viewpoints.

Scott Gregory, M.D.
Paul Kangas

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A tape recording (Talking Book) of the San Francisco Voter Information pamphlet is available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name__________________________________________

Address_______________________________________ Apt. #_____

Telephone No. (required)___________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): __________________________

Second choice locations (if any)_______________________________

Signature_____________________________________________
PROPOSITION I

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?

YES 307
NO 308

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the Freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a policy statement asking whether or not the Embarcadero Freeway should be torn down.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City's policy to remain as it is, and you want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to change the City's policy, and you do not want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway demolished, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by at least $10.2 million in local funds. Potential private sector financing and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “I” Got on Ballot

On March 3 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy placing the question of demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway before the voters had qualified for the June ballot.

Richard Hongisto, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 11,119 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,720 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land now under the Broadway ramps is put back on the tax rolls, with low-rise buildings limited by restrictive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when united with Proposition J, recognizes these facts:

1) The Embarcadero Freeway is what is left of a never-completed elevated freeway that would have blighted the City through North Beach and Marina neighborhoods to the Golden Gate Bridge.

2) Today this massive freeway, which separates us from our waterfront, would never be built.

3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.

4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf will be preserved.

5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked for this new system.

6) Only that portion of the Embarcadero Freeway east and north of the Main and Beale Street ramps — basically the portion directly on the waterfront — will be removed to make way for the new system. The removal cost, approximately $10 million to be paid for with privately-generated new revenues, is a relatively small part of the overall new system.

As for Proposition I, vote "YES, let's tear down the Embarcadero Freeway." Then turn to Proposition J and support the plan for a beautiful waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Removing the Embarcadero Freeway will allow San Francisco to:

• Create a six-lane, tree-lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero;

• Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway.

• Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula.

• Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero.

• Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.

• Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won't benefit San Francisco. Don't let outsiders determine our future. Vote YES on I.

Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Jack Whaley
Roger Beyer
A. Lee Knight
Robert Bradford
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Donald A. Crosby, AIA
Rai Y. Okamoto
Robert Meyers
Ralph Hariado
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Douglas G. Wright
Anita Sanchez
Chuck Forester
Fritz Arko
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AICP
Ronnie B. Jones
Randall Rossi
Karl Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
Jon Twichell
Jane Winslow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON I

This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY—VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds — without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city's fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities. DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT—VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

ABSENT VOTER BALLOT APPLICATION
Application must be received by the registrar of voters no later than 5/27/86.

Election Date June 3, 1986

MAIL COMPLETED FORM TO:
Registrar of Voters
Room 155 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

PLEASE PRINT REGISTERED NAME:

FIRST NAME MIDDLE NAME LAST NAME

RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX NUMBER)

NUMBER AND STREET—DESIGNATE N, S, E, W CITY ZIP

X

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT (DO NOT PRINT) DATE (AREA CODE) DAYTIME TELEPHONE
I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.

(AREA CODE) RESIDENCE TELEPHONE

THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT PROPER SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

STREET OR BOX

CITY STATE ZIP

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE.

Sponsored by:

Hon. Doris W. Kahn
Monica H. Halloran
Lisa Klairmont
Jeffrey Heller
Nancy Katz
Robert Katz
Bob Isaacson
John Behanna
City Lights Books, Inc.
Kenneth R. Lerch

Alan Lubliner
Norman Rolfe
Jerry Hurndal
Gregory E. Jones
Marc Kasky
James W. Haas
Richard Reinhart
Mrs. Bland Platt
Donald Block
David M. Hartley

Official Use Only

Ballot Type/Party Affidavit No.

Signature and Registration Verified as Correct:

Date Deputy Registrar
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SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled.
Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYNFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF proposition I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan revisors includes removal in order to make way for growth will pay for itself as land back on the tax rolls, with tive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when added these facts:
1) The Embarcadero completed elevated free through North Beach and Gate Bridge.
2) Today this massive waterfront, would never be built.
3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.
4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf will be preserved.
5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked

FROM:

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION? (FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK — VOTE YES ON I
This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY — VOTE YES ON I
Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds — without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city’s fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT — VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree — it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don’t let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to $15.7 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown, Fisherman’s Wharf and the financial district would be reduced.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:

- Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
- Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
- If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that

— By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
— Queueing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
— MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
— Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City’s plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Judith Tornese

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Tear it down? The concept is preposterous! There are 70,000 cars a day whizzing by on this high speed downtown elevated waterfront freeway! Where will they all go?

Aside from the outrageous demolition costs involved, (some engineers estimate $40,000,000 of taxpayer money!), eyeball observation, logic, and just plain “common sense” dictates that ground level “total gridlock” will result if this expensive freeway is now destroyed.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled.

Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?  

YES 310

NO 311

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a policy statement that says that the City would replace the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt a policy statement which says that the Embarcadero Freeway would be torn down if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt a policy statement to replace the Embarcadero Freeway under these conditions.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

"The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway replaced with a tree-lined six lane boulevard and other traffic and transit improvements, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by approximately $27.5 million. This includes a one-time freeway demolition cost of $10.2 million plus $17.3 million required to match potential federally-funded transit improvements. Potential financing by the State and private sector and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost."

How “J” Got on Ballot

On March 5 a declaration of policy regarding the future of the Embarcadero Freeway was delivered to the Registrar from the Mayor and several supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows the Mayor or four or more supervisors to submit a declaration of policy to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

In addition to Mayor Feinstein, the March 5 document was signed by Supervisors Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker, Molinari, Kennedy and Nelder.

POLS ARE OPEN FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans now have a chance to remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with an at-grade, six-lane parkway, which will open our waterfront and restore views blocked for years by this large freeway.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for traffic and transit improvements:

- New, shorter freeway ramps connecting directly with The Embarcadero;
- A tree-lined, at-grade, 6-lane Embarcadero Boulevard, with a new waterfront Muni line, a jogging and bicycle path from Fisherman's Wharf to Mission Bay;
- Extension of Muni Metro south to the Caltrain station at 4th and Townsend;
- New ramps connecting I-280 with The Embarcadero;
- Changes in traffic flow and improvements to existing freeway ramps.

Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf will be preserved and enhanced.

The Board of Supervisors has specified that the Embarcadero Freeway will be torn down only if preliminary engineering during the next two years confirms—as traffic and environmental studies already have—that removal of the freeway will not result in more problems than it solves.

San Francisco became eligible for $88 million in federal highway funds for this new system when the Supervisors approved the plan in 1980. The $10.2 million cost of freeway demolition itself can be paid from revenues from low-rise development of the parcels now under the Broadway ramps and the increased values of nearby properties. Strict waterfront zoning limits the size of any development.

Traffic and environmental studies by the California Department of Transportation since 1980 clearly indicate that the new waterfront transportation system will be vastly superior to the existing situation, and that traffic congestion levels will not be notably different with the elevated structure removed.

Vote Yes on J and let's remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with a parkway and transit system—once again let us see our waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J gives the voters a chance to be heard on an important and timely issue. This issue is the replacement of a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway as one element of a comprehensive package of transportation improvements in the Waterfront area.

Last fall, the Board of Supervisors adopted for further study a set of traffic and transit improvements for the Waterfront. These improvements include:

- a new landscaped surface-level boulevard
- replacement of the Clay/Washington and Broadway on and off ramps with new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom
- removal of the unused stub of I-280 and construction of new ramps connecting the new waterfront boulevard to Route I-280
- a new light rail transit line linking Fort Mason with the Caltrain Depot
- extension of the Muni Metro to the train depot, improving the Peninsula Commute Service

A YES vote on Proposition J does not allocate funds for these projects. It does allow for further design and engineering studies, including cost analysis, assessment of impacts on traffic, and other matters. The studies will then be presented to the Supervisors so that they can make an informed decision on the plan. If the studies prove positive, San Francisco will be able to transform its Waterfront for the benefit of all.

Proposition J will insure that the City will not proceed with the removal of any of the Freeway until all the studies are completed and all potential consequences are assessed. This is the responsible approach. Vote YES on J.

SPUR
League of Women Voters
Embarcadero Citizens Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SAN FRANCISCO'S NEIGHBORHOODS ASK YOU TO VOTE YES ON J.

REDUCE TRAFFIC CONGESTION—YES ON J!

Traffic backed up by the Embarcadero Roadway slows travel and creates congestion in North Beach and other nearby neighborhoods. J will speed traffic flow.

IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION—YES ON J!

Proposition J will provide regular streetcar service along the Embarcadero and extend Muni Metro service to the south, ultimately extending to Bayview-Hunters Point.

PROMOTE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY—YES ON J!

If Proposition J does not pass, San Francisco could lose $88 million in federal funds for traffic improvements.

(continued)
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

RESTORE THE WATERFRONT—YES ON J!
San Francisco's waterfront could become a focal point for the city, graced by a grand promenade, instead of the dismal, deteriorating eyesore it is now.
San Francisco's neighborhoods join together to ask your support for an improved Embarcadero. We guarantee the freeway will not be removed unless it is replaced by facilities that will assure a smoother, more efficient traffic flow. YES ON J!
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Robert Bradford
Ruth Gravani
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Anita Sanchez
Nancy Katz
Robert Katz
Beverly Mills
North Beach Neighbors
John Behanna
Herbert D. Kosovitz
Jerry Hurtado
Gregory E. Jones
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors
Dale A. Carlson
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Ralph Hurtado
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Yoshiho Nakashima
Chuck Forrester
David M. Hartley
Donald P. Black
Mrs. Bland Platt
Richard Reinhardt
James W. Haas
James Ream
Jill M. Jones
Peter J. Locke
Maejorie G. Stern
John B. Lowry
Lawrence Ferlinghetti
Nancy Peters
Steven Taber

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J
SUPPORT PUBLIC TRANSIT—VOTE YES ON J.
SAVE SAN FRANCISCO FROM GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON J.
The revitalization of the Northeastern Waterfront...as included in San Francisco's Master Plan and transit plans, as overwhelmingly approved by the Board of Supervisors and as urged by Mayor Feinstein...will allow almost $90 million in unused federal highway funds to be used for vital downtown and waterfront transit and street improvements which will be a key to reducing needless auto congestion in San Francisco.
PROPOSITION J SUPPORTS IMPORTANT TRANSIT Improvements TO THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT: It will:
— extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific/CalTrain depot
— create a new rail line (possibly using historic streetcars) to connect the entire waterfront from Mission Bay to the Ferry Building to Fishermans Wharf and Fort Mason
— set the stage for a possible streetcar line along Third Street
Since the city of San Francisco adopted the Transit First policy in the early 1970's, transit investments in the Muni Metro,
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J
A SOUND BUSINESS PROPOSITION—YES ON J!
Common sense and good business demand we make the most of our resources. San Francisco's waterfront is an economic and civic asset unrivaled anywhere—yet much of it is cut off by an ugly, noisy, elevated roadway. The traffic improvements called for by Proposition J will benefit workers, tourists, property owners, neighborhoods, ...and business.
— Traffic flow and transit will move quickly on a realigned, reorganized Embarcadero Roadway, allowing easier, more pleasant access to waterfront businesses.
— An improved and beautified Embarcadero will create new commercial opportunities and increase the value of existing property and businesses.
— New jobs and an expanded tax base will generate increased revenue for the city as several lots now covered by freeway ramps return to productive private ownership. Though limited to low rise development (40 to 65 feet), tax revenues from development will more than make up the city's share of the project.
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Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J OFFERS RESIDENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO A ONCE IN A LIFETIME OPPORTUNITY TO RECAPTURE THEIR WATERFRONT.

Converting the Embarcadero into a tree-lined boulevard and building a new streetcar line will make the waterfront more pedestrian and transit oriented, that is, more people oriented.

A freeway structure that is a source of objectionable noise and casts a pall over a large part of the waterfront will be removed. The waterfront will be opened up to sunlight and fresh air and made more inviting and cheerful to those who wish to walk on one of the world's outstanding waterfronts. Air pollution that is now retained by the existing elevated structure will be dissipated.

The transit orientation of the new waterfront will encourage energy conservation. Proposition J will:

- Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero
- Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway
- Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula

—Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero
—Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line
—Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won't benefit San Francisco. Don't let outsiders determine our future.

VOTE YES ON J FOR A BETTER SAN FRANCISCO.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J GIVES US A CHANCE TO CORRECT A COLOSSAL MISTAKE!

The Embarcadero Freeway should never have been built. The original plan was to build a freeway from bridge to bridge, destroying the Northern Waterfront, Fisherman's Wharf, Fort Mason, and Marina Green in the process. When the people of San Francisco saw what was happening, they stopped it in mid-air—literally.

Walk under it. Hear the noise. Feel the gloom. See how it cuts out light.

It's time to remove this mistake.

The new waterfront plan will give us a tree-lined boulevard, a new streetcar line, and a Muni Metro extension to the Southern Pacific/Caltrain depot. It will give us a transit and pedestrian oriented waterfront that will give us pride and pleasure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

San Francisco Tomorrow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, with a membership of 1700 working architects in San Francisco, urges a "YES" vote on Proposition J. In 1968 the citizens of San Francisco stopped highway planners from ringing our waterfront with freeways. Today voters have another opportunity to return the waterfront to our citizens. Removal of the Embarcadero Freeway is one part of a carefully researched transit plan for San Francisco. This proposition supplies an unique opportunity to carry out a broad range of transportation improvements that will have many positive effects on the City of San Francisco.

Removal of the freeway will:

1. Return the waterfront to the people by removing this barrier to access and view.
2. Facilitate needed MUNI improvements.
3. Encourage development of the Embarcadero as a grand civic boulevard unifying the City of San Francisco.

The members of the American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, urge you to vote "YES" on Proposition J and "YES" on Proposition J.

Donald Kennedy, FAIA
President
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans love Their City, the ambiance, the Bay, waterfront, the views, the healthy neighborhoods.
Freeway builders did their damnest to destroy the City and divide our neighborhoods.
Now we can remove that damned spot, the concrete dinosaur, the hideous barrier that destroys our scenic views, the fence that keeps us from the Bay, the concealer of the Ferry Building.
Correct a mistake.

VOTE YES ON J.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

NO ON PROPOSITION J.
"J" is for JOKE—a cruel joke on us. What will J really do?
Add traffic to every street east of Gough. Delay the construction of waterfront streetcar service. Cost millions in local dollars needed to improve MUNI. Create a ground-level freeway on the waterfront as big as Van Ness, with more cars.
I'm a private citizen who's concerned about traffic and what it's doing to our City. If you are too, vote NO on Proposition J.

Steve Colman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
• Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
• Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
• If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
— By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
— Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
— MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
— Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Blair C. Pascoe

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:
1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION A

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by

---

3.202 Office of Risk Management
There is established under the chief administrative officer an office of risk management which shall review, analyze and report to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the finance committee of the board of supervisors the practices of the several departments, boards and commissions of the city and county regarding loss prevention and risk management, including the insurance requirements of the city and county. The office shall also establish and assist in the implementation of planning and operational guidelines regarding risk management and loss prevention for each department, board or commission. The chief administrative officer may appoint, at his or her pleasure, or contract with, a qualified individual or organization for the operation of the office. The qualifications of the individual or organization providing the office shall include relevant education, training and experience in insurance and risk management.

3.462 City Attorney
(a) The city attorney shall be an elected officer. He shall furnish an official bond in the sum of ten thousand dollars ($10,000). He shall appoint, and at his pleasure may remove, all assistants and employees of his office. He shall devote his entire time and attention to the duties of his office. He must, at the time of his election, be an elector of the city and county, qualified to practice in all the courts of the state, and he must have been so qualified for at least 10 years next preceding his election.

The city attorney must represent the city and county in all actions and proceedings in which it may be legally interested, or, for or against the city and county, or, any officer of the city and county in any action or proceeding, when directed so to do by the supervisors, except where a cause of action exists in favor of the city and county against said officer. Whenever any cause of action exists in favor of the city and county, the city attorney shall commence the same when within his knowledge or when directed so to do by the supervisors. He shall give his advice or opinion in writing to any officer, board or commission of the city and county when requested. Except as otherwise provided in this charter, he shall not settle or dismiss any litigation for or against the city and county, unless, upon his written recommendation, he is so ordered so to do by ordinance.

The city attorney shall prepare, or approve as to form, all ordinances before they are enacted by the supervisors. He shall approve, by endorsement in writing, the form of all official or other bonds required by this charter or by ordinance before the same are submitted to the proper commission, board or office for final approval, and no such bonds shall be finally approved without such approval as to form by the city attorney. Except as otherwise in this charter provided, he shall prepare in writing the draft or form of all contracts before the same are executed on behalf of the city and county. He shall examine and approve all contracts and the title of all real property to be acquired by the city and county.

He shall keep on file in his office copies of all written communications and opinions, also all papers, briefs and transcripts used in matters wherein he appears; and books of record and registers of all actions or proceedings in his charge in which the city and county or any officer or board thereof, is a party or is interested.

(b) The duties of the city attorney in connection with the bureau of delinquent revenue collection shall be transferred to and performed by the attorney for said bureau who shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

c) There is established in the office of the city attorney a bureau of claims investigation and administration which shall have the responsibility of investigating, evaluating and processing for the several boards, commissions and departments all claims for money or damages made upon the city and county pursuant to section 7.703 of this charter or the general law of the State of California. Claim investigation functions of the police department in existence on June 4, 1986, shall continue as an adjunct to the bureau established under this section. Claims functions of the public utilities commission shall remain under that commission unless transferred to the bureau of claims investigation and administration by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the bureau shall also have the power to investigate events and occurrences giving rise to potential civil liability against the city and county and adjust and settle demands, within dollar limits to be established by ordinance, prior to their presentation as claims. There shall be established by ordinance a revolving fund to satisfy such demands adjusted prior to their presentation as claims. The bureau shall be responsible for the investigation of all claims and the analysis of city policies and practices upon which the bureau shall report and advise the several departments.

The city attorney shall appoint a chief of the bureau who shall serve at his or her pleasure. The chief of the bureau may appoint, subject to confirmation by the city attorney, investigators who shall serve at the pleasure of the chief; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of civil claims investigator or any equivalent classification on the date of approval of this amendment by the electorate shall continue to have civil service status to said position under the civil service provisions of this charter.

---

cal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the contractor shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of materials, supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two or more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned and may advertise for

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by

---

7.100 Materials, Supplies and Equipment
The furnishing of the several departments shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreements for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract. All purchases in excess of one thousand dollars ($1,000) shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases and a permanent record of all such quotations shall be kept. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) shall require the signatures of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fis

---
bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions promising manufacturers of or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends, or accepts the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments and agencies to inspect all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall direct the rejection of all articles which may be below standards, specifications or samples furnished. He shall not approve any bill or voucher for articles not in conformity with specifications, or which are at variance with any contracts.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall also have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops hereafter maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting shop and personnel for fire alarms, telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies, and equipment purchased and in use in all departments of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report the same to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments charged with such property.

7.103 Requisition, Contract and Payment

All purchase orders and contracts shall be based on written requisitions, or, for materials, or supplies, in common use in the various departments, on the purchaser's records of average use by all departments. Purchase orders and contracts in excess of $15,000, fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) must be approved by the chief administrative officer. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall approve all bids and vouchers for materials, supplies, equipment, and contractual services. Before the controller shall draw and approve warrants therefor. All contracts for the purchase of materials, supplies and equipment shall be made after inviting sealed bids by publication. All sealed bids received shall be kept on file. When an award of contract is made, notice that the same has been made shall be given by one publication, and any interested persons may obtain the bids and records at the purchaser's office.

The purchaser of supplies shall by rules and regulations, approved by the chief administrative officer and the controller, designate and authorize appropriate personnel within the purchasing department to exercise the purchaser's signature powers for purchase orders and contracts appointed as provided in this charter.

7.200 Public Works and Purchasing Contracts

The construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements, and the purchasing of supplies, materials and equipment, when the expenditure involved in each case shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), shall be done by contract, except as otherwise provided by this charter. It shall constitute official misconduct to split or divide any public work or improvement or purchase into two or more units for the purpose of evading the contract provisions of this section. In an emergency, provided an actual emergency be declared by the board of supervisors to exist, and when authorized by the board of supervisors to do so, any public work or improvement may be executed in the most expeditious manner. Notwithstanding any other provision in this section or in any contract contained, upon the approval of the chief administrative officer declaring the work to be emergency in character, there may be expended by the department of public works the sum not to exceed five hundred dollars ($500) for new construction of any type in or upon unimproved or unoccupied streets.

Any public work or improvement estimated to cost less than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) may be performed under contract or within order or by the employment of the necessary labor and materials and supplies directly by the city and county.

Any public work or improvement executed by the city, other than routine repair work, shall be authorized by the chief administrative officer when the cost exceeds fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or by the heads of departments not under the chief administrative officer, only after detailed specifications have been prepared and submitted by the chief administrative officer. There shall be separate accounting for each work or improvement so executed, which accounting shall include all direct, indirect and supervisory elements of cost chargeable to such work or improvement, and each cost accounting shall be reported to the chief administrative officer, or to the mayor when such work shall have been performed by departments not under the chief administrative officer. All such accounts shall be reported to the controller. Any public work or improvement costing less than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) and not performed by the use of city and county labor, materials, and supplies shall, if not performed under contract, be covered by written order or agreement which shall be based on not less than three bids, notice of which shall be given by three days' posting. Records of such bids shall be kept by the department.

When the expenditure for any public work or improvement shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), the same shall be done by contract, except as otherwise provided in this charter. The head of the department in charge of or responsible for the work for which a contract is to be let, or the purchaser of supplies in the case of purchases of materials, supplies and equipment, shall let such contract to the lowest responsible bidder not less than ten days after advertising by one publication for sealed proposals for the work, improvements or purchase contemplated. Such advertisement shall contain the reservation of the right to reject any and all bids. The officer responsible for the awarding of any such contract shall require from all bidders information concerning their experience and financial qualifications, as provided by general law relative to such investigations authorized by department of public works.

The purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer for bids in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or the department head concerned, with the approval of the board or commission to which he is responsible, may reject any and all bids and readvertise for bids.

The department head or the purchaser of supplies, as the case may be, shall have power to sign such contract for the estimated amount thereunder not in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000). Any contract involving the expenditure of more than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), if for the purchase of materials, supplies or equipment, shall require the joint approval of the purchaser of supplies and the chief administrative officer. If such contract is for public work or improvement, it shall require the joint approval of the department head and the chief administrative officer for amounts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), relative to departments under his jurisdiction, or the signature of the department head and the approval by the board of supervisors of the board or commission concerned for departments not under the chief administrative officer.

The board of supervisors, by ordinance, shall establish procedure whereby appropriate city and county departments may file sealed bids for the execution of any work to be performed under contract. If such bid is the lowest, the contract shall be awarded to the department. All bids shall be kept of file and costs incurred by the department under any such contract, which unit costs shall be reported to and audited by the controller monthly and on the completion of the work.

In any case where the lowest gross price or unit cost bid is not accepted, and a contract is entered into with another bidder, written report shall be made to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the controller by the officer authorized to execute the contract, with the reasons for failure to accept such lowest bid.

If any provision of this section is in conflict with any provision of section 7.100 of the charter, the provision contained in section 7.100 shall govern and control.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.

7.210 Public Works Contract Procedure by Ordinance

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter and, in particular, the provisions of section 7.200, the board and the supervisors shall by ordinance determine the monetary limits not to exceed fifteen thousand dollars ($50,000), within which the construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements may be done by contract or by written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county, consistent, save as to monetary limits, with the manner provided for in section 7.200 and section 7.100.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D, Continued from page 25

point two commissioners to terms of one year each, one commissioner to a term of two years, one commissioner to a term of three years and one commissioner to a term of four years. Thereafter, the terms of the commissioners shall be for four years from the commencement thereof. Not less than one-fourth members of said commission shall be of the same sex, and one member shall have prior experience representing labor and one member shall have prior experience representing management.

In accordance with section 3,500, the commission shall have the power and it shall be its duty to appoint an executive assistant to be the administrative head of the affairs under its control who shall serve at its pleasure provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of assistant secretary to the civil service commission on the effective date of this section as amended shall continue to have civil service status in the position of executive assistant under the civil service provisions of this charter.

3.661 General Powers and Duties

(a) The civil service commission shall have the power to make rules for the employment and training of employees; to establish and operate a personnel department; to fix the duties and responsibilities of the employees; to fix the duties, time, and place of duty of employees; to determine the compensation of employees; and to make such rules, regulations, orders, and procedures not inconsistent with this charter.

(b) The civil service commission shall have the power to make rules for the employment and training of employees; to establish and operate a personnel department; to fix the duties and responsibilities of the employees; to fix the duties, time, and place of duty of employees; to determine the compensation of employees; and to make such rules, regulations, orders, and procedures not inconsistent with this charter.

(c) The civil service commission may hear appeals from an action of the personnel director with respect to:
1. Allegations of discrimination. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the civil service commission regarding allegations of discrimination shall forthwith be enforced by every officer and employee;
2. Allegations of fraud; and
3. Allegations of conflict of interest, pursuant to section 3,405.

(d) No action by the personnel director which is the subject of any appeal shall be stayed during the appeal process except by the unanimous vote of the civil service commission.

(e) The commission shall be notified of the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal of personnel regulations and may comment on such proposals. The adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing fraud or allegations of discrimination shall be subject to ratification by the commission. In addition, the adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing fraud or allegations of discrimination shall be subject to ratification by the commission. The commission shall ratify or reject any such regulation within 60 days of receipt. The commission's failure to act shall be deemed approval.

3.662 Exemption of Personnel Administration

There is hereby established a department of personnel administration which shall consist of a personnel director and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of such department. Any employee who was a permanent employee at the time of the civil service appointment to the civil service commission and whose job function is placed under the department of personnel administration shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job function had not, by amendment to this charter, been placed under the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration.

The department of personnel administration shall be the personnel department for the city and county and shall provide a means to recruit, select, certify, appoint, train, evaluate, promote career development, classify positions, administer salaries, administer employee discipline, discharge and other related personnel activities in order to maintain an effective and responsive work force.

3.663 Personnel Director

(a) A personnel director shall be appointed and shall serve at the pleasure of the mayor; provided, however, that the personnel director shall be selected from candidates nominated by any civil service commissioner and confirmed by vote of the board of supervisors. The nominee of the mayor may be appointed acting personnel director pending confirmation. The person so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointment to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of personnel director in the spirit of this declaration."

(b) The personnel director shall conduct appropriate examinations for employment, establish eligibility lists based on the written examination and provide for certification of eligibles. The action of the personnel director on examination matters including,
but not limited to, announcements, minimum qualifications, classes of applicants, components, construction, weighting, content, type, list length, duration and certification shall be final.

(c) The personnel director shall adopt personnel regulations by which, except as otherwise provided in this charter, shall govern both the administrative matters within the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration and the exercise of the authority granted in this section, including, but not limited to, recruitment, examinations, testing, acceptation decisions, classification of eligible lists; certification of eligibles; permanent, temporary and provisional appointments; regular performance evaluations; promotions; transfers; resignations; layoffs or reduction in force due to lack of work; lack of funds, reorganization, retirement or completion of work; and classification. No personnel regulations shall be adopted, amended or repealed without a prior public hearing upon at least two weeks public notice by the personnel director and after joint and confer sessions with recognized employee organizations as required by state law. All civil service commission rules relative to the foregoing as well as the provisions of former sections 8.322, 8.323, 8.326, 8.328, 8.329, 8.330, 8.331, 8.332 and 8.340 of this charter shall remain in effect and shall be implemented on the effective date of this charter amendment.

(d) The personnel director shall conduct the salary surveys for the civil service commission as set forth elsewhere in this charter.

(e) The personnel director by personnel regulations shall provide procedures to review and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, religious or military factors. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the personnel director shall forthwith be enforced by every employee and officer, unless the decision is appealed to the civil service commission in accordance with personnel regulations.

(f) The personnel director shall investigate all employee complaints concerning job related conduct of City and County employees and shall promptly report to the source of the complaint. The personnel director by personnel regulations shall promote effective and efficient management through personnel programs that encourage high productivity and exemplary performance.

(g) The personnel director by personnel regulations shall provide procedures for employee disputes which shall be consistent with other provisions of this charter and shall be utilized by all department heads and appointing officers upon the expiration of the existing term of any otherwise binding agreements.

(h) Consistent with the foregoing and other applicable provisions of this charter, the personnel director shall delegate to the various appointing officers appropriate personnel responsibilities, including but not limited to appropriate disciplinary procedures, and conduct with appointing officers with respect to personnel regulations affecting their operations.

(i) Personal services contracts shall be reviewed and approved by the personnel director in accordance with the provisions of appropriate personnel regulations. Personal services contracts reasonably expected to involve payment by the city and county of more than twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000) shall also be reviewed and approved by the Commission. Failure to make such review within thirty days of submission of the contract by the personnel director shall be deemed to constitute approval by the commission.

(j) The personnel director shall establish a system of job classification. The provisions of section 8.200 shall govern whenever new classifications are created and existing positions are reclassified. The personnel director shall be the judge of such classification determinations.

(k) From the regulation of the appointing officer or otherwise, the department of personnel administration shall determine whether a position within a civil service classification is, in character, temporary or permanent.

(l) Any appointments made on a permanent, temporary or, where confirmation is required, a provisional basis.

(m) Excepting sections 8.390, 8.400, 8.401, 8.405, 8.406, 8.407 and 8.408 of this charter, all but the initial paragraph of section 8.404, section 8.405, section 8.406, section 8.407 and this section, wherever the words "civil service commission" or "commission" appear in the personnel provisions of this charter, they shall be replaced by the words "department of personnel administration", "department", "personnel director" or "director". Where the word "rules" or "rule" shall be replaced by the words "personnel regulations" or "regulations", the words "general manager, personnel" and "secretary of the civil service commission" shall be replaced by the words "personnel director", and the words "statute" or "statutory" shall be replaced by the words "section 3.662" or "section 3.663", as appropriate.

The clerk of the board of supervisors, after consultation with the city attorney, is hereby directed to conform the language of the charter as herein amended when next the charter is submitted for republication.

8.322 Protest of Written Questions and Answers

—After the written portion of a civil service examination has been held, the questions used and the answers thereto shall be available for review by the participants. This review period shall not apply to questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written test. During the review period, participants shall have an opportunity to protest questions or answers which are found to be incorrect or unclear.

After all protested items have been acted on and after the official rating key has been adopted, and the identification sheets have been opened, further changes in the rating key shall not be made.

8.323 Protest of Tentative List of Eligibles

—Following the completion of any examination, a tentative list of eligibles shall be posted for the inspection of the public and of the participants. The posting period shall be for a minimum of three (3) working days for the entrance-examinations or five (5) working days for promotional or combined entrance and promotional examinations. During this period a fee shall be charged for the inspection of the list. The amount of such fee shall be established by ordinance of the board of supervisors. The fee shall be paid for by the applicant. Inspection of the list shall be paid for by the applicant. Inspection of the list shall be paid for by the applicant. Inspection of the list shall be paid for by the applicant. The identity of the examiner giving any mark or grade in an oral examination nor the questions and answers on application forms or standardized entrance and promotional written test shall be provided.

8.324 Certification of Eligibles

—Eligibles who wish to be examined in writing and whose applications have been accepted shall be certified. Only participants in the examination may receive the examination. If no protest is received during the posting period the eligible list is automatically adopted. If protests are received during the posting period the examination and selection of the general manager, personnel shall be expedited so that final adoption of the eligible list is not delayed beyond sixty (60) days after the date of posting. Eligibles who, as a result of their ranking, shall receive a notice of their eligibility, shall be informed of the outcome of the protest(s) or protest(s) offered by examination. The eligible list shall be forwarded to the adopted eligible list.

8.326 Promotions in General

—Except as specifically provided for in this section, the Civil Service Commission shall provide for examinations on an entrance, promotional or combination entrance and promotion basis. Consideration shall be given to permanent employees in separate promotional examinations and in competitive examinations. Promotions shall be made with entrance examinations for city and county service when the passing mark has been attained and may include evaluation of work performance and other credits. When an examination announcement is issued for a class on both a promotional and entrance basis, those eligible shall include all successful candidates—both promotive and entrance—in order of relative performance.

—Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this or any other provisions of this charter, an employee of the city or county who is a member of a bargaining unit, if he is determined to be eligible to a non-permanent position in a civil service classification shall be permitted to participate in promotional examinations on the same terms and conditions as a person holding a permanent appointment to a position in that classification subject to the satisfactory performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by the rule of the civil service commission. The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to promotive examinations announced on or after the effective date of this charter.

8.328 Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave

—Employees under permanent civil service appointment who, because of absence on duty authorized military leave after June 27, 1970, did not participate in a promotional examination held after June 27, 1970, and during time of war as defined in section 8.324 of this charter, in which examination the employee would have been otherwise eligible to compete had the war not intervened, and which examination is hereinafter referred to as the "original examination", and who were on the Civil Service Commission civil service appointment list, shall be deemed to be eligible for a supplemental examination to be given in this examination list. The original examination list shall be created on the basis of the examination applications from the time their names were reached for permanent certification while in the military service.

—In order to qualify for participation in a similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section, such employee who desires to participate therein must make application in writing to the civil service commission within thirty days after the abridgment of his military leave, or within thirty days after the effective date of this amendment. Failure to file such written request to participate in a similar promotional examination as herein provided shall be deemed a waiver of all rights of the employee to participate in such similar promotional examination.

—The civil service commission shall arrange to hold such similar promotional examination within a reasonable time after receipt of written request to participate therein in any similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section which have indicated their desire to so participate, or have waived their right to participate, as herein provided.

—The civil service commission shall be the sole administrator of such similar promotional examinations. If the employee obtains in the similar promotional examination a score rating equal to or
more than the minimum passing mark established by the civil service commission for inclusion on the list of eligibles resulting from the original promotional examination, his name shall thereupon be entered on the eligible list resulting from the original promotional examination in accordance with the relative excellence obtained by all the qualified participants in the original and similar promotional examinations. Such employees shall be eligible for appointment from such list of eligibles in accordance with civil service rules to any vacancy thereafter occurring, and subjects satisfying completion of a probationary period as provided in section 8.340 of this charter for a period of four years after the date on which their name is entered on the eligible list and before eligibles procuring standing through examinations held subsequent to the promotional examination.

If it is determined by the civil service commission that the name of such person would have been reached for permanent appointment from the list of eligibles established as a result of the original promotional examination during his term of military service had the name of such person appeared thereon, then such employee, upon appointment to a permanent position as herein provided, shall be granted seniority in such appointment from the date his name would have been reached had his name appeared thereon, but such seniority shall be used for the purpose of determining salary increments and calculating city and county service credits in other promotional examinations held subsequent to the similar promotional examination herein authorized. For all other purposes, seniority in service shall date from the date of appointment as a result of qualifying in the similar promotional examination as herein authorized.

Such employees who qualify for appointment as a result of a similar promotional examination as herein provided, and who are appointed to permanent positions shall be permitted to use the time served during the period of temporary service for the purpose of determining salary increments and calculating city and county service credits in other promotional examinations held subsequent to the similar promotional examination as herein authorized, for all other purposes, seniority in service shall date from the date of appointment as a result of qualifying in the similar promotional examination as herein authorized.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules to govern the administration of similar promotional examinations for which they are otherwise eligible, while serving under probationary appointment in the position to which appointed as a result of the similar promotional examination provided that certification from lists of eligibles established from such other examinations shall be made only when the employee has successfully completed the aforesaid probationary appointment.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules to govern the administration of similar promotional examinations for which they are otherwise eligible, while serving under probationary appointment in the position to which appointed as a result of the similar promotional examination provided that certification from lists of eligibles established from such other examinations shall be made only when the employee has successfully completed the aforesaid probationary appointment.

8.329 Certification of Eligibles: Rule of Three

Whenever a position controlled by the civil service provisions of this charter is to be filled, the appointing officer shall make a requisition to the civil service commission for a person-to-fill it. Thereupon the commission shall certify to the appointing officer the names and addresses of the three persons standing highest on the list of eligibles for such position. In case the position is promotive, the commission shall certify the names of the three persons standing highest on the list of eligibles. Where there are fewer than three persons on the list from which certification is to be made, there shall be certified the number therein. The appointing officer shall fill the position by the appointment of one of the persons certified. The provision of this section may be amended by the commission as hereinafter provided. In the event of a vacancy created by resignation, removal, or retirement on or after November 2, 1976, there shall be certified only to lists of eligibles finally adopted by the civil service commission pursuant to the provisions of section 8.323 of this charter or on or after the effective date of this section. Therefore, such certification shall be disregarded except when a statute, rule of the commission or the appointing officer specifies sex.

From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the commission shall determine whether the position is, in character, essential, vital or

permanent, and shall notify the candidate in accordance therewith to the end that the candidate may have knowledge of the probable duration of employment. The commission shall provide for such waiver of temporary or seasonal employment as it may deem just to candidates.

No appointment shall be made to any position in this section without the approval of the civil service commission. The appointments to permanent positions shall be made by the civil service commission to the appointing officer. The civil service commission shall make every effort consistent with current conditions to maintain adequate registers of eligibles established through the regular examination procedure as provided in sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules to carry out the provisions of sections 8.320 and 8.330 hereof and to govern the administration of limited tenure appointments.

In time of national emergency declared by the president of the United States or by the Congress or by any act authorizing compulsory military service or training in effect, the provisions of sections 8.320 and 8.330 hereof may also be operated upon recommendation of the civil service commission and approval of the board of supervisors by ordinance enacted by two-thirds vote of the board. Authority for limited tenure appointments, if established pursuant to the authority of this paragraph, shall cease six months after repeal by the board of supervisors of the ordinance which authorized such appointments.

8.332 Temporary and Emergency Appointments

The civil service commission may, at its discretion, appoint eligibles from other than regular examinations subject to the approval of the mayor. Authority for such appointments shall be made available in existing classified service positions. Authority for such appointments shall be made available in existing classified service positions.

8.332 Temporary and Emergency Appointments

The civil service commission may, at its discretion, appoint eligibles from other than regular examinations subject to the approval of the mayor. Authority for such appointments shall be made available in existing classified service positions. Authority for such appointments shall be made available in existing classified service positions.

8.333 Limited Tenure Appointments

In time of war declared by the congress of the United States eligible from certain non-regular examinations subject to the approval of the mayor. Authority for such appointments shall be made available in existing classified service positions. Authority for such appointments shall be made available in existing classified service positions.

8.333 Limited Tenure Appointments

In time of war declared by the congress of the United States eligible from certain non-regular examinations subject to the approval of the mayor. Authority for such appointments shall be made available in existing classified service positions. Authority for such appointments shall be made available in existing classified service positions.

8.333 Limited Tenure Appointments

In time of war declared by the congress of the United States eligible from certain non-regular examinations subject to the approval of the mayor. Authority for such appointments shall be made available in existing classified service positions. Authority for such appointments shall be made available in existing classified service positions.

8.333 Limited Tenure Appointments

In time of war declared by the congress of the United States eligible from certain non-regular examinations subject to the approval of the mayor. Authority for such appointments shall be made available in existing classified service positions. Authority for such appointments shall be made available in existing classified service positions.

8.333 Limited Tenure Appointments

In time of war declared by the congress of the United States eligible from certain non-regular examinations subject to the approval of the mayor. Authority for such appointments shall be made available in existing classified service positions. Authority for such appointments shall be made available in existing classified service positions.

8.333 Limited Tenure Appointments

In time of war declared by the congress of the United States eligible from certain non-regular examinations subject to the approval of the mayor. Authority for such appointments shall be made available in existing classified service positions. Authority for such appointments shall be made available in existing classified service positions.

8.333 Limited Tenure Appointments

In time of war declared by the congress of the United States eligible from certain non-regular examinations subject to the approval of the mayor. Authority for such appointments shall be made available in existing classified service positions. Authority for such appointments shall be made available in existing classified service positions.
8.340 Dismissal During Probation Period

Any person appointed to a permanent position shall serve a probationary period of not less than six months' service and up to a maximum of twelve months' service for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed ranks of the police department, fire department, sheriff's department and San Francisco International Airport police force shall be for twelve months except that, with respect to members of the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve months' service from the date following completion of the prescribed departmental training officer program, but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment; provided further that probationary members of the uniformed ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedures and rights set forth in section 8.343 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four months may be established for executive and management classifications. At any time during the probationary period an appointing officer may terminate the appointment upon giving written notice of such termination to the employee, and to the civil service commission specifying the reasons for such termination. Except in the case of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments the civil service commission shall review the termination. The civil service commission shall by rule establish the procedures for such review. If the appointment resulted from an entrance examination the commission may declare such person dismissed or may return the name to the list of eligibles under such classification. An employment determination may be deemed just if the appointment resulted from a promotional examination the employee shall have the right of appeal and hearing before the civil service commission. The commission shall render a decision within thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and such decision may be appealed as provided in section 8.427.

(b) order such person reinstated to the position without prejudice, and the commission may in its discretion order that the employee be paid salary from time of the termination of the position; or (c) order the return of such person to a position in the classification from which the employee was selected at the time of the entrance examination, at the same salary, to the extent consistent with the eligibility of the employee to the classification.

(c) Agencies of the state and federal governments and from school districts and other special districts in the six Bay Area counties as determined by the civil service commission. The civil service personnel director shall collect private basic pay data from governmental organizations in the Bay Area counties and surveys of private employees in the city and county of San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. The data collected shall be limited to basic rates of pay and salaries actually being paid by public and private employers for like work and like service.

The term "prevailing rates of wages" for employers governed by this chapter shall be determined by the civil service commission in the manner prescribed in section 8.401 of this chapter and this section shall be defined as the mean rates developed from the weighted average of the midpoint of the basic pay rates, excluding fringe benefits, for surveyed public and private employees and the median of the pay rates for private employment to be determined as follows:

(i) multiply the medians from the private and public employee pay data by the number of employees in the given classification from each data base;
(ii) add the products of (i);
(iii) divide the sum in (ii) by the total number of employees surveyed for that classification; and
(iv) extend this figure by 10 percent to establish the maximum of the rate and reduce this figure by 10 percent to establish the minimum.

When fixing rates of compensation the board of supervisors shall fix basic pay rates as close as reasonably possible to the average of the rates provided, however, that the board of supervisors shall not set the maximum rate of pay for any class in excess of the maximum prevailing rate for that class; provided further, however, that no employee shall have his basic pay reduced to conform to prevailing rates as provided for in this section. For those classifications of employment in which the practice is customary, the schedules of compensation shall provide for minima, not less than three intermediate, and maximum salary steps and for a method of advancing the salaries of employees from minimum to intermediate to maximum with due regard for seniority of service.

The term "basic pay rate" as used in this section is hereby defined as applying only to the basic rate of wages, with included range scales, and does not include any other benefits of employment or working condition benefits.

The board of supervisors may, in the interest of qualified electors of the city and county that neither the board of supervisors nor the mayor have any power to provide for any other benefits of employment except those enumerated already provided for in the charter. Any delegation or modification of benefits of employment enumerated in the charter shall be made only after being submitted, as a charter amendment, to the qualified electors of the city and county. The qualified electors expressly state that they understand that benefits of employment are sometimes referred to as "fringe benefits" of employment and the qualified electors may now reserve the right to make such benefits except those conditions of employment commonly referred to as "working conditions". Any reference to "working conditions" shall mean those compensations which must necessarily be provided in order for the employee to perform his job description duties efficiently and safely, and shall include but not be limited to such working conditions and benefits as are typically included in the administrative provisions of the salary standardization ordinance and the salary ordinance.

The board of supervisors, in its at-large or district may provide working condition benefits for employees covered under this section and section 8.401 of this chapter only in accordance with the following provisions:

(a) The civil service commission personnel director must determine, certify and recommend to the board of supervisors that the working condition benefit is equitable or necessary for the efficient and safe performance of the employee's duties as enumerated in his job description.

(b) The working condition benefit, as recommended by the civil service commission personnel director, is substantially comparable for like work and like service to that provided for the job classification and is provided to not less than 50 percent of the employees of the class in the jurisdiction covered by the salary survey.

9.008 Initiative, Referendum, and Recall

(a) The registered voters shall have power to propose by petition, and to adopt or to reject at the polls, any ordinance, act or other measure which is within the power conferred upon the board of supervisors to enact, or any legislative act which is within the power conferred upon any other board, commission or officer to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinance, act, or amendment or other measure may be so proposed by filling with the town clerks or the election setting forth said measure in full, signed by registered voters of the city and county as many in number as the percentages hereinafter required of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election.

Any declaration of policy may be submitted to the voters in the manner provided for the submission of ordinances; and when approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting on said declaration, it shall thereupon be the duty of the board of supervisors to enact an ordinance or ordinances to carry such policies or principles into effect, subject to the referendum provisions of this charter.

Any ordinance which the supervisors are empowered to pass may be submitted to the voters by a majority of the board at a general election or at a special election called for the purpose, said election to be held no less than thirty days after the adjournment of the call. Any such ordinance may be proposed by one-third of the supervisors, or by the mayor, and when so proposed shall be submitted to the voters at the next succeeding general election. No ordinance passed by the supervisors granting any public utility franchise
TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: All sections are new.

Be it ordained by the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. This ordinance may be called the "City College Public Lands Preservation Ordinance."

Section 2. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall disapprove or deny, WITH NO EXEMPTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS, any building permit application for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, located across Phelan Avenue from the presently occupied campus of City College and consisting of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted, between June 3, 1966 and June 3, 1989.

Section 3. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall revoke or rescind, WITH NO EXEMPTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS, any building permit application previously granted for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, which consists of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

Section 4. The term "building permit" includes building permits, site permits and any other permits for the performance of construction work.

Section 5. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of the ordinance shall not be affected thereby and shall remain in full force and effect. No provision of this ordinance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent implementation of the policy stated above.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION F

NOTE: All sections are new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The People of the City and County of San Francisco desire and are entitled to a local government whose officers do not engage in, assist or participate in private activities on behalf of private interests before City and County commissions and boards while also serving as City and County officers.

Section 2. No officer of the City and County may, during the term of office, engage in compensated advocacy on behalf of private interests before any City and County board or commission, or any member of the board or commission or its staff, in order to represent any private interest, for which representation the officer receives, directly or indirectly, any compensation, reward or gain.

Section 3. Officers of the City and County shall not discuss matters pending before their commission or department with other City and County officers or state legislators when those other officers or state legislators are acting as compensated advocates for a private interest.

Section 4. No member of the California State Legislature shall appear before any City and County board, department or commission as a compensated advocate representing a private interest.

Section 5. In the financing of city and county campaigns: (a) No person other than a candidate shall make, and no campaign treasurer shall solicit or accept, any contribution which will cause the total amount contributed by such person with respect to the compensation for representing a client to such candidate, including contributions to political committees supporting or opposing such candidate, to exceed $5000.00. (b) If any person is found guilty of violating the terms of this section, each campaign treasurer who received part or all of the contributions which constitute the violation shall pay promptly, from available campaign funds, if any, the amount received from such person in excess of the amount permitted by this section to the City and County Treasurer for deposit in the General Fund of the City and County. (c) This section shall not apply to any in-kind contribution of television or radio airtime to any candidate or committee granted to said candidate or committee pursuant to the "Fairness Doctrine" articulated in Cullman Broadcasting, 40 FCC 576 (1963).

Section 6. Any person violating the terms of this ordinance shall be subject to the penalties set forth in San Francisco Charter Section 8.105. Such penalties shall include, but not be limited to, removal from office.

Section 7. If any provision of this ordinance, or its application to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, it is the expressed intent of the people of the City and County of San Francisco that the remainder of the ordinance, or the application of such provision, or any other provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.
rates and the same shall be in lieu of said annual compensation, and notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, said rates shall become effective and be payable as if adopted prior to April 1, of any year.

The provisions of sections 3.100 and 3.100-1, relating to the emergency powers of the mayor, shall not be applicable to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

11.105 Effective Date of Amendments
The effective date of the amendments, additions and deletions to the civil service provisions of the charter shall be ninety (90) days after the acceptance and filing thereof with the Secretary of State.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION G

We the people of San Francisco declare this to be our policy:

1) IT IS IMPROPER TO PROFIT FROM OR PROVIDE SUPPORT TO THE RACIST POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SYSTEM IN SOUTH AFRICA, KNOWN AS APARTHEID.

Therefore it is necessary to sever commercial ties to South Africa, until people of all races obtain equal rights in that country, including equal voting rights.

2) COMPANIES HAVING SUBSTANTIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH APARTHEID MUST BE CONSIDERED IRRESPONSIBLE.

(a) The Board of Supervisors must determine which companies doing or seeking business with the City have the greatest ties to Apartheid. Companies that have a significant involvement in profiting from or maintaining the Apartheid system, may, on that basis, be deemed "irresponsible bidders."

In purchasing goods and services and awarding other contracts, the city must give priority to avoiding such companies; the degree of the preference must be

in proportion to the company's complicity with Apartheid, according to the following criteria:

— how much business the company does in or with South Africa;
— how much the company profits from that business;
— how much support the company provides the Apartheid government in taxes, loans, payments or other funding;
— the nature of the company's South Africa business;
— the degree of the company's cooperation with South African political censorship or secrecy agreements;
— the degree to which the company provides the South African government with the technology, materials and other means to maintain and enforce Apartheid.

(b) City funds must not be deposited or invested with any bank or other company which does business in or with, or makes loans to, South Africa.

(c) If any exception to the above policies is found to be necessary or appropriate, the responsible official must promptly and publicly report it to the Board of Supervisors, clearly describing the exception and the reasons for it.

(d) The term "city" includes all agencies, departments, officials, employees, units and subunits of the city and county of San Francisco, and all funds administered by or on behalf of the city or county.

(3) WE CALL ON ALL OTHER PUBLIC BODIES AND PRIVATE OR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS TO ADOPT SIMILAR POLICIES.

We CALL A GENERAL PUBLIC BOYCOTT, FOCUSING ON THOSE COMPANIES HAVING THE GREATEST TIES TO APARTHEID. The Board of Supervisors must determine and announce which company or companies are the worst offenders within each major industry, so that the public can focus its boycott on those companies.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION H

SUMMARY: THIS INITIATIVE STATES THAT THE AIDS EPIDEMIC IS A MAJOR PUBLIC HEALTH PROBLEM OF CONCERN TO EVERYONE, REQUIRING INCREASED SUPPORT FOR RELATED MEDICAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION, IT CALLS FOR A COUNCIL FOR AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION OR SIMILAR UNITED EFFORT TO STOP AIDS.

We the people of San Francisco hereby adopt the following policy:

The AIDS epidemic has rapidly become a major public health problem, costly both in human lives and in general community resources;

The first steps in dealing with such a crisis are:

— the scientific research needed to discover and understand the nature, causes, co-factors, prevention, diagnosis and treatment of the disease, and
— the education of the public about the lessons of that research;

A proper program of research and education pays for itself in the long run;

Prompt action is urgent, because of the rapidly growing number of persons affected, increasing not only the suffering but also the difficulty of eradicating the disease;

The leadership and support of such an effort is everyone's responsibility;

While San Francisco's role in the overall effort against AIDS has been viewed as a positive example to other areas, the continued rapid increase in the spread of the disease means that we cannot afford to rest on our laurels or leave further responsibility to others.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

We call on all appropriate government bodies as well as medical, professional, charitable and community organizations and concerned individuals to join together in an all-out effort to stop AIDS;

We call for support to an organized united effort along the lines of an AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION COUNCIL, including, in some form:

— A COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, to provide informed evaluations as to priorities among research projects and proposals, recommending those which are most cost-effective and most likely to produce early results useful in the prevention or treatment of the disease, to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts or neglect of promising approaches, and to provide the council with complete and up-to-date information regarding comparative results of experimental treatments, prevention programs and other existing research;

— A COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, to inform the public regarding prevention and other research findings, and to inform relevant government officials and the general public, concerning the factual basis for a re-ordering of current public funding priorities toward an increased war against disease, including research and education against AIDS and related conditions;

— A FUND-RAISING COMMITTEE, to solicit donations, lobby for grants, organize benefits and other fund-raising projects spreading the financial burden by appealing to many sources;

We ask the council and committees to be responsive and accessible to public input, to include representation of all interested groups, to consider all viewpoints, and to be capable of prompt action;

We ask appropriate city officials to determine whether a suitable form of such a council already exists; if it does, we wish the city to support it actively; if not, we wish the city to seek to encourage its formation by such means as may appear proper.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION I

SUMMARY: This initiative asks "Shall we tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?" The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated portion of Route 480 known as the Embarcadero Freeway. This initiative declaration of policy will give the voters the opportunity to establish the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco regarding the proposed teardown of the Embarcadero Freeway.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION J

Shall the City replace a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if such replacement would open up the Waterfront to its citizens, improve the tax base, and create a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic?
Candidates

FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco
My age is 42

My qualifications for office are: The Bill of Rights guarantees that every person accused of a crime shall have the effective assistance of counsel. Whether an individual is rich or poor, that person is entitled to a competent and dedicated attorney.

In San Francisco it is the duty of the Public Defender to uphold this sacred right. In every case, we provide the client with the best defense under the law.

In the last 7 years, my outstanding staff has done this work with the highest degree of professionalism. In the next 4 years, that same strong, professional, independent and ethical representation will continue.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:

Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John D. Bards, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Sala Burton, 8 Shot Blvd., Representative In Congress, 5th District
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
George Christopher, 170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 34th St., Clerk
Linda T. Friets, 830 35th Ave., Artist/Community Organizer
Brian Getz, 55 22nd Ave., Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson, Sheriff of San Francisco
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
MATTIE J. JACKSON, 524 Belvedere St., International Vice President, ILGWU
Jean Jacobs, 93 San Andreas Way, Advocate for Children & Youth
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 370 26th Ave., Executive Assistant to Sala Burton M.C.
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Community Health Director
Linda Ann Post, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative
Jim Rivaldo, 430 Steinier St., Political Consultant
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Member, SF Community College District Governing Board
Yori Wade, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel W. Walker, 562 Campbell Ave., President - Local 250-A Transport Workers Union of America
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilliards Ave., Minister
Benny Y. Yee, 551 Marina Blvd., Realtor
C. R. Zanca, 1966 Pacific Ave., Auto Repair Proprietor

FOR ASSESSOR

SAM DUCA

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor

My qualifications for office are: I was elected your Assessor in 1978 and re-elected in 1982. My years in the Assessor's Office were spent in a professional appraisal capacity personnel and administration. I have two university degrees, the coveted MAI designation, and am the recipient of a special Congressional Advisory Board award from the United States Congress. I have served in an advisory capacity, both nationally and internationally, in property tax administration and will continue to serve the taxpayers of the City and County of San Francisco in dealing with Article XIII-A of the State Constitution. My community involvement includes participation in cultural, civic business organizations.

Sam Duca

The sponsors for Sam Duca are:

Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
Eugene L. Friend, 290 Lake St., Investor
Nancy Pelosi, 40 Presidio Ter., Housewife and volunteer in politics
Walter H. Shorenstein, 740 El Camino del Mar., Chairman, Milton Meyer & Co.
Stanley Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Emma W. Louie, 1257 Jackson St., Housewife
Alfred S. Wilsey, 2590 Jackson St., Chrm. of Exec. Comm. of Diversified Holding Co.
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
Gerson Bakar, 2310 Hyde St., Investor
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management
June McKaskle Murphy, 2235 Washington St., Retired
Joseph C. Oreno, 886 Fulton Ave., Publicity Dept. - S.F. Giants
James A. Scatena, 101 St. Elmo Way, Chairman of the Board, Seutena York Co.
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher
Phrases May McAteer, 130 Sante Ana Ave., Recreation & Park Commissioner
Frederick F. Campagnoli, 2609 Larkin St., Attorney
Betty Brooks, 1736 26th St., Field Representative
Jussi Teruel Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Businessman
Cyril I. Magnin, 994 California St., Merchant
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John H. Swanson, 143 Lake Merced Hill South, Bowling Alley Owner
Frances G. Goldman, 745 El Camino Del Mar, Child Guidance
Irma M. Bernardo, 2182 24th Ave., Housewife
Leo J. Murphy, 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Charles M. Canningham, 475 Connecticut St., Self Employed
Lawrence V. Espinette, 815 Fell St., Conf. Secretary
Mary M. O'Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Volunteer & Homemaker
Elizabeth R. Duca, 16 Wawona St., Homemaker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Application for Absentee Ballot
is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

Name ____________________________________________

Residence Address __________________________________

Mailing Address ____________________________________

Signature ________________________________________

If the person to whom this pamphlet is addressed no longer resides at this address, please draw a diagonal slash (/) through the address label and drop the pamphlet in the mailbox.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter en route to the polls have not been considered.
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YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 5, 1986.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
• are a U.S. Citizen,
• are at least 18 years of age on election day,
• are a resident of California, and
• are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, such as this one, you can only choose among the candidates of your party.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressman, State Senator, State Assemblymember, County Central Committee, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your polling place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—the election will be Tuesday, June 3, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in”. If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

Q—Can a worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
• Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
• mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—An application form is not necessary. You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—you must write:
• your home address,
• the address where you want the ballot mailed,
• then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail by absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—you should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 3, 1986.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS CONCERNING VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

Note: Si hace algun error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

Step 1
USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

Step 2
BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que las dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

Step 3
HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfora con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

Step 4
AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

D 第三步

H 第四步
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO ÚNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto al nombre del candidato. Cuando hay de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escribe el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SI" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borradas están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

請勿在投票記録冊上之打孔針在選票上打孔；千萬不要用鋼筆或鉛筆。

選民須知：

投票時所選擇的任何候選人名，請在選票上箭頭所指之候選人名打孔。如有兩位或以上
候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上箭頭所指之所有候選人中，選擇你要投票的候選人打孔，但
不要超過所選職位的規定人數。

投票合格的非候選人，請在非候選候選人選票信封所提供的預定位置上寫下該候選人
所競爭的職位和候選人的姓名。

投票任何提案，請在選票上箭頭所指 "YES" 或 "NO" 字樣打孔。

選票上若有顯著污點或破損者，選票即作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔错了，顛倒或弄壞了，或撕裂了、弄髒了非候選候選人的選票信封，應
把該選票遞交給選區的選舉員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

請在下頁開始投票

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>GEORGE &quot;DUKE&quot; DEUKMEIJAN</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILLIAM H.R. &quot;BILL&quot; CLARK</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>H.L. &quot;BILL&quot; RICHARDSON</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIKE CURB</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>RALPH E. WINKLER</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MICHAEL CYRUS</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRUCE NESTANDE</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
2. Vote for One.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Position Description</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>MARZ GARCIA</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Tax/Business Controller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contralor de Impuestos y Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILLIAM CAMPBELL</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>California State Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senador del Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAN STANFORD</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Corporate Controller/Attorney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contralor Corporativo/Abogado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DON A. SEBASTIANI</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>California Legislator/Winemaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legislador de California/Vinicultor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>BRUCE GLEASON</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Attorney at Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAWRENCE J. STRAW, JR.</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Attorney at Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DUNCAN M. JAMES</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Attorney at Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td>CLAUDE W. PARRISH</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Business Executive/Controller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ejecutivo de Negocios/Contralor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. JOHN SHIMMON</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Board Equalization Auditor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auditor del Consejo de Igualamiento</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Vote #</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED ZSCHAU</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL ALLEN</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM H. PEMBERTON</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH WILLIAM KNOWLAND</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTHUR B. &quot;ART&quot; LAFFER</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE C. MONTGOMERY</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELDREDGE CLEAVER</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN W. SPRING</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOBBI FIEDELER</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED DAVIS</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE HERSCHENSOHN</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT W. NAYLOR</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-ON): To vote for a candidate not on the ballot, write the name and office title on the long stub of your ballot.
**United States Representative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIKE GARZA</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*WRITE-IN: To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*

---

**State Senator**

*There is no contest for State Senator in this district.*

*No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal.*

---

**Member of the State Assembly**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIMOTHY C. WIKLE</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFF CORINO</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*WRITE-IN: To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*

---

**Republican Party**

*Election Primary 3 de Junio de 1986*

---

**Republican Party**

*Primary Election June 3, 1986*

---

**Republican Party**

*Member, State Assembly*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DONALD DONALDSON</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE S. DOLSON</td>
<td>College Professor</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH HEIZER</td>
<td>Oil Company Officer</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.F. O'KEEFFE, SR.</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAMONA ALBRIGHT</td>
<td>State Central Committeewoman</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDIE WALLACE</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESLIE “LES” PAYNE</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNA M. GUTH</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM KREMEN</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. MARTIN KELLER</td>
<td>State Central Committeewoman</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS J. MARK</td>
<td>Accountant, Businessman</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT McGuire</td>
<td>Businessman, Party Veteran</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAY SANDERS</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
## State Superintendent of Public Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL NUSBAUM</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maestro P.R.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEANNE BAIRD</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Project Advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asesora para Proyectos Educativos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendente Estatal de Institución Pública</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the postal instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

## Assessor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAM DUCA</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En posesión del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the postal instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

## Public Defender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En posesión del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the postal instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

---

**NONPARTISAN BALLOT**

**ELECCION PRIMARIA**

**JUNE 3, 1996**

**CITY & COUNTY**

**ESCOLAR**

**SCHOOL**

**州公共教育總監**

**Vote para Uno**

**Vote for One**

**Assessor**

**Defensor Publico**

**Vote para Uno**

**Vote for One**

**ñ**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote YES</th>
<th>Vote NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $850,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>COMMUNITY PARKLANDS ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for acquiring, developing, improving, rehabilitating, or restoring urgently needed local and regional parks, beaches, recreational areas and facilities, and historical resources.</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>WATER CONSERVATION AND WATER QUALITY BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $150,000,000 to provide funds for water conservation, groundwater recharge and drainage water management, and clarifies language in the Clean Water Bond Law of 1984.</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>DEPOSIT OF PUBLIC MONEYS IN CREDIT UNIONS. Authorizes Legislature to provide for deposit of public moneys in any credit union. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect. Legislation already approved implementing measure could result in greater interest income to state and local governments.</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. Provides exception to property tax limit when acquisition or improvement of real property approved by two-thirds of voters. Fiscal Impact: By itself, measure has no fiscal effect. No increase can occur in local property tax rate unless bond issue is approved by two-thirds vote. State costs for tax relief programs could increase. State income tax revenues could decline as taxpayers deduct greater amounts for property tax payments.</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>ALLOCATION OF VEHICLE LICENSE FEE TAXES TO COUNTIES AND CITIES. Requires allocation of Vehicle License Fee taxes to local governments. Fiscal Impact: Measure would have no direct fiscal effect. Prevents Legislature from changing the law to take vehicle license fees away from counties and cities. Measure would not prevent state reducing other forms of aid to local governments or changing existing formula for dividing vehicle license fee revenues between counties and cities.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>LEGISLATORS' AND JUDGES’ RETIREMENT SYSTEMS. Limits retirement allowances for persons entering Legislators’ and Judges' Retirement Systems after January 1, 1987. Fiscal Impact: Minor savings to state in future years if rate of inflation exceeds increase in salaries paid to current officeholders.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1988. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $500,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en la compra de granjas y casas para los veteranos de California.

ACTA DE TERRENOS DE PARQUES DE LA COMUNIDAD DE 1988. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición, desarrollo, mejora y mantenimiento de parques, playas, áreas de instalaciones de recreación, y los recursos históricos locales y regionales.

LEY DE BONOS PARA LA CONSERVACIÓN DE AGUA Y CONTROL DE LA CALIDAD DEL AGUA DE 1988. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la conservación del agua, rehabilitación de aguas subterráneas, manejo apropiado del agua de drenaje, y clarificación del lenguaje en la Ley de Bonos para Agua Limpia de 1984.

DEPÓSITO DE FONDOS PÚBLICOS EN COOPERATIVAS DE CRÉDITO. Autoriza a la Legislatura para que disponga el depósito de fondos públicos en cualquier cooperativa de crédito. Impacto Fisca: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. La legislación ya aprobada que en lo efectivo podría resultar en mayor ingreso de intereses para los gobiernos locales y estatal.

FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD: Dispone exenciones a los impuestos de impuestos a la propiedad en el caso de adquisición o mejoramiento de la propiedad inmueble al ser adquirida por dos tercios partes de los votantes. Impacto Fiscal: Por sí sola, la medida no tiene ningún impacto fiscal. Ningún aumento en la tasa de los impuestos locales a la propiedad puede ocurrir a menos que una medida de bonos sea aprobada por los dos tercios de parte de los votantes. Los costos de la renta por propietarios de iglesia precisa de impuestos estatales en la parte pública se podrían disminuir a medida que los contribuyentes de impuestos estatales mayores cambian por peajes del impuesto a la propiedad.

ASIGNACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS POR PAGOS DE LICENCIA DE VEHÍCULOS A LOS CONDADOS Y CIUDADES. Requiere la asignación a los gobiernos locales de los impuestos recaudados en pagos por licencia de vehículos. Impacto Fiscal: La medida no tiene ningún impacto fiscal directo. Implica que la Legislatura pueda cambiar la ley para tomar los fondos provenientes de licencias de vehículos de las ciudades y condados. La medida no evita que el estado pueda reducir otras formas de asistencia a los gobiernos locales o pueda cambiar la fórmula actual de dividir los réditos provenientes del pago por licencia de vehículos entre los condados y ciudades.

SISTEMAS DE JUBILACIÓN DE LOS LEGISLADORES Y JUECES. Limita las pensiones de jubilación para aquellas personas que se afilien al Sistema de Jubilación de los Legisladores y jueces después del 1 de enero de 1987. Impacto Fiscal: Algunas menores para el estado en años futuros sin la tasa de inflación excede el aumento en los salarios que se pagan a los que actualmente ocupan cargos.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE PROPOSITIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 NONPARTISAN OFFICES. Prohibits a political party or party central committee from endorsing, supporting, or opposing a candidate for nonpartisan office. Fiscal Impact: No direct state or local government fiscal impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 PROPERTY TAXATION. DISASTERS. Base-year value of property damaged or destroyed by disaster transferable to comparable replacement property in same county. Fiscal Impact: Local property tax revenues would decrease by an unknown amount. County assessor and tax collectors would have nonsignificant higher administrative costs. State would replace revenues lost by school and community college districts. State income tax revenues could increase due to lower property tax deductions on replacement properties. These state costs and revenues cannot be estimated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 MULTIPLE DEFENDANTS TORT DAMAGE LIABILITY. Plaintiff’s non-economic damage recovery limited to defendant’s liability based on defendant’s percentage of fault. Fiscal Impact: Substantial savings to state and local governments. Savings could be several millions of dollars in a year, varying significantly from year to year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 COUNTY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county correctional facilities and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of four hundred ninety-five million dollars ($495,000,000).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CITY &amp; COUNTY PROPOSITIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgements against the City?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C PROPOSITION C HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THE BALLOT BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

262 SI 贷成 無紛当職位，本提案禁止任何政府或
49
263 NO 反對 政府委員會購買、支持及為當

IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE DEHASTA. El valor en
50
266 SI 贷成 金额超过政府支付的物業可被估
51
267 NO 反對 量為政府支付的物業的

RESPONSABILIDAD CIVIL DE MÚLTIPLES PARTES DEMANDADAS
52
273 SI 贷成 程中，本提案規定，在怎樣
51
274 NO 反對 由政府支付的物業的

ACTA DE BONOS PARA DESEMPEÑO DE CAPITAL PARA INSTALA-
53
273 SI 贷成 及其法律。本提案規
51
274 NO 反對 CIONES CORRECCIONALES DE CONDADOS DE 1988. Este acta

PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONTADO

276 SI 贷成 市政府應否設立一個控制管理
55
279 NO 反對 由行政部門推動的

281 SI 贷成 一項控制管理政策，以規
55
282 NO 反對 化市的物業及

OFFICIALMENTE ELIMINADA

正式撤消
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong> Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 288 NO 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong> Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 292 NO 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong> Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 296 NO 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong> Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 300 NO 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong> Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 303 NO 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong> Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 307 NO 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong> Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 310 NO 311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

288 SI 财政
289 NO 反对

"¿Debería la Ciudad transferir su administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil a un departamento de administración de personal que tenga poder para cambiar las normas del servicio civil que se presenten en la Corte Constitucional?"

292 SI 财政
293 NO 反对

"¿Debe la Ciudad restringir o revocar cualquier permiso de construcción para edificar en la Playa Balboa en las Avenidas Ocean y Phelan en los próximos tres años?"

VOTER SELECTION CARD

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIMARY ELECTION</th>
<th>JUNE 3, 1986</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POLLS ARE OPEN FROM</td>
<td>7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fill out this card and take it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR CANDIDATE SELECTION
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

D  Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?  

YES 288  NO 289

E  Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?  

YES 292  NO 293

F  Shall the City prohibit competition before any city commission, candidate for municipal office?  

G  Shall it be the policy of the police and private organizations to operate jointly on the Police Public Safety Committee?  

H  Shall it be the policy of the public Freeway?  

I  Shall it be the policy of the public Freeway, if it would reduce traffic?  

VOTER SELECTION CARD

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>1. 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td>2. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>3. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>4. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>5.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>6.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td>7.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>8.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>9.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate</td>
<td>10.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. Public Inst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

County Central Committee

*Refer to your sample ballot for the number of County Central Committee members to be elected. The number varies with each district.

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR PROPOSITIONS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NÚMERO</th>
<th>PROPUESTA</th>
<th>SÍ / NO</th>
<th>DETALLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>¿Debe la Ciudad transferir la administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil a un departamento de administración de personal que tenga poder para cambiar las normas del servicio civil que al presente constan en la Carta Constitucional?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>¿Debe la Ciudad negar a revocar cualquier permiso de construcción para edificar en la Regresión Balboa en las Avenidas Ocean y Photon en los próximos tres años?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>¿Debe la Ciudad prohibir la defensa remunerada efectuada por oficiales de la Ciudad y legisladores estatales ante cualquier comisión de la Ciudad, y limitar la cantidad con la que una persona pueda contribuir para un candidato a una oficina municipal en $500?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>¿Debe ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el bolsear las empresas que tengan mayor vinculación con la segregación racial subterfugia?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>¿Debe ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el apoyar a todas las organizaciones apropiadas, públicas y privadas, para establecer y mantener un Consejo para la Investigación y Educación sobre S.A.A.R. (A.I.A.B.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>¿Debe ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el denunciar al Autopista Embarcadero?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>¿Debe ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el reprogramar parte de la Autopista Embarcadero, si esto aumentara el acceso del público a la zona de los muelles y mejorara el tráfico?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

**BALLOT** — An official list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT** — If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL** — See Absentee Ballot, above.

**POLLING PLACE** — The place where you go to vote.

**PROPOSITION** — This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

**MEASURE** — Another name for proposition.

**CHALLENGE** — Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

**SUPERVISORS** — Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

**CHARTER AMENDMENT** — The charter is the basic set of laws for the city government. A charter amendment changes one of those basic laws. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

**ORDINANCE** — A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

**DECLARATION OF POLICY** — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, the supervisors must carry out the policy, to the extent legally possible.

**INITIATIVE** — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

**PETITION** — A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

**PERMIT (noun)** — A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building. Proposition E concerns the issuance of a permit.

**COMPENSATED ADVOCACY** — Compensated means being paid for doing something; Advocacy means speaking or writing on behalf of someone else. Proposition F concerns the issue of compensated advocacy.

**RISK MANAGEMENT** — This field covers two areas: (1) deciding on when it is better to buy insurance and when it is better to be self insured or uninsured, then shopping for the insurance; (2) identifying hazardous conditions on one’s property and seeing that they are corrected so that liability and damage claims will be avoided. Proposition A concerns risk management.

---

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.
Risk Manager; Claims Investigation

PROPOSITION A

Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgements against the City?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Consultants hired by the Chief Administrative Officer are available to City departments that have questions about "risk management", such as how to keep damage claims to a minimum and how to find the best insurance rates. In some cases, the departments use these consultants. In other cases, the departments make their own decisions. When damage claims are filed, some are handled by the City Attorney's Office and some are handled by City departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would amend the City Charter to create an Office of Risk Management, under the Chief Administrative Officer. The office would set risk management guidelines for all City departments, boards and commissions. Proposition A would also establish a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration in the City Attorney's Office. The bureau would be responsible for investigating, evaluating and processing all damage claims made against the City, except those claims made against the Public Utilities Commission and the Police Department. The bureau would also have the power to investigate potential suits against the City and to make settlements within dollar limits to be set by ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer and a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want damage claims and risk management decisions to continue to be handled the way they are now.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not affect the cost of government. However as a result of its potential future application and the exemption of certain employees from the civil service provisions of the Charter, costs may be affected in an amount presently indeterminate."

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On March 10 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors voted "No."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON A

Last fiscal year, over 6,400 claims and law suits were filed against the City, costing us more than $10 million in settlements. I believe that it is time to change the way we handle our claims, secure insurance, prevent risks and settle legitimate claims against the City.

Last summer, we appointed a task force of citizens, under San Francisco Bar President Jerry Falk, to make recommendations on how to streamline our procedures and save money at the same time. The present system is very slow, costly, and inefficient.

Currently, all claims are investigated by the department involved. The City Attorney cannot act on any claim until the department is ready. This results in delay and duplication of effort and increased costs. A centralized and accountable Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney would be more efficient, cost-effective, and professional. It would enable the City to settle many claims quickly, before litigation is begun, saving the City the costs of defending itself in court and lowering the average cost of settling a case.

This can be accomplished without creating new jobs by simply moving into one office the city positions presently scattered throughout the government.

Vote "Yes" on A. Reduce the cost of City government.

Adoption of this measure would also formally establish responsibility for Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer, where it has been unofficially since 1978. With this strengthened authority, the Risk Management Office would be responsible for the gathering of claims data on a City-wide basis, the creation of incentives for both reducing the possibility for injuries and damage and the number of claims for each department, the coordination of insurance purchasing and specific suggestions to avoid and reduce risk.

This amendment is presented with the recommendation of the Mayor’s Task Force on Claims and Judgments, the Chief Administrative Officer, City Attorney, the President of the San Francisco Bar Association, and the President of the Lawyers’ Club of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Each year the City spends almost $10 million to settle damage claims. It is estimated that the overall costs to the City for all risk-related activities exceeds $125 million a year. It is time for action to be taken to reduce these huge expenditures. This charter amendment is designed to do just that.

Claims Investigation and Adjustment

Right now, the City claims investigation process is decentralized and largely unorganized. Each department investigates its own claims. Investigators may or may not be specially trained for their duties. There is no uniformity of investigation procedure or claims reporting. In only a few departments do investigators contact injured parties within days of an accident in order to settle the claim quickly and economically.

This amendment will create a claims investigation and adjustment bureau in the Office of the City Attorney. Claims investigation and adjustment activities will be centralized, economized and made much more efficient. The new bureau will be able to respond immediately to accidents and claims, providing quick compensation to deserving persons while at the same time producing a prompt, professional investigation. This reform is greatly needed.

Risk Management

Presently, there is no overall plan for the management of the City’s risk exposure: insurance purchasing, avoidance of industrial accidents, gathering data on accident patterns, etc. Again, risk management as a function is fragmented among the various City departments. As a consequence, departments cannot develop the necessary expertise to manage themselves to reduce risk-related costs.

This measure will establish a risk manager under the Chief Administrative Officer. For the first time, overall City planning will be possible in order to control risk. Departments will be told what activities are producing injuries or damage and advised on corrective measures. Private industry has been utilizing risk managers of this type for years. It is time that the City did the same.

This amendment will reduce the cost of government and ensure a more efficient delivery of City services to all San Franciscans. We urge you to give it your unqualified support.

Board of Supervisors

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This charter amendment was proposed by a citizens’ task force appointed by Mayor Feinstein. Its mission was to propose ways of reducing the number and financial costs of claims and lawsuits against the City.

The amendment has two principal features. The first is to centralize within the City Attorney’s office the investigation of claims filed against city departments. This will allow for improved training and supervision of the investigators, who presently are scattered throughout city government. The result will be more efficient, cost-effective and professional investigation of claims. By improving the quality of claims investigation, the City can identify those claims which have merit and attempt to reach early—and less costly—settlements. Meritless claims will be denied with greater confidence that if suit is filed it can be defended successfully.

The second major feature of the amendment will establish a Risk Management office under the Chief Administrative Officer. Risk management is a concept widely used in private business. Risk managers are professionals skilled in reducing the overall cost of claims. The Risk Manager would be responsible for coordinating the City’s insurance program, data collection, and correcting problems within the City which lead to claims. The Risk Manager would review those claims which have been filed against the City. Where it appears that an unsafe condition or practice has led to a claim, the Risk Manager would suggest to the affected department that corrective measures be taken. Reports to the Mayor and to the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors of the recommended corrections and the actions taken would ensure that the various departments will be responsive.

The City cannot eliminate claims and lawsuits against it. But it can limit its exposure by managing the claims process more effectively. This measure will reduce injuries and reduce claims, and that is good for everyone.

Jerome B. Falk, Jr.
Chair, Mayor’s Task Force on Claims and Judgments
Against the City

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, May 31, 1986

12 Noon  State Senate, Assembly, Congress and State Propositions
1:00      Proposition A—Risk Management & Claims
1:15      Proposition B—Purchaser & Contracts
1:30      Proposition D—Civil Service
2:15      Proposition E—Balboa Reservoir
2:30      Proposition F—Compensated Advocacy
3:00      Proposition G—Apartheid
3:20      Proposition H—AIDS
3:30      Propositions I, J—Embarcadero Freeway
3:50      Statewide Candidates
Purchaser & Contracts

PROPOSITION B

Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?

YES 281
NO 282

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchaser must get the approval of the Chief Administrative Officer before signing certain contracts for more than $15,000. Only the voters may change that dollar limit. The Purchaser must personally sign every contract that comes through his office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would raise the limit on contracts requiring the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval to $50,000. It would also allow the Board of Supervisors to change that limit by ordinance. Proposition B would also permit the Purchaser to name certain people in his office to sign contracts on his behalf.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval only on contracts for more than $50,000. You also want the Purchaser to be able to name certain people in his office to be able to sign contracts on his behalf.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to require the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval on contracts for more than $15,000. You also want him to sign all contracts himself.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

“Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 3 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.
Purchaser & Contracts

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON B!

The City's Charter requires that a permanent, non-elected City official, the Chief Administrative Officer, review all purchases and contracts above $15,000. Of course, CAO approval of major contracts is very important. But, due to inflation, the number of contracts that have to go to the CAO for approval is always increasing. Today there are too many documents requiring CAO approval. This slows down the purchasing process, occupies staff time — and ultimately costs the City money. Proposition B will raise the CAO approval level to $50,000, and help the City to improve the efficiency of its purchasing operations.

The City's budget includes more than $250 million for purchases on tens of thousands of contracts. At the current $15,000 review limit, the CAO must approve thousands of documents every year — a costly, time-consuming process. In the long run the City loses money because of the inordinate length of time required to complete all the paperwork.

An adjustment must be made to remove the smaller contracts from this cumbersome process. Review and approval of contracts under $50,000 should be under the responsibility of the City Purchaser, a highly trained and experienced professional, who reports directly to the CAO. By changing the present $15,000 to $50,000, it will be possible for the CAO to give each document that comes to him the attention it requires. And, by placing its orders and paying its bills faster, both the City and businesses will benefit — especially small business and those owned by minorities and women.

Proposition B will allow future adjustments to the limit to be made by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility will ensure the City's ability to adjust to inflation and changes in the market.

This amendment comes to you with the recommendation of auditors, controllers, bankers, and others who exercise top fiduciary responsibility within their own organizations.

VOTE YES ON B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will make essential changes to update the purchasing and payment procedures under the Chief Administrative Officer. These measures are necessary and desirable because they will save the City money by significantly increasing our management efficiency.

Right now, the City loses because it takes too long for contracts to be reviewed and payments okayed, which means that early payment incentives go unutilized. The CAO has to approve every contract greater than $15,000 — and with City purchases last year over $250 million, the paperwork logjam is vast and overwhelming.

An increase in the review limit from $15,000 to $50,000 will make an adequate adjustment for inflation—$50,000 now is only about $15,000 in 1967 dollars. Proposition B will also enable the City Purchaser, who reports to the CAO, to maximize potential savings through early payments by designating appropriate personnel to approve contracts up to $50,000. These "Good Business" amendments are consistent with private sector practices and should be incorporated by the CAO in the City's best interests.

Finally, Proposition B will give the City the ability to respond quickly to changes in the market place by allowing changes in the CAO review limit by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility is necessary to ensure that in the future we will not lose money because of institutional rigidity. Control is maintained with the necessity of Board action and Mayoral approval to adjust the review limit, and this same feature will allow for change when desired.

Vote yes on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!
You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civil Service

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?

YES 288

NO 289

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the civil service system of the City of San Francisco. The structure of the civil service system and certain rules governing its operation are written into the Charter and can only be changed by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would make major changes. A Department of Personnel Administration would run the Civil Service system and would be able to change rules with Commission approval. Major features of Proposition D are described below. The complete charter amendment is printed in this voters' handbook.

Department of Personnel Administration

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Certain civil service rules governing the general operation of the system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs, are written into the Charter and carried out by the Civil Service Commission. Only the voters can change these rules.

THE PROPOSAL: A department of Personnel Administration would be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. A Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor would run the Department. Certain rules governing examination, selection and appointment would be taken out of the Charter. The Personnel Director would be able to change these rules with the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

Civil Service Commission

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the general operation of the civil service system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs. The Commission also hears and decides appeals on civil service matters.

THE PROPOSAL: The Civil Service Commission would no longer be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. The Commission could investigate the operation of the system, approve rule changes proposed by the Personnel Director, and hear and decide appeals only on claims of job discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest.

Employee Relations

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors appoints an Employee Relations Director to negotiate contracts with City employees; the Board approves all contracts.

THE PROPOSAL: The Mayor or his or her agent would negotiate with City employees; the Board of Supervisors would still approve all contracts.

What your vote means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing civil service system.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE
Controller's Statement on "D"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not directly affect the cost of government, as it removes many civil service policy setting functions from the Charter and an independent Civil Service Commission and transfers responsibility for personnel matters, including labor negotiations, to the Mayor.

"As a product of its inherent flexibility and possible future application, costs could be affected or savings realized in amounts presently indeterminate but probably substantial."

How "D" Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative Charter amendment rewriting the civil service provisions of the Charter had qualified for the June ballot.

Robert Bradford, Jonathan Bulkey, Lee Munsen and Mary Hilton, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 36,049 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 25,027 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

POLS CLOSE AT 8:00 p.m.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. Consistent with the City's and County's affirmative action goals, no applicant or employee shall be selected, appointed, reduced in rank, removed or in any way favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, union activities, political affiliation or sexual orientation.

(b) The purpose of the civil service system is to obtain for the city and county the best qualified persons to fill city and county positions in a timely and economical manner, using professional, fair and equitable personnel selection and personnel management practices consistent with consideration of the following merit principles:

1. Recruiting, selecting and advancing employees on the basis of their ability, knowledge, skills and performance relative to the work to be performed.

2. Establishing equitable and adequate compensation, as provided elsewhere in this charter.

3. Training employees, as needed, to promote productivity and high quality performance and to facilitate career development.

4. Retaining employees during good service and separating employees for good cause.

5. Assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration, with proper regard for their privacy and constitutional rights; and assuring equal employment opportunity, based on the person's ability to do the job.

6. Assuring that employees are protected against coercion for political purposes and are prohibited from using their official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the outcome of an election or a nomination for office.

(c) This charter does not limit the power of departments, agencies, or other subdivisions of the city and county in their exercise of management prerogatives including but not limited to:

1. Directing employees in the performance of their duties;

2. Hiring, promoting, transferring and assigning employees from those qualified;

3. Classifying positions in accordance with Section 3.663 (k);

4. Disciplining employees;

5. Laying off employees because of lack of work, lack of funds or other reasonable cause; and

6. Determining the mission of its departments and divisions, and its budget, organization, the number of its employees, and the numbers, types, classifications and grades of positions or employees assigned to an organization unit, work project, shift or tour of duty, and the methods and technology of performing its work.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

—(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. No person shall in any way be favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, age, religion, national origin or other non-merit factors.

—Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in subsection (a) or any other provisions of this charter, it shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, consistent with a policy of acquiring qualified personnel for the service of the city and county; to encourage the hiring of blind persons. It shall further be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that no otherwise qualified blind person shall be discriminated against in employment, re-employment, re-employment, waiver of eligibility for employment or re-employment, promotion or demotion in any class, subclass or position in the civil service unless eyesight is indispensable for the performance of the duties and responsibilities of the class, subclass or position. It shall be the duty of the commission to classify, and from time to time it may recessively, places of employment in the civil service that duties for which may be efficiently performed by qualified blind persons and to conduct appropriate examinations which will fairly test the capacity of blind persons as well as sighted persons to perform such duties.

—B.203 Employee Relations Director.

—Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 3.50 of this charter, the employee relations director shall be appointed by the board of supervisors and shall hold office at the pleasure of said board.

3.102 Employee Relations

It shall be the duty of the mayor to meet and confer with employee representatives on behalf of the city and county and all its constituent boards, commissions, departments and agencies as required by applicable law. These duties may be performed by a designee of the mayor who shall serve at the pleasure of the mayor. Nothing herein shall limit the mayor from contracting for the performance of these duties.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the mayor shall submit all memoranda of understanding or ordinances to be enacted pursuant to Article V of this charter herein to the Board of Supervisors for its approval or rejection.

3.660 Commission; Composition; Meetings

There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the positions of the city and county to serve the general power and duties set forth in Section 3.661.

The civil service commission shall consist of five members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in office at the time of the adoption of this charter and this chapter section as amended shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following.

The respective terms of the commissioners who shall hold office on the effective date of this section as amended shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date. Thereupon, the mayor shall... continue on page 73
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Vote YES and join 34,000 San Franciscans who signed petitions to get this crucial reform on the ballot. “D” clears the way to modernize Civil Service so that it is fair and efficient. The present system is a 50-year conglomeration of rules that tie the City’s hands—

— A protest by one applicant can hold up hiring for an entire job classification for months—even years.
— Often tests cannot be given frequently enough to maintain current tests of qualified employees. This leads to delays and temporary appointments that make hiring top candidates all but impossible.
— Appointments to jobs are restricted to the top three names on a list even though more than three people have the same score!
— Many provisions are out of date. Some deal with hiring during the Korean War. Others limit our ability to carry out affirmative action.

“D” would remove archaic rules from the Charter so they could be changed as the times require—subject to meet and confer and public hearings. Job tests could be expedited; hiring and promotions speeded up; opportunities opened to women and minorities.

Specifically, Proposition D:
1) Creates a Department of Personnel Administration at no additional cost. Like other U.S. cities, day-to-day administration would be the responsibility of a director, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Supervisors.
2) Makes the Civil Service Commission the oversight body to set policy and hear appeals. Rulings would have to be within 60 days, eliminating endless delays.
3) Moves the office of labor relations from the Supervisors to the Mayor, who must make the tough-minded decisions to balance the budget. Never again could the Board give labor $27 million for “comparable worth.”

This reform is the product of years of work with SPUR, League of Women Voters, Chamber of Commerce. Members of the Board of Supervisors could have put the reform on the ballot last year but bowed to some labor leaders, and 34,000 San Franciscans had to do the job for them.

Proposition D will enable City government to work better for you. Vote YES.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON ‘D’

Proposition D is a complex proposition with a simple goal: remove the archaic restrictions on the hiring, promotion, or firing of city employees and bring San Francisco’s personnel system into the modern age.

Archaic is the only way to describe a system that keeps equally qualified people from competing for a job, and that takes months—sometimes years—to fill vacancies.

For example, if 50 people score equally high on a competitive examination, shouldn’t they all have a chance for any job for which they are eligible? Not under the current system, which requires complicated tie-breaking rules not at all related to a person’s qualifications or abilities.

Or what about being able to hire the best person available for a given job? Currently, eligibility lists are frozen for two years and every person on each list, including the lowest-scoring, must be offered a job before the highest-scoring person on a more recent list. Private businesses couldn’t function saddled with such absurdities.

Proposition D cuts through the red tape. It creates a modern personnel department, with a director responsible for carrying out rules to ensure fairness and efficiency. Accountable to the Mayor, the director would be selected from a list provided by the Civil Service Commission, and subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.

The Civil Service Commission remains an independent body, with the right to approve new personnel rules and hold hearings on abuses. Also under ‘D’, negotiations with employee unions would be under the Mayor, subject to approval by the Supervisors, providing checks and balances in balancing our budget.

With greater accountability and continued checks and balances, Proposition D will open the way to more efficient government in our City.

Bill Maher, Supervisor
Louise Renne, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON ‘D’

Proposition D is a necessary reform to the City’s Civil System. As the City’s Chief Administrative Officer for almost ten years, I have found that quality employee hiring is difficult and the process causes long delays.

The current system is:
• inflexible. The City cannot hire and promote the most qualified persons.
• inefficiently administered by a commission. Other large

(continued)
Civil Service

Cities do not have such a bureaucratic process.

- antiquated. Civil service rules represent practices of the 1950s rather than the 1980s.

The new system:

- allows the Mayor to appoint an effective personnel director, who controls administration and procedures.

- allows efficient procedures to be developed with review of the Civil Service Commission.

- eliminates cumbersome and dated rules and practices.

- expedites City hiring and promotion procedures.

I urge a Yes vote on Proposition D.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

It's 1986 and we're still trying to manage City business as if it were 1932. As heads of City departments, charged with the daily responsibility of putting out fires, fighting crime, maintaining hospitals, parks, libraries and providing other essential services, we know from bitter experience about shortcomings of the existing Civil Service System.

Enacted with the City Charter in 1932, the system is foundering in red tape. Outdated rules are the subject of endless challenges. Tests are put off; vacancies go unfilled; promotions delayed; any appeal, however groundless, stops the process in its tracks.

Proposition D would take old procedures out of the Charter so they could be changed in an orderly process by the Civil Service Commission, which also would hear appeals.

Day-to-day administration of the tests—the content, scoring, all the myriad details of managing a complex system, would be put into a modern, highly professional personnel office. Tests would be speeded up. Hiring would keep pace with need. Promotions would be on the basis of competence. High performance would be the standard. Discipline could be imposed with working rights fully protected, and women and minorities would be assured equal opportunity.

Proposition D will help improve management and the quality of City services. Vote Yes on D.

Frank Jordan, Chief of Police
Emmet Condon, Fire Chief
Don Birrer, Director, Public Works
Mary Burns, General Manager, Recreation & Park
John Frantz, City Librarian
Eugene Gartland, Director, Port
Marvin Geistlinger, Purchaser
Wilbur Hamilton, Executive Director, Redevelopment Agency
Claire Inacis, Director, Arts Commission
Ray King, Director, Parking Authority
Dean Macris, Director, City Planning
Grant Mickins, Director, Human Rights Commission
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, PUC
Joyce Ream, Director, Aging
Ed Sargfield, General Manager, Social Services
Thelma Shelley, Managing Director, War Memorial
Moin So, Executive Director, Community Development
Louis Turpen, Director of Airport
Dr. David Werdegar, Director, Health Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The hiring practices outlined in San Francisco City Charter have been virtually unchanged since 1931, a severe handicap in running a modern city. Proposition D is designed to streamline the charter and ensure that the rights of present city employees and candidates for city jobs are protected, while improving the hiring process itself. The initiative also builds management accountability in the city system.

Proposition D Is More Fair, More Efficient, More Economical

The day-to-day personnel functions, including hiring, will be consolidated under a Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. Decisions of the Director of Personnel on examination content and administration are final, unless a decision is stayed during the appeal process by a unanimous vote of the Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D will make it easier to modernize the many archaic Civil Service rules and procedures now included in the Charter, while maintaining a strong and independent Civil Service Commission to safeguard the merit system and protect the rights of city employees. Many detailed rules will come out of the Charter and will become personnel regulations. These regulations can then be modernized, but only through a process which includes public hearings and meet and confer sessions with the union involved. In addition, the Civil Service Commission must approve any changes or new regulations governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfer, resignation and terminations.

Proposition D Will Improve Performance And Public Confidence

The openness and fairness of the proposition will benefit everyone. Well-qualified job candidates will have a better chance of being hired, and well-qualified job holders will have a better chance of being promoted. This means generally better job performance in all departments, resulting in higher employee morale and more public confidence in city government.

Submitted by
Louis Hop Lee, President
Civil Service Commission
Lee Munson, Member Civil Service Commission and
Treasurer, San Franciscans for Fair and Efficient Government

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Cities can survive only with strong management. The greatest budgetary restraint must be exercised to assure that full value is received for each tax dollar spent.

With firm limits on what it can spend and faced with a possible loss of Federal funds next year, the City must be managed with the greatest possible efficiency.

Essential to greater efficiency is the need for Civil Service reform. As members of City Commissions, we constantly confront the torturous delays and confused rules that grindlock the present system. The present system simply can’t respond to the City’s personnel needs.

Qualified applicants become frustrated and seek employment elsewhere. Promotions are blocked. Morale suffers. Temporaries fill in; overtime mounts. The ability to plan is crippled; management is weakened.

Proposition D would put the system on a business-like basis. A personnel department would handle day-to-day administration. The Civil Service Commission would be the watchdog to assure the integrity of the merit system.

This streamlined system would replace what is now inflexible and cumbersome. Testing could be accelerated; hiring made more efficient and promotions made on time. The result would be greater efficiency and elimination of costly waste.

Vote Yes on D.

Jerry E. Berg, President, Board of Permit Appeals
Henry Berman, President, Fire Commission
Mo Bernstein, President, Airport Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Hector Chinchilla, Rent Board
Rev. Harry Chau, Housing Authority
Dr. Arthur Coleman, President, Port Commission
Owen Davis, Police Commission
J. Edward Fleishman, airports Commission
H. Welton Flynn, President, Public Utilities Commission
James Foster, Health Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation & Park Commission
James Fussell, President, Housing Authority
Anne Halsted, Port Commission
Tommy Harris, Recreation & Park Commission
Tom Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Walter Jebe, Public Library Commission
Jeffrey Lee, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Philip Lee, President, Health Commission
Bruce W. Lilienthal, Small Business Advisory Commission
Jacqueline Nemirovski, President, Arts Commission
Toby Rosenblatt, President, Planning Commission
Dr. David Sanchez, President, Police Commission
Irwin San Jule, Housing Authority
John Patrick Short, President, Parking Authority
Marjorie G. Stern, President, Public Library Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D contains civil service reform measures urged by the League of Women Voters since 1969.

Proposition D will:
— Modernize the City’s outdated personnel system by creating a Director of Personnel, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors
— Preserve the principles of merit through policies set by the Civil Service Commission
— Create a more responsive Civil Service system at no additional cost to the taxpayer

EFFICIENCY AND FLEXIBILITY

Proposition D transfers authority for day-to-day management of the City’s personnel system from the Civil Service Commission to the Director of Personnel. This will:
— Prevent hiring delays
— Ensure only the most qualified individuals are hired and promoted
— Provide City managers with more administrative flexibility

FAIRNESS FOR EMPLOYEES

Proposition D will:
— Safeguard the rights of City workers
— Protect gains made in hiring women and minorities
— Retain the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit appeals board
— Retain the ability of the City’s unions to negotiate working conditions
— Create a system that can respond quickly and fairly to the needs of City workers

Proposition D will bring the Civil Service system into the 20th century by making the Mayor accountable for the management of a system employing more than 25,000 people. Hiring by merit is still guaranteed by the Charter. Please join us in voting for this Reform!

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
Esther Marks, Past President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote Yes on Proposition D the Civil Service Modernization Initiative.

Prevent abuse of a system that was intended to serve the public and protect against favoritism. Prevent situations like this: an employee failed to report to work for a week without explanation; he was telephoned, notified by certified mail and a message left under his door; he was terminated 13 days later; he did not appeal the termination and the civil service commission up-
Civil Service

held the termination. Two months later, the employee petitioned the commission for reinstatement. The employee got his job back, not because the process of termination was wrong but because the commission had a long standing objection to using "absent without leave" as a reason for firing.

The quality of public services is dependent upon the effectiveness of the staff who deliver them. The primary role of the civil service commission should be to facilitate recruitment and retention of the best available personnel. It must protect against favoritism and must assure that everyone has an equal and fair chance at employment.

The present system does not do that. We feel this initiative will make the system work better, for the managers, for the employees and for the public.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco government is huge, with a budget of more than $1 billion per year and 25,000 employees. It is expected to solve serious problems. This requires that the City have the ability to hire and promote talented people to do the job.

The present civil service system is so tied up in red tape that jobs remain vacant for six months to a year, and all too often someone who is not capable of doing a good job is hired. Your tax dollars are being wasted, and you are not receiving the quality of services you need and deserve.

Proposition D will modernize San Francisco's civil service system. It separates the personnel department from the Civil Service Commission, and puts the department under the Mayor where it belongs. The Mayor is responsible for balancing the budget and delivering city services as efficiently as possible. She cannot do this unless she can find capable people to do the job. That is the task of the personnel department in any organization.

Proposition D will also insure that the independent Civil Service Commission has sufficient authority to require the personnel system to be fair in its treatment of City employees. The Commission will be able to issue subpoenas and require testimony of witnesses on investigations it conducts. Should it find that discrimination has occurred, it can issue orders that must be obeyed.

Most major American cities, and virtually all cities and counties in California, have the kind of civil service system that will be established by Proposition D. San Francisco's present system is still mired in the past. It hobbles the ability of the City to deliver services and spend your tax dollars as efficiently as possible.

SPUR has not placed a statement in the Voter's Handbook for any other issue over the past 15 years. We feel that Proposition D is so vital for San Francisco's future that we are making this appeal for your support.

Vote "YES" on Proposition D.

SPUR—The San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

OF PROPOSITION D

working conditions within the City's financial capacity.

Proposition D is the result of years of painstaking review by the most experienced, able and respected management experts in San Francisco. It is a plan intended to move City government out of the 1930s and equip San Francisco to enter the twenty-first century without being burdened by the red tape of the past.

After ten years of commitment to improving our City, the Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee is convinced adoption of Proposition D is one of the most important issues facing the voters. CHANGE IS LONG OVERDUE. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by,
The Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee

David Anacker
Jerome Anderson
Richard Blum
Charles Chapman
Arthur Cooke, Jr.
Benton Dial
James Edgar
Ruben Garcia

Robert Hayden
Walter Headley
John Jacobs
Michael McGill
Ellen Newman
Roy Nordman
Frank Tatum

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civil Service

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PERSONNEL MANAGERS SAY YES ON PROPOSITION D

As the personnel managers for City Departments, we are charged with the responsibility of managing the City's personnel system. The activities include examinations, hiring, training, discipline, union-management relations, affirmative action and compensation. No one knows better than we the frustrations experienced in attempting to monitor an unbelievable sequence of overlapping bureaucratic activities in attempting to get the job done.

Proposition D will bring our personnel system into line with most other public personnel systems. The improved system will create the potential for being more responsive to the needs of operating departments. It will improve labor relations by transferring this function to the executive branch of government where it belongs.

Proposition D will streamline certain routine procedures resulting in a reduction of cost and time. Under the current system delays are experienced due to lengthy appeals during which time the departments' objectives are delayed.

Proposition D will create an atmosphere of increased accountability for department managers in the areas of affirmative action, discipline and job performance.

Proposition D has been endorsed by the San Francisco Council of Human Resource Managers, the association of over one hundred personnel managers in City government.

Proposition D strengthens merit system principles. Civil Service commissioners will have more time to enforce and protect these principles rather than being bogged down in the day-to-day activities of administration.

Proposition D will help bring about improved methods and practices in personnel administration and should result in a more competent and effective workforce which the citizens of San Francisco have a right to expect.

Alvin W. Schaaf
Personnel Director
Recreation and Park Department
Marsha Ramirez
Personnel Officer
San Francisco Port
Edward M. Gazzano
Personnel Director
Department of Health
James Howan
Senior Personnel Officer
Department of Social Services
James Kinicki
Personnel Director
San Francisco International Airport

Andrea R. Gourdine
Manager, Bureau of Personnel & Training
Public Utilities Commission
Moris Noguchi
Senior Department Personnel Officer
Mary Smith
Senior Personnel Officer
Laguna Honda Hospital
Thelma Poteet
Senior Personnel Officer
San Francisco General Hospital
John Burke
Personnel Director
Controller's Office

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will assist the Department of Public Works by streamlining the Civil Service process.

- Under the current system, the duration of eligible lists from 2 to 4 years hampers the Department from hiring graduates of colleges and universities on an annual basis. Consequently, many excellent candidates are not entered into the Civil Service System. Passage of the proposition will improve the quality of the pool of applicants and thereby the quality of public service given by the Department.

- The establishment of a Personnel Director to administer the day-to-day tasks of the system will speed up the decision making process to the advantage of employees and management alike.

- The proposition still calls for checks and balances in that the Commission will continue to hear appeals on discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest. The Commission will act as a watchdog while leaving the general administration to the Personnel Director.

The initiative will make for an improved system for employees, management and the citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Donald Birrer
Director of Public Works

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Passage of this amendment will update our civil service system. These changes will make it comparable to other merit system agencies. Some of these changes are

(A) removal of administrative details from the charter which inhibit timely and effective personnel actions.

The following subjects will be placed in personnel regulations:

- Protests of written questions and answers
- Protests of tentative employment lists
- Promotional examinations

- Examinations for employees on military leave
- Certification of eligibles — Rule of three
- Duration of employment lists
- Temporary employee appointments

(B) allows continuous up-dating of employment lists.

(C) allows equitable treatment of job candidates with same test score.

(D) realigns responsibilities: the Civil Service Commission dealing primarily with compliance and adjudication activities (continued)
while the Personnel Department administers the day-to-day operation of the merit system.

Equally important the amendment retains important merit system provisions dealing with:
- Employee salary setting procedures
- Positions subject to merit system examinations
- Public hearing and meet and confer requirements
- Penalties for examination fraud
- Seniority, meritorious service and applicable educational credits for promotional examinations in the Police/Fire De-

partsments
- Termination of unsatisfactory employees
- Disciplinary suspensions
- Conflict of interest
- Creation of positions

Proposition "D" merits a 'YES' vote.

John J. Walsh
General Manager Personnel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Initiative, is a long-overdue reform to streamline antiquated hiring practices in San Francisco’s fifty-year-old charter. Proposition D will ensure that the best and brightest job candidates are chosen to serve our city, thus promoting excellence in job performance and helping to eliminate incompetence. This initiative builds management accountability in the city system, while giving the Civil Service Commission the independence to protect the rights of women and minorities.

A Better, More Efficient System at Less Cost

Proposition D consolidates personnel functions, including hiring, under a new Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. The Director has final authority over content of examinations given city job applicants, so more flexibility is possible in finding truly qualified candidates.

Proposition D redefines the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit systems appeals board and policy-setting body. The merit principles are spelled out in the Proposition. This allows the Commission to protect the rights of women and minorities at no cost to the public.

More Fair to Everyone

Proposition D greatly improves the city charter. Well-qualified job candidates have a better chance to be hired and well-qualified job holders have a better chance to be promoted. The public is rewarded with the better job performance, efficiency and friendliness one expects from good government employees. All of these improvements are at no additional cost to the taxpayer.

Submitted by
James W. Haas

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service System, as presently constituted, (vintage 1932), is uncivil, and there is nothing "systematic" about it! It’s pure, unadulterated municipal lunacy and chaos! Remarkably, BOTH Management and Labor despise it. It certainly is NOT producing the best qualified persons to fill City jobs!

Let’s follow Mayor Feinstein’s recommendations. If this operation doesn’t dramatically improve, there are always FUTURE ELECTIONS where additional, more Draconian changes can be considered by the voters.

As matters now stand, it is far better to light a candle than just sit and curse the darkness! Any changes will be an improvement! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. ÒKeeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

For more than a half-century, San Francisco Mayors have abided by the employee examination, hiring and promotion policies administered by a strong and independent Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D is a deceptive and dangerous scheme that would give future Mayor’s and top-level bureaucrats the power to ignore competence and reward political loyalty.

Proposition D would take key Civil Service employment rules out of the City Charter and make them subject to wheeling and dealing by City Hall politicians.

There’s an old saying — "if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it."

Civil Service has worked well for more than 50 years. Proposition D is unnecessary, ineffective and even counter-productive.

It’s not just deceptive, it’s dangerous.

Joseph L. Alioto
Former Mayor of San Francisco

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Time and time again, different groups have put various propositions on the ballot to weaken our Civil Service System and reintroduce political patronage into City employment practices.

And every time the voters have wisely rejected these schemes, no matter how cleverly they have been disguised.

Proposition D is just another power grab by bureaucrats at the top in City Hall.

We've said NO! loud and clear in the past. Let's say NO one more time.

Submitted by:
TAXPAYERS FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT
Thomas Scanlon
City Treasurer, Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "D"!!!

During the eight years while a member of the Board of Supervisors, I fought hard to reform the Civil Service Commission to bring working conditions and city workers' pay equitable to both workers and taxpayers. I fought to insure an independent Civil Service Commission that would remain just that — independent and free from political influence and political patronage of particularly the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

I am truly saddened by the Mayor's insistence in bringing this disastrous Proposition "D" before the voters. Some of the Supervisors rejected this misguided measure for what it is; an unwise consolidation of authority to hire, fire and promote city workers by the Mayor and newly created personnel officer.

My efforts to bring pay equity to both taxpayers and city workers were continually squashed by then Supervisor Feinstein and Supervisor Molinari. Finally, in 1975, shortly after a disastrous city strike, I was able to place on the ballot, for voter approval, a measure that almost eliminates the power of the Mayor and Supervisors to manipulate the pay of city workers. This measure was overwhelmingly passed by the voters that year and we have not had any labor unrest since that date.

Vote No on "D"!
"D" stands for disaster. It will undo many of these reforms. Also, right now, the City is almost broke, thanks to the manipulation of Mayor Feinstein and her chief ally Supervisor Molinari.

If "D" passes the cost of operating our city government will increase in the next 24 months by not less than $60,000,000. Contrary to the provisions of Proposition 13, property taxes would be increased, thus forcing up rents.

Don't weaken our Civil Service Commission, whereby least deserving city employees could be promoted because of connection or clout.

We now almost have more problems than we can handle. We don't want our city turned into another Chicago, wherefor nearly half a century a corrupt political system flourished under Mayor Richard Daley.

John Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We join San Franciscans for Fair Employment in opposing the Civil Service Initiative, Proposition D.

This measure will severely hamper the well-being of the San Francisco Fire and Police Departments. These departments are two of the finest in the Country and have consistently protected life and property in a professional manner. They must continue that tradition with a civil service system based on MERIT and not political patronage.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.
Andrew C. Casper
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Keith P. Caldec
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

William F. Murray
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Thomas J. Cahill
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired

Donald M. Scott
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Our present Civil Service system was designed to keep corruption out of government. It has generally served that purpose well. This proposition would dismantle that system and in my opinion open the doors to nepotism, favoritism, patronage and corruption. Better a city government that is bureaucratic than one that is corrupt. Vote NO on D.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is an attack on the merit system and an attempt to return patronage to the Mayor’s office by eliminating the authority of the Civil Service Commission and its built in checks and balances.

The present Civil Service system is not perfect, but corrections can be made within the Charter without destroying a system that has worked for over 50 years and has been free from fraud and corruption.

This proposition will do nothing to improve the caliber of police performance and could have the opposite effect. I urge you to vote NO on PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by
The San Francisco Police Supervisors and Investigators Association

Don Good, Captain SFPD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D could be a dangerous first step toward weakening the independent, impartial administration of our City government.

Proposition D would transfer power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor. The Director’s decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline and certification would be final. The Commission would have no right to hear examinations or disciplinary appeals.

With the transfer of duties and responsibilities from the Commission to the Mayor’s appointed Personnel Director, the Mayor would have control over personnel functions. Currently, commissioners have independent status and can be dismissed for cause. The Personnel Director could be dismissed at will.

The Merit System could be replaced by a patronage system. Proposition D could open the door to rules permitting the Personnel Director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his or her position on the list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Proposition D is NOT a reform package. The checks and balances for efficient City government would be lopsided, with too much power in the hands of unknown future Mayors.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
John L. Molinari, President
Harry G. Britt
Richard Hongisto
Willie B. Kennedy
Wendy Nelder
Nancy Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Beware of PROPOSITION D!

Powerful special interest groups are attempting to remove key City employees from the independent and impartial Civil Service system in the name of “reform”.

They want instead to make these employees answerable directly to future Mayors and politically-appointed Personnel Directors and department heads.

PROPOSITION D got on the ballot because the Chamber of Commerce and such companies as Pacific Bell and PG&E paid a professional southern California campaign firm, $70,000 to collect signatures.

They’re trying to destroy the merit system and replace it with an old-fashioned patronage system.

Department heads will be able to ignore examination scores and reward loyalty rather than competence in promotions and hiring.

Don’t let the Chamber of Commerce, big business and their allies in the City bureaucracy dictate who’s hired, fired and promoted among public employees.

PROPOSITION D is not just deceptive, it’s dangerous!
Vote NO on PROPOSITION D!

Libby Denver
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Ron Huberman
Vice-Chairman, Democratic Central Committee
Jim Wacob
Democratic Central Committee
Robert Estanis
President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Rick Pacuric
President, Harvey Milk Lesbian Gay Democratic Club
Walter L. Johnson
Exec. Seety., S. F. Labor Council
Michael Bernick
Linda Pate
Sal Roselli
Deborah Stein
John Mehriug
Pat Norman
Nancy Wilker
Gwen Craig
Harry Brit
Louise Minnick
Carole Migden
Ajar Jacks
Jack Morrison
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D places too much power in the hands of ONE. Proposition D will provide for a personnel director to be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. The Mayor now appoints five members of the Civil Service Commission who also serve at her pleasure.

You work for years to climb the civil service ladder and then somebody comes along with an idea to cut you off at the pockets.

Proposition D will lock in all the employees employed in the Mayor’s office and will control the appointments of any new staff by the next Mayor elect in 1987 and years thereafter. Like controlling your estate from the grave.

Vote NO on D.

Marguerite Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service Merit System has served our City well, giving San Franciscans an equal opportunity. It has helped us obtain employment and earn promotions based on objective examinations.

The Civil Service Merit system replaced the old patronage system that rewarded political loyalty more than competence.

Now the supporters of PROPOSITION D want to create a new Personnel Director, accountable only to the Mayor, and give department heads the absolute power to decide who works for the City and who gets promoted.

IF PROPOSITION D passes, equal opportunity would give way to opportunity based on membership in the bureaucratic “establishment”.

Keep our Civil Service Merit System strong and free from the political abuses of the past.

Vote NO on D!

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly
Ben Tom
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
JoAnne Miller
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
A. Richard Ceballos
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Sodonia Wilson
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Ernest “Chuck” Agata, President
S. F. Community College Governing Board
Julie Tang
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Alan S. Wong
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Henry Der
Albert Chang
Rudy Meraz
Robert "Bob" Morales
Yori Wada

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Can you imagine studying for a civil service examination, being rated at the top of the eligible list and never receiving the promotion? That’s exactly what Proposition “D” will do should the electorate adopt this amendment.

The civil service merit system has defects, but to totally eliminate the system and replace it with a patronage system where promotions are based on who you know, rather than what you know is scandalous.

Civil service was put into place to prevent scandal and the “favor seeking” individual from getting a paid position because he/she happened to support the right elected official.

Proposition “D” will allow one person, chosen by the Mayor, to decide who will be promoted, hired and fired. This is awesome power for one single individual to have at any level of government.

Our current Mayor may choose a fair person for this position, but will future Mayors be as careful? As each new Mayor assumes office, the civil service system will again change. The potential to favor one individual or group over others is great.

Proposition “D” has a great potential to diminish the quality of services we now provide to our citizens, as the future of how people are hired and promoted in the San Francisco Police Department is completely unknown.

It’s true our promotional system is fraught with delays and delays frustrate us all, but Proposition “D” is not the answer. Proposition “D” will only add to our existing problems. Several years ago, our citizens elected a Charter Commission to streamline city government and make civil service work more efficiently. The voters eventually rejected those proposals. The checks and balances that make our government stable were no longer present. It simply went too far.

Proposition “D” goes even further. It brings about a system of patronage and should be defeated lest we want to engage in “free-wheeling and dealing” of civil service jobs and promotions.

We urge a strong No vote against Proposition “D”!

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS’ ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry, President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The purpose of the Civil Service Commission is to ensure that the merit system would be the only criteria in any examination process.

If Proposition D passes, all authority concerning examinations would be taken from the Civil Service Commission and given to a Personnel Director, who is appointed by the Mayor. This Personnel Director would have the authority to hire and fire at his discretion, with no appeal available. This proposition is contrary to everything the Fire Department and all City employees have strived for over the years.

The Civil Service Commission in its present form was instituted to prevent any possibility of a patronage system, where one person has complete control.

This proposition would do nothing to improve your Fire Department. If you are satisfied with the work and make up of the San Francisco Fire Department in its present form, “Vote No On Proposition D”. You will be doing a service for the San Francisco Fire Department, and the people of San Francisco.

Submitted by the San Francisco Fire Chiefs’ Association
John Flaherty, Battalion Chief SFFD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is bad government and bad politics, changing our independent civil service system into a system dominated by the Mayor:

...By shortening the six year terms of Civil Service Commission to conform to the Mayor’s four year term of office.

...By transferring most of the Commission’s powers to a Personnel Director who serves solely at the Mayor’s pleasure.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D fails to offer enough new and improved procedures to cure the current defects in the civil service system. Charter sections and civil service rules are repealed without specific known replacements.

Proposition D transfers power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created personnel director appointed by, and to serve at the pleasure of, the Mayor. The director’s decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline, and certification would be final. The commission would have no right to hear examination or disciplinary appeals.

There are hidden costs with Proposition D because the new Personnel Administration Department will employ a personnel director, and other employees “as may be necessary to carry out (its) functions and duties.”

The Merit System could be replaced by an old style Patronage System. Proposition D could open the door to rules which permit the personnel director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his/her position on the civil service testing list.

Keep politics out of employment services. Vote NO on Proposition D!

Alice B. Toklas, Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Roberto Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Police and Fire Commissions would lose functions as a result of the personnel director’s new power. The director’s unlawful employment discrimination policy would be binding upon department administrators. The director’s procedure for employee dispute resolution must be used by all department heads and appointing officers.

Proposition D is not the answer. The checks and balances for efficient city government would be lopsided.

I urge a no vote on Proposition D.

Wille L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, 17th Assembly District
Sala Burton
Congresswoman
Art Agnos
16th Assembly District
Milton Marks
State Senator

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Balboa Reservoir Development Ban

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?

YES 292
NO 293

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission declared Balboa Reservoir South (located across Phelan Avenue from San Francisco City College) surplus in 1984 and made the site available for low, moderate and market rate housing. In July 1985, a City-community advisory committee chose a developer to build 203 single-family homes on the 13 acre site. Construction has not yet begun.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would prohibit granting new building permits and would revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site (Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1) between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit granting any new building permits and you want to revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to allow building permits to be granted for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

How "E" Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for a three-year ban on development of the Balboa Reservoir site had qualified for the June ballot.

Sidney Kass and Jesse David Wall, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 12,430 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 10,012 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 77
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Having been responsible for providing leadership at City College from 1947 to 1977, we cannot stand by and see this site converted to housing. We must speak out. Such a move would preclude forever the logical and much needed campus expansion to what was once our West Campus. We left that site reluctantly to make way for water storage. If it is no longer required for that purpose, let us return it to City College.

Thousands of San Franciscans—high school graduates, dropouts, veterans, re-entering women—representing all of the city's diverse ethnic groups, have been prepared for transfer to four-year colleges, profitable careers, and have had their lives enriched at the City College of San Francisco. Without City College's open door and easy access, many would have been deprived of these opportunities.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 'E'

We question:
1. Why no EIR was required when the proposed development could have a substantial impact.
2. Whether the future needs of City College for classrooms, housing, and parking have been considered.
3. What the impact on taxpayers is with below market land sale and construction financing by bonds.

This moratorium will permit adequate study of these issues. Vote YES on Proposition 'E'.

Bruce Bonacker, President
Board of Directors, Glen Park Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let a developer make a mint on land across from the most overcrowded college in the Bay Area! Parking is already an impossibility for residents near City College. Adding 200 homes to this land would make the situation much worse.

It's simple: a college which can't find room for more students at a time when more people are returning to education doesn't serve the community.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

You'd probably be upset. We certainly are. Please help us protect our neighborhood. Please vote YES on proposition E.

Westwood Park Residents:
- Edna Toeker
- Minnie Dorwin
- Eugene Edan
- Donna Nicoletti
- Robert Armstrong
- Pauline Armstrong
- Joel Martinez
- Richard & Lisa Patterson
- David Bean
- H. Bozzone
- William Burke
- Richard Robel
- Clyde Theriot
- Danae Manus
- Euna Manus

Sunnyside Residents:
- Ellen Wall
- Melissa Voluntad
- David Wall

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let the greedy developers take this potentially picturesque open space. A yes vote means you want more time to consider its future use. All we ask is time to think and plan.

John Barbagelata
Former member, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Suppose there was a publicly owned open space across the street from the main U.C. Berkeley Campus. Can you imagine for one moment that it would be passed into private ownership? Vote Yes on E for Equality and Excellence in Education

City College Students:
William Lew, Student
Tim McGuire, Student Council Member
Joseph Goldstein, Student Council Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

In 1952, the "Experts" said we needed reservoirs. They felt so strongly that they condemned the City College West Campus, destroyed the buildings, and constructed the reservoirs—all at taxpayer's expense.

Now, in 1986 with more demand for water, the "Experts" say the reservoir is no longer needed. What is the concerned taxpayer to believe?
When in doubt, the city should hold on to the expensive things already paid for.

Stop the reservoir giveaway. Vote YES on E.

Taxpayers for Preserving the Reservoir.
Richard Patterson
Dorice Murphy
Lucille Carson
Daniel Gutierrez
Franz Witte
Bernhard Scholand
Ruth Hanson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This is a Planning issue. We have been accused of trying to stop housing for poor people. Not true. In the first place, the price levels are certainly middle income and above, but our main objection is that this badly done plan is damaging to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as to the over-crowded community college across the street.

WHAT WE WANT

Even our critics point out that we originally SUGGESTED housing for that site, but they don't talk about what else we suggested. We want two levels of parking under a City College Library, Bookstore, and Auditorium, with housing on top. Furthermore, let the housing be TRULY affordable—for students and seniors. We are trying to stop the bureaucrats' subsidized middle income housing project because it makes our dream impossible.

We ask for three years to give the neighborhood and the college a chance to produce a better plan.
SNAP (Sensible Neighborhood Planning Committee)

Helen Crizer, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council, representing 17 neighborhood associations in the area of the surplus reservoir property in question has voted to endorse the three-year stop of private construction on the old West Campus of City College. Dr. Louis Batmale, Chancellor of City College from 1970-1977, has persuaded us that City College needs the lands.

Juanita Raven, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Be a sport.
Give City College a vote of support.

City has 23,000 students and badly needs a library. The only place to put it is in the reservoir site. City College has walked closely with San Francisco for five decades. The reservoir site has always been understood to be reserved for City College.

Until now when someone wants it for housing. Housing is important, but it can be anywhere in town. But a City College library can only be located at the College.

Vote yes to support a book—and a reader.
Reading, studying, writing and research make up our town also.

It is hard to understand criticism of City for wanting to keep this area for a library. Sure, housing sites are at a premium—but even more so a library site for City which is one of the largest schools in the Nation.

Some people blast City for wanting a library because of the need for housing. Housing is needed. But some of those very same people want a big battleship stationed here that will bring in 15,000 new family members.

The Educational and cultural growth of San Francisco mandates living space for the City College library.

If this measure gets a no vote, it means there will be no site for a Library. This is the last chance. Vote YES to help out a book—and a reader.

State financing, when approved, will construct this building. It is the top building priority at City College.

A YES vote here means there will be time to think about the use of the site. During that three year period, cooler heads may realize this is the only site for a Library. If the housing goes in there will be no library there.

Vote yes for a book, for a good school and a better City.

John Riordan, Board of Governors
San Francisco Community College District.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Sunnyside Neighborhood Association is not against housing, but we are trying to stop a hasty and short-sighted plan. We are asking for this moratorium to get time for a better plan that will answer a variety of needs and benefit the entire city as well as our community.

This is a planning issue.
The release of the reservoir property as surplus by the water department came as a surprise to our neighborhood. The June 1984 "Residence Element" of the city's Master Plan did not even list the land as surplus. By 1985 major decisions were being made for use of the land without adequate neighborhood input.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

There were some meetings attended by a few people carefully selected for their zealous pro-housing views or potential financial gain. The resulting plan has gone out of control. Now it benefits only the developer and the lucky few who will get houses on free land.

Proposition E is not an attack on housing.
Please help us save our neighborhood against poor planning by voting YES on Proposition E.

Joe Mahoney, President
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Miraloma Improvement Club urges a YES vote on Proposition E.

Frank Mastro, President
Arnell Rodrigues
Maggie Kroll
Dorothy Evers

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION E

All the talk in the world can't change the fact that City College has fewer acres of land relative to its student population than any college in the Bay Area.

Enrollment at City College is INCREASING, as is the enrollment of the San Francisco public schools from which City College draws most of its students. It is obvious that City College needs and deserves the reservoir land. The three year moratorium will give time to produce a better plan which will have in-

put by faculty, students and alumni who know the college's needs and want to support it.

Sid Kass
Susie Langdon Kass
Phil Kass
City College Student
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The homeowners of Westwood Park, a neighborhood adjacent to the Balboa Reservoir, support the ballot initiative calling for a 3-year development moratorium. We believe that the City and City College should take additional time to determine their needs and how they might be met by using the Reservoir. In the event that City College does not need this property, we support its development as open space or as single-family detached housing.

Westwood Park Association
Don C. Swander
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Let's not aggravate the traffic problem around City College before we first develop solutions for the existing problems.

A three-year moratorium only buys our neighborhood and elected officials time to find solutions; it doesn't say no to housing. A YES vote is a vote for prudent development. A YES vote helps to preserve the family character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ken Hoegger
Realtor and community Activist

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As representatives of the students of City College, we understand first-hand, the intense need to reserve a site for future school expansion.

Preservation of the Balboa Reservoir, a site directly adjacent to the campus, is particularly crucial. The facilities that CCSF requires, such as a library and an auditorium, are essential to the main structure of the campus. Unlike classrooms, it would be unreasonable to build an auditorium or a library on an off-campus site, since these facilities are integral to the main function of the school.

In short, opposition to the moratorium based on the notion that alternate sites could be secured, is misleading. Once a site near the college is taken, any hope of expansion would be eliminated.

Associated Student Council of City College
Jack Lee, Vice President of Associated Counsel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Local 2121 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, representing City College faculty, urges a YES vote on Proposition E.

While this project provides short-term employment for a few, we are more concerned about the thousands of students who would benefit from planning and development that would better serve the community and the college.

Yes on E for continued excellence in community college education.

Anita Martinez, President
San Francisco Community College District
American Federation of Teachers

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is twice as crowded as any community college in northern California. It needs a much larger library, bookstore and auditorium, and more parking.

The college has always expected to use the empty SOUTH reservoir for educational needs. That land is finally surplus. Neither the college Governing Board nor the Chancellor attended the Mayor’s planning sessions for the property and the faculty was not informed. When the 12.3 acre site was offered to a developer for $36,900 for subsidized housing, the Chancellor said, “We are at a crossroad and the correct path is for the Board of Supervisors, with the Mayor’s support, to deed this surplus land to City College so that the college may continue to serve the city effectively for the next 50 years as it has for the past half century.” The Mayor refused. Now only Board member John Riordan supports the correct path.

The Water Department says it may need the NORTH reservoir now used for student parking. If that crisis occurs, the Chancellor says, “We’ll deal with the situation then.” How, if the south reservoir is gone?

(continued)
When land is available other community colleges finance large projects through alliances with civic, athletic and cultural organizations, and through property sales. New methods for public funding are being developed.

The faculty would like three years of careful study to unravel misunderstandings and poor management, and to find the best way to be a good neighbor.

Ken Crizer
Lene Johnson
Madeline Mueller
Julia Scholand
Steering Committee,
City College Faculty for Responsible Development

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College needs land now for desperately needed facilities, one of which is a library. City College has an enrollment of 23,000 students but our library has seating for 450. There are other possible locations for new housing, but City College can't be moved. Give us an opportunity to plan a development for the community and the college.

Annie M. Young
City College Library Faculty and Staff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty and staff members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students’ needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Virgine Applin
Bill Carpenter
Matthew Castaneda
Hortensia Chang

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students’ needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Darlene Alton
Mary Allen
Mary Ansier
Tom Angeloff
Robert Balestreri
Don Bateni
Diana Bernstein
Joe Berry
Anna Briston
Thomas Brendel
James Bristol
Richard Brownell
Laurent Broustal
Philip Brown
Barbara Cabral
John Callen
John Carlin
Frank Cerrato
Rosemary Clark
Perry Close
Kurt Commen
Walter Cripps
George Crippen
Patricia Davis
Guy DePrimo
Edward Dierman
Sharon Edwards
Larry Ernst
Mary Erwin
Kacy Fong
William Fomke
Terry Greenfield
Robert Griffin
Michael Guthrie
Mary Hamma
Yan Kung Ho
Peter Hoch
Ronald Hochshe
Myrna Holden
Katherinel Honald
Michael Hubert
Edward Hunt
Frank Ingersoll
Elaine Johnson
Wendy Kaufman
Jo Kennedy
Mercedes Kow
Rossalind Kvak
Don Lafferty
James Lallas
Steve Levinson
Sue Light
Gary Ling
Amelia Lipp
Dave Lubbert
Leon Lucy
Demeine Macaou
Marion McNam
Patricia Madigan
Michael Malachowski
Mary Mart
Maria Marian
Sylvia Marshall
Valerie Mexican
Jose Mejia
Margit Michelmayr
Deanne Milton
Cindy Moody
Thomas Munro
Trump Myhre
Deborah Nage
Glenn Nance
Herbert Naylor
William Neff
Dennis Pionkowki
Francine Podestki
Therese Poydessus
Solomon Raju
Mary Riordan
Furibor Sanree
Marvin Schinnerer
Fred Schneider
Earl Scribner
Andy Seal
Ken Shen
Robert Struckman
MoShu Tam
Edward Taylor
Piere Thi
Barbara Thomas
Clare Thompson
Willie Thompson
Mary Thurber
Robert Tricaro
James Trullner
Joanne Tummia
George VonBuzay
Cherie Wetzal
Austin White
Joan Wilson
Rosalie Woff
Christina Yee
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Water Department has begun a resource study of water use, due for completion in two or three years. The study may well indicate that one or both reservoirs will be needed. The American Water Works Association states that reservoirs should be used in pairs. This is particularly important because it is the only reservoir at an elevation of 305 feet.

The Mayor twisted the arm of the Water Department to declare one of these reservoirs surplus before the water resource study is completed. Don't let her get away with this kind of political manipulation.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Kurt Common
Ken Crizer
Ed Dierauf
Herb Naylor
CCSF Engineering Professors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The South Balboa Basin has been unused since college leased buildings, including a large auditorium, were torn down on that site thirty years ago. We hope that three years of thorough planning would explore the possibility of returning a part of that property to the college for the development of a multi-purpose medium-sized auditorium which could be shared with community groups.

Robert Bezina
Mack Crooks
Bob Davis
Helen Dilworth
Franz Ensig
Richard Esterman
Richard Fenner
Lawrence Ferrara
Ted Fleming
Peggy Gehr
William Grothopp
David Hardman

Judy Hubbell
Charles Hudspeth
Sieglinde Isham
Baruch Klein
John Kongsmark
Joshua Law
Steven Lopez
Jerry Mueller
Madeline Mueller
Marvin Tortak
Frank Tompkins
City College Music Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition E. This moratorium is necessary because there are too many worthy uses for this land to make a hasty and potentially very costly decision. Only through careful planning can the limited land available for development be best used.

Joseph Alessi
Mary Argenti
Neyde Azevedo
John Blachoff

Jerome Hooken
Robert Kaar
James Kurck
Duck Lee
Chelcie Liu
William Maynez
Annette Rappeleyea
Oleg Reout
David Wall
City College Physics Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, as Physical Education Instructors, have always been committed to a diversified program for our students and community. The reservoir space is a natural land resource for a Multi Educational and Cultural Center.

Your YES vote on E will allow us the freedom to explore ways that this property could most constructively benefit all.

Nicholas Alexander
Paul Hewitt

Gail Barton
Curtis Decker
Brad Duggan
Takako Hagiwara
John Hahn
Daniel Hayes

Lene Johnson
Grover Klimmer
Paula McCullum
Art Octavio
Louise Scourkes

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, full-time faculty of the Computer and Information Science Department of City College, urge a YES vote to postpone the decision until additional planning and surveys can be conducted. The current proposal would negatively impact the College's enrollment.

William Beaver
Ronald Cerruti, Chairman
Kirk Gibson
Howard Granger
Frank Holden
Michael Kelly

George Lanyi
Norbert Ludkey
Charles Metzler
Charles Miller
Marilyn Schnake

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

A YES vote on Proposition E helps STOP a scheme to GIVE AWAY $12,300,000 worth of City land for $1,800,000 (or less) to a Redwood City real estate developer.

A YES vote will SAVE taxpayers $550,000 per year. The housing project will produce $240,000 in taxes, but supplying City services will cost $790,000 per year.

The Controller's cost estimate does NOT account for the $12,300,000 land value, since land sale below value is NOT technically a cost of government. The Controller also is NOT permitted to assume that the housing project will be constructed, since construction has NOT yet been ordered by the Board of Directors.

The plan does NOT restrict housing sales to moderate-income first-time buyers. The plan only restricts use of tax-subsidized funds. Any person favored by the developer or politicians can buy these dwellings and get the benefits of the public land giveaway.

The houses are made "affordable" by giving away the land far below market value, by City-backed low interest, and by cutting construction corners.

The real beneficiaries of the subsidized housing project are the financiers (NOT the project dwellers). Bondholders receive 9.6% average tax-free interest, which is equivalent to 24.6% taxable interest at 61% maximum tax. The developer and bond establishment receive $5,340,000; this is $26,300 (or 22.40%) for each $117,400 unit.

The City loses $51,700 worth of land GIVEN AWAY for each unit.

Vote YES on Proposition E for good fiscal management.

William Marquardt
Financial Analyst, SNaP

Helen Crizer, Treasurer, SNaP

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is by far the most crowded community college in the Bay Area. With 22,600 students on a 56 acre campus, it is more than twice as crowded as any of the others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of College</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Campus (acres)</th>
<th>Area/1000 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City College of SF</td>
<td>22,624</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laney College, Oakland</td>
<td>9,805</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot College, Hayward</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa College</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of San Mateo</td>
<td>13,820</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>9.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Marin</td>
<td>6,663</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given these facts, why does the Governing Board not try to get the old West Campus back? Why don't they support this moratorium to delay the land grab?

The Governing Board is under political pressure from City Hall. They have been threatened with the loss of the north reservoir parking lot and funding for special projects. Forgive them.

Vote Yes on E.

Friends of City College

David Newton
Glen Simpson
Jack Baker
Thomas Velasquez
Tillie McCullough

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The student population at City College is increasing. This semester's enrollment is up 1,265 students over last semester.

The enrollment in the San Francisco public schools has been increasing by 1,218 per year for the last three years. City College draws most of its enrollment from public schools in San Francisco.

Obviously, City College will have a larger enrollment in the future years, and will be in desperate need of space if we do not give it back its old West Campus.

Please reserve this public land for the college.

Please vote YES on E.

Barbara Holman

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON E

In 1981, I launched a six-point program to expand San Francisco’s housing supply and the voters had approved a City policy to add 20,000 new housing units within five years. This Proposition would destroy a major portion of the effort to build affordable, single-family housing in our city.

The Balboa Reservoir Site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now a site for development of 203 new single-family homes, most with three bedrooms and two baths. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed as other homes built under the City’s program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom could not afford homeownership. It is believed that these new homes will sell rapidly.

The Balboa Reservoir site is one of the few sites large enough to accommodate a substantial number of new homes. Please do not let a few people stop a major opportunity for new housing. Vote no on Prop E.

Not only would Proposition E halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site, but the 9.8% fixed-rate, 30-year mortgage money set aside for the housing would also be lost.

Nothing constructive is accomplished by this measure—it does not provide additional land or facilities for City College. As a matter of fact, City College has neither plans nor money to use the property. Further, the Community College Board of Directors, the governing body for City College, has voted overwhelmingly to oppose the initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No on E.”

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the site of the unused Balboa Reservoir and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost.

These homes are desperately needed for San Franciscans who can’t afford to buy in the city where the average house is selling for over $600,000. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

The homes would be built on land that belongs to the City. Over two years ago, it was declared surplus and available for housing. It is not part of City College, and City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

We urge you to vote no on Proposition E if you want more affordable housing for San Franciscans.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

In 1980 San Franciscans voted overwhelmingly (63% yes to 37% no) to construct 20,000 housing units. Good progress is underway towards achieving the voter goal. A 1986 report by Mayor Dianne Feinstein states, “In the last five years, 3,559 new housing units completed with another 3,000 by 1988 and 20,000 more in 10 to 15 years”. Most of this housing will be built in underutilized commercial districts; not in existing residential neighborhoods.

The 203 affordable owner occupied single family units slated for the southern portion of Balboa Reservoir are part of the 1988 total. Our progress in addressing the City’s housing shortage will be curtailed if this ill-advised initiative is approved. SUPPORT OWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Housing production is essential to check rising prices and to maintain our social, economic, and ethnic population diversity. AS A SAN FRANCISCO VOTER, YOU CAN BE PART OF OUR HOUSING PROGRESS BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Do not be misled. The Community College Governing Board opposes this initiative. The district does not have any future building plans for this housing site.

WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT THE CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY HOUSING BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt construction of affordable housing at Balboa Reservoir site. This surplus public property empty for 30 years was declared surplus by the City in 1984. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders. The housing is desperately needed. San Franciscans need affordable housing.

Doris M. Ward, Member
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

A critical issue facing San Francisco today is the lack of housing middle class San Franciscans can afford.

That is why I have joined these neighborhood associations to support the Balboa Reservoir neighborhood housing proposal. Those participating in the development of the proposal includes:

O.M.I. Community Association
Dorado Terrace Association
Outer Mission-Ingleside
Political Action Committee
Greater Ingelside Community
Mount Davidson Manor
Ocean Avenue merchants Association
Ingleside Terrace Association
The San Francisco Open Space Committee
City College of San Francisco

From early in 1985 I worked closely with these neighborhood groups in the discussions between city government and community leaders concerning the development plans for this desperately needed new housing at the unused Balboa reservoir site.

These are the reasons you should vote no on Proposition E.

1. The neighborhood housing proposal that this initiative seeks to stop is the result of months of hard work by the largest coalition of neighborhood associations ever to join together to plan a housing development in San Francisco.

2. The housing at the Balboa Reservoir site was designed with the involvement of the coalition of neighborhood associations to enhance the surrounding community.

3. The governing Board of the Community College District has made clear that they have no plans for the site and no ownership rights to it. City College does not oppose the construction of this development and opposes this initiative.

4. Self-proclaimed “Friends” of City College want to stop the proposal in order to preserve the site for future faculty parking. A clique of City College staffers involved in a neighborhood association pose as community opposition to this development even though a representative from this organization, the Sunny-side Neighborhood Association, had helped plan and support the proposal.

5. By masquerading as concerned neighbors these self-appointed “friends” of City College hope to prevent the construction of 204 critically needed units of housing and pull off one of the biggest land grabs in San Francisco’s history.

Don’t be fooled. Vote no on Proposition E

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Residence Element of the Comprehensive Plan of the City and County of San Francisco assesses the City’s housing needs and lays out specific steps to meet those needs. This document was adopted by the City Planning Commission in 1984 after extensive public review at neighborhood meetings and public hearings, and consideration of the detailed Environmental Impact Report.

The first objective of the Housing Element is “to provide new Housing for all income groups” in locations appropriate for residential development. To meet this goal, development of housing is to be aggressively pursued and encouraged on surplus, underused and vacant public land.

Proposition E would halt construction of affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site. This public property, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City in 1984. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

If you want more affordable housing in San Francisco vote no on Proposition E.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Susan J. Bierman, City Planning Commissioner
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on E.

Proposition E deprives San Franciscans of one of their last real chances to become homeowners at an affordable price. At the South Balboa Reservoir we have City-owned land on which 203 units of three-bedroom, two-bath homes can be built at low prices which average San Franciscans can afford to pay. These homes need to be built now, not in three years. In three years the low interest rates on mortgages and the bond financing will be gone. Two hundred families will have lost the opportunity to become homeowners, and the City will have lost the opportunity to ease the tight market in rental housing.

Nor does this ill-conceived initiative help City College in any way. City College does not need this land. Speculation that the College may at some future date find a use for the land is not founded on fact. The College may never be able to build on the reservoir. Their enrollment has dropped by over 4000 students in the last few years.

This initiative is designed to confuse you. It will make our housing shortage worse for three long years. If you support affordable housing in our City, Vote NO on Proposition E.

Bill Maher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Balboa Reservoir site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now planned for development of 203 new single family homes. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed — other homes built under this program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom would not otherwise be able to afford home ownership.

San Francisco has the most expensive housing in the nation where last year the average home sold for over $160,000. Housing is difficult to produce because the obstacles are great — little land on which to build, high construction costs and uncertain interest rates.

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost. The initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional land or facilities for City College. The Community College Board, the governing body of City College, in fact recently voted to oppose this initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No” on Proposition E.

John L. Molinari

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

In 1980, the voters of the City and County of San Francisco approved a measure making it City policy to add 20,000 new units of housing within five years. In 1984 in an effort to satisfy this objective, the Board of Supervisors adopted a policy encouraging the expansion of the City’s housing supply. Making surplus City-owned land, such as the site at Balboa Reservoir, available for affordable housing was an important part of that policy. A proposal to build 203 homes on the unused Balboa Reservoir site was advanced to help implement the pro-housing policy.

Approval of Proposition E would HALT construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.

The Balboa Reservoir homes would be built on land currently belonging to the City and County of San Francisco. The property IS NOT part of the City College, and City College has neither plans or money to buy the property and convert it for City College use.

The only debatable issue is the future of affordable housing on the Balboa Reservoir site.

As we are all aware, San Francisco has the most expensive homes in the United States. The average cost of a home is $152,000. Not many can afford such prices. However, the housing proposed for the Balboa Reservoir will give many more citizens the opportunity to become homeowners. The homes to be built will be sold to first-time buyers at prices ranging from $83,000 to $145,000.

Other homes built in San Francisco under the direction of similar affordable housing programs have been snapped up quickly by San Franciscans. Without the program, most would not have been able to purchase the home and become homeowners.

Again, if you desire to preserve the construction of more affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site, vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Willie B. Kennedy

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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Additional single family housing is undeniably San Francisco’s most acute social need.

When some vacant surplus City land (12 acres) finally becomes available for 203 additional new private homes there will always be some selfish individuals who are in favor of new housing “just so long as it is not built across the street from me!”

This unused, vacant City reservoir land hasn’t generated a dime of taxes for over thirty years! Let’s add 203 NEW home-owner taxpayers to the City’s rolls as quickly as possible.

Stop these self-serving no-growth obstructionists! Please vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Prop E would halt affordable housing construction at the Balboa Reservoir site. Many gay people need affordable housing, too, and we join with other community groups urging you to vote NO on Prop E.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Robert Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E, if approved, would block the construction of 203 badly needed single-family homes on the south portion of the Balboa Reservoir in San Francisco. Sixty percent of these homes would be available for purchase by moderate and middle income families at purchase prices between $80,000 and $120,000. They would be constructed on surplus public land and financed by the sale of mortgage revenue bonds to enable the developer to sell the homes at below market prices.

A neighborhood group headed by two city college faculty members is responsible for placing Proposition E on the ballot. The group contends that the land which is intended to be used for the project should be made available instead to City College for the construction of new teaching facilities even though enrollment at City College is declining and the City College Board has voted 6 to 1 to oppose the initiative.

Like many other areas of the country, San Francisco suffers from a shortage of housing. Purchase prices here are among the highest in the nation. The use of surplus public lands and revenue bond financing provide a means for making single family homes available to a broad spectrum of families at affordable prices.

The Balboa Reservoir project is supported by the leaders of 8 neighborhood groups in the area surrounding the location of the proposed project and by a majority of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, as well as by Mayor Diane Feinstein. We urge you to encourage the construction of this type of housing in San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition E.

San Francisco Board of Realtors
William L. Jansen, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

SAVE OUR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS!
BERNAL HEIGHTS SAYS, “VOTE NO ON PROP E!”
We are residents of Bernal Heights in San Francisco. We’ve worked hard to build affordable family and senior citizen homes in our neighborhood.

We need more affordable housing in our City to survive. The real issue in Prop E is affordable family housing—a “yes” vote prevents the construction of 203 family homes. That’s crazy! Join us in preserving what’s best in our City. Vote “no” on Prop E!

Sylvia M. Yee, Bernal Heights Community Foundation Board of Directors***
Frank Hutchins, BHCF Board*
Mary Lou Bertolino, BHCF Board*
Lesa Havener, BHCF Board*
Elizabeth Egger, BHCF Board*
Sister Janet Simons, BHCF Board*
Stephen Antonaras, BHCF Board*
Lorenzo R. Dill, BHCF Board*
Barbara Bagot, BHCF Board*
Margaret C. Randolph, Northwest Bernal Block Club*
Maureen Lamb, NWBBC*
Tim Molinar, BHCF Planning & Dev’t Committee*
Duck Bagot, BHCF P & D Committee*
***Organization for identification purposes only.
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San Francisco Needs Affordable Housing— Vote No on Proposition E

Everyone agrees that San Francisco needs affordable housing. The questions are how and where that affordable housing can be built.

The Balboa Reservoir housing development, to be built on the site of a reservoir built thirty years ago and unused since that time, answers those important questions for more than 200 San Francisco first-time homebuying families by providing:

- 203 new affordable three-bedroom, single family homes
- 9.8% fixed-rate financing
- A mix of 30% low-income, 30% moderate-income and 40% market-rate first time buyers
- A convenient site that has been declared “surplus” by the City and “available for development of affordable housing”

The Balboa Reservoir housing development is a small but significant step in the effort to generate affordable housing in our City.

Thousands of San Franciscans from every community, neighborhood group and viewpoint agree that the Balboa Reservoir development is good for San Francisco. Virtually every elected official, including the Governing Board of City College also agree.

All these San Franciscans ask you to say “yes” to affordable housing and “NO” to Proposition E.

San Francisco Coalition for Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar, Executive Director

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The viable plan for affordable single family housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site is being threatened by Proposition E. If Proposition E passes, 203 single family homes will be lost to the citizenry of San Francisco at a time when they are greatly needed.

The facts about the proposed housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site argue strongly against Proposition E. All 203 homes will be for first time home buyers. One-third of the homes will be available to households earning $27,000. Another third of the homes will be available to households earning $36,000. Adequate parking will be provided within the development itself, thus answering any concerns that traffic in the area will be congested.

City College has no need or plan to use South Balboa Reservoir for its facilities. City College’s priority is to develop its existing campus. South Balboa Reservoir should therefore be used for one of the City’s greatest needs: increased and affordable housing which is available to lower and middle income families.

As homeowners who live in the vicinity of South Balboa Reservoir, we welcome its planned use for single family housing and feel it will become an integral and contributing part of the community. We therefore urge you to vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Submitted by:
Stephen Graham, Chairman of the Housing Sub-committee of the Citizen’s Committee for Community Development
Roderick A. McLeod, Vice-Chairman of the Citizen’s Committee on Community Development

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing is a group of neighbors which consists of many of the renters of Woodside Park and Sunnyvale neighborhoods as well as owners and renters of Ingleside which are the closest neighbors to the Balboa Reservoir along with some of the students and teachers of City College.

We strongly support the Balboa Reservoir for housing. We believe that the Balboa Reservoir is an ideal spot for housing.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

As Merchants as well as residents of Ocean Avenue, Greater Ingleside and San Francisco, we support the Development of the Balboa Reservoir as housing.

A Traffic Survey has stated that there will be minimal impact on the existing patterns of traffic by this development.

Our neighborhood wants homes in the South Balboa Reservoir.
Vote No On Prop. E.

Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughn
Submitted by Patricia Vaughn

Additional City College Parking is being considered on another location off I-280 to keep the college congestion away from the neighborhood’s streets.

City College has 44 more acres in which to expand and existing buildings at City College have viable means to expand.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
We believe that housing on the Balboa Reservoir is the most viable solution to develop a vacant piece of property that is directly adjacent to our stores on a Transpreferential Street. Affordable housing is in great need in San Francisco and is as much needed here as anywhere. We want to help provide this need. Vote No on Prop. E.

Ocean Avenue Merchants Assoc.
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughney
Submitted by Patricia Vaughney

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction on much-needed affordable, single-family housing at the long vacant south Balboa Reservoir site. This proposition would also block a major housing development that would bring jobs into an area of the city that has little industry or private business.

Sale prices for these units are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the San Francisco housing market, where the average home is selling for $160,000. Construction of these homes will help all young, first-time home buyers and will require only 5% down, instead of the 20% down payment on houses bought with conventional home mortgages.

This plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by nine nearby neighborhood organizations. If Proposition E is approved and this project is blocked, more young adults will purchase their first home in Vallecito or some other outlying area, further draining San Francisco of the young families that every growing community needs.

San Francisco residents will gain apprenticeships, jobs, contracts and subcontracts from this development.

This plan calls for 2 and 3 bedroom, family-sized houses, with space for another bedroom which can be finished when needed. Each house will have 2½ parking spaces in front and would not cause parking problems in the area. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

City College of San Francisco has no plans to buy the property, has no money for institutional expansion, nor any mention of this land in any master plan. Some supporters of this proposition are motivated by racist notions and have said they fear that this development will become another “Geneva Towers.” This type of thinking is similar to support for apartheid practiced in South Africa and must be defeated by progressive San Francisco voters. Property values will increase, instead of a decrease as a result of this project.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition E.

Larry Uball Johnson-Reed—President, O.M.I. Pilgrim Community Center Inc.
Maria Campbell-Casey—Program Director, Bay Area Engineering Societies Committee for Manpower Training, Inc.
Clara Mills-Bradford—Program Director, O.M.I. Senior Center
John C. Jackson
Linda Rose-Gipson
Jon Still—Secretary, Young Adult Committee
Kenneth Butler

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided—2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Affordable Housing Alliance—Mitchell Omerberg, Director
Bay Area Urban League—Gregory Best, Field Representative
Bernal Heights Community Foundation—Andre Lennell Daye
Community Educational Services—Dorothy Chen, Executive Director
Japanese Community Youth Council St. Francis Square Apartments, Inc.—Sandra Mayor-Jenkins, Secretary
Minority Contractors Association of Northern California—James Haukabook, Secretary, Board of Directors
National Community Congress—Dr. Eddie C. Welban
Parkmerced Residents Organization, Inc.—Ricardo A. Callejo, Esq.
Potrero Hill Neighborhood House—Eulae Maxwell
San Francisco Building Trades Council—Stan South
San Francisco Housing & Tenants Council—Joseph Lacey
San Francisco Tenants Union—Jim Faye
Rev. Ames C. Brown—Local Pastor & Community Servant
Greg Day—Chairman, Citizens Committee on Community Development
Polly W. Marshall—Commissioner, San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
Regina A. Steed
Jim Wachob—San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Michael E. Willis, AIA—Fleming Corporation

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided — 2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Greater Ingleside Political Club — Frank Noto, Treasurer
Housing Conservation and Development Corporation — Lonnie Lawson, Board of Directors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided — 2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Bayview Baptist Minister Fellowship — Rev. N. B. Mills, President
Bread of Life Missionary Baptist Church — Rev. S. A. Bailey
Cosmopolitan Baptist Church — Rev. A. Ray Gentle
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Raymond M. Howard Sr.
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Carole Nelson
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Cornelius P. O’Reilly
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Paul G. Theiss
Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee — Charles Gale, Chairman
St. Peters Housing Committee — Tessa Rouvel

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON’T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!
You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
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Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: With certain exceptions, City officers, including elected officials and commission members, may represent clients before City boards and commissions other than their own, and be paid for their services. State legislators may represent clients before City boards and commissions, and be paid for their services. Any person may contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would prohibit City officers from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay. This proposition would prohibit State legislators from appearing before City boards, commissions and departments on behalf of clients for pay. City officers would be prohibited from discussing with these officers and legislators matters that the City is deciding. Proposition F would also prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit City officers and State legislators from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to allow City officers and State legislators to represent clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to allow any person to contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 77

How “F” Got on Ballot

On February 26 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for limitations on compensated advocacy and campaign contributions had qualified for the June ballot.

Quentin Kopp, Marth Gillham and Cheryl Arenson, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 9,400 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,986 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The purpose of Proposition F is to cut campaign contributions by large contributors (and thus reduce campaign spending) and eliminate undue influence by officeholders retained as paid lobbyists for projects requiring City approval.

Let's take a minute to analyze the untrue arguments against Proposition F:

- The opponents claim that Proposition F will force half the City's Commissioners to resign. In fact, Proposition F does not force any Commissioners to resign. It simply says they can't be paid lobbyists at the City Commissioner at the same time. Does a commissioner value making money by lobbying more than public service?
- Some have also alleged that Proposition F will prevent duly-elected union leaders from serving as City Commissioners. No it won't. Proposition F prohibits "compensated advocacy"—that means lobbyists hired by an organization, not members of the organization itself. Proposition F does not apply to salaried employees of labor unions, corporations, or non-profit agencies. Moreover, Section 8.105 of the Charter precludes it specifically from applying to any member serving as a representative of any profession, trade, business, union or association on any board or commission which requires membership of representatives of specific professions, trades, businesses, unions or associations.
- Another untrue argument against Proposition F is that it prohibits City officials only from discussing pending issues with other City officers or State Legislators who are also acting as paid lobbyists in a matter and doesn't stop those officeholding lobbyists from writing City officials about their clients' objectives. That's not so. Proposition F applies to all such lobbying, written or oral. (The dictionary defines "discuss" as "to examine by means of speech or writing.")

End government decision-making by "insiders" and reduce the influence of money on local campaigns.

VOTE YES ON F.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
San Franciscans for Good Government

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

In all our years of observing San Francisco City government, we have found one maxim to be true time after time: a good idea gets copied, especially among politicians.

For no sooner did Quentin Kopp promise to bring Proposition F to the voters than did Mayor Feinstein come up with an informal, administrative version of her own. Fine, you say (and the Mayor says), then why vote Yes on Proposition F?

(1) The Mayor's remedy of asking City Commissioners who also act as lobbyists before City agencies to resign is nothing more than a hand slap, and is good only as long as she is mayor. It's not binding on future mayors and could be changed without any vote of the Board of Supervisors, let alone the people of San Francisco. Proposition F prohibits this kind of conflict-of-interest, and it will be the law, no matter who is mayor.

(2) The Mayor's action did nothing to state legislators who can also act as lobbyists before City Boards and Commissions, nor did her action stop the law or business partners of City Commissioners from picking up the slack in big-money lobbying. Proposition F will stop these practices in their tracks.

(3) What about the other half of Proposition F, which reduced the campaign contribution limit to $100 so that all San Franciscans can enjoy equal access to City officials, not just the ones with the big bucks? The Mayor can't do anything about this, and she hasn't. Only a Yes vote on Proposition F will reduce the weight of big money and ensure our full voice in City elections and City government.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. If it's important enough for the Mayor to copy part of it administratively, it's important enough to do the job right and make it a law.

John J. Barbogelaia
Harry Ahe
June Cahn
Dorothy Partridge

Robert Aronson
Rudolph Lehman
Janet Wentworth

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The worst and most persistent problem in American politics is that politicians and political races can be "bought". Reducing the size of campaign contributions will be a step forward in reducing the role of money in elections. Vote yes for more honest government.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
RESTORE to the people their rightful and equal power as individual voters by reducing the monetary clout and influence of private interests who make the laws and the policies as City officials and Commissioners or State legislators.

TELL the special interests that their money and influence can no longer interfere with representative government.

TELL the special interests that the voters will no longer tolerate the influence-buying which comes with large campaign contributions.

TELL the special interests that this measure will encourage highly talented citizens to serve San Francisco honestly and responsibly.

VOTE YES ON F.

Cheryl Arenson  Tom Hayes
Anne Renfrew  Dorothy Vukich
David Pacheco

"Government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

These noble words from Abraham Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address, cast in bronze at the entrance to City Hall, seem to have escaped the attention of some City officials who pass by them every day. For in San Francisco City government, Lincoln’s simple formula for representative government would read quite differently: “Government of the powerful, by the lobbyists, and for the wealthy.”

Government of, by, and for the privileged few is bad government. Government of, by, and for all the people is good government. It’s as simple as that—as simple as Lincoln first put it.

Proposition F, the Good Government Initiative, will help San Franciscans maintain control of their government and will prevent undue influence by City officeholders.

To reduce undue influence, Proposition F outlaws the practice of City Commissioners and State Legislators representing special interests for pay before City Commissions and Boards. City Commissions should render their decisions deliberately and impartially, not be swayed by the political clout of the lobbyists appearing before them, or by any political favors those lobbyist/politicians might promise. “I’ll scratch your back if you scratch my back” bargains do not belong in government. And until such backroom bargains are made illegal, City government will not belong to the rest of us either.

Proposition F also reduces the maximum amount that anyone can give to a local candidate from $1,000 to $500. If large contributors and other special interests can’t give as much money, they can’t buy as much influence with elected officials. And the lower the contribution limit, the less campaign spending and the more City government will be responsive to all San Franciscans.

You can “buy back” City government from the privileged and powerful with the most precious of all political commodities: your vote.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Mary Lohneis  Babette Drefke
Peter Fatooh  Daniel Jordan
Judith Thorson

Proposition F, an initiative of the people, is needed to protect the voters and the integrity of the legislative process from being corrupted by the power of money and influence. It prevents City officials and State Legislators from lobbying the City on behalf of high-powered special interests. It also lowers the campaign contribution limit from $1,000 to $500, thus reducing the influence of those same special interests over our elections and elected officials.

The bogus argument that the Mayor won’t be able to find qualified people to serve on City commissions if Proposition F is adopted ignores the plain fact that there are 700,000 people in San Francisco, a pool of civic-minded citizens more than large enough to accommodate the 250 commission appointments available in our City government. For example, there are plenty of architects to fill the one architectural appointment on the Art Commission, just as there are plenty of non-lobbyist business people and lawyers available to serve on other commissions.

Thousands of San Franciscans, not just the “insiders”, are ready, willing, and able to serve the public.

Proposition F deserves your vote. Restore integrity to City government. Restore the confidence of the citizens of San Francisco in that government. Let’s have no more Wilkes Bashford situations.

VOTE YES ON F.

Oscar Satro  Leonel Monterey
Martha Gillham  Tony Kilroy
Marguerite Warrent
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE "NO" ON F

This proposition disguises itself as "good government" but, in reality, would drive good people out of government. It is so crudely drawn — so sweeping in its implications — that it would bar from government almost anyone with even a remote business or community tie to government.

It would purge from City commissions anyone who "directly or indirectly" receives compensation from any "interests" with an issue before any City agency. Effectively, this could discriminate against employees from community and neighborhood groups, civil rights organizations, non-profit corporations, labor unions, merchant and business groups, as well as architects, lawyers and other professionals.

Actually, there currently are no commissioners who represent any clients before any City agency. All who are appointed in my administration sign a statement saying they will not advocate for any paying client before any official body of the City while they are commissioners. This proposition simply is not necessary.

Proposition F also would lower the limit for any individual campaign contribution from $1000 to $500. Although this sounds good, it would permit a wealthy person with various businesses and numerous family members to contribute many thousands of dollars through different sources. This would encourage "hidden" contributions. We must strive for disclosure of contributions, not a system which drives contributions underground. Candidates must be able to raise funds enough to put their message before the voters. Reducing the contribution limit can be a tactic to discourage persons from challenging incumbents.

Vote no on Proposition F.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition F purports to achieve a noble objective: The removal of "influence peddling" from City Hall. In fact, Proposition F is so poorly-crafted, it may have exactly the opposite effect on City government. It is not a "good government" initiative. It is bad legislation.

Proposition F provides no definitions and no standards for the public to judge whether City officials comply with its restrictions. Its uncertainties will be chaotic and lead to endless, needless lawsuits.

A measure similar to Proposition F was rejected by the Board of Supervisors because no public hearings were ever held on the legislation. If the public had had a chance to comment on this initiative, it might not have the critical shortcomings, deficiencies and uncertainties that now warrant its rejection by responsible San Franciscans.

In the coming months, the Board will review good government measures that are comprehensible, effective and, most important, certain. Proposition F is a misguided disaster.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

This should properly have been titled the "SINK WILLIE BROWN ORDINANCE"! The "meat of the coconuts" is in Section 4.

Supervisor Kopp's intentions are good, however this sloppily drafted and incomprehensible measure succeeds in "burning down the barn" to eliminate a couple of rats!

Under this proposal, to avoid any potential INDIRECT conflict of interest, (which is undefined), one would have to be a destitute, unemployed welfare recipient to qualify for service on any City Board or Commission! The Mayor has already solved this "hired advocacy" problem with the "conflict of interest" affidavits she demands IN ADVANCE from any prospective appointee.

Quentin's proposed $500.00 campaign contribution limit is an "inside joke" and he, of all people, knows it! It merely obliges a heavy contributor to have his wife, children, business associates, or friends send in SEPARETE $500.00 checks if he wants to contribute more than $500.00 to a politician's campaign.

These proposals require additional City employees for enforcement and wind up doing far more harm than good. Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr., President
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Union members and labor officials have legitimate reasons for meeting with City officers. It is unfair and wrong to lump them in the same category as special interest lobbyists, yet that's exactly what Proposition F does. Working people deserve representation on City boards and commissions. VOTE NO!

Walter Johnson
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council

LeRoy King
James Elliot
Keith Eickman
Reeva Olson

Jeff Greendorfer
Stan Smith
Larry Griffin
Steve Rubisa
Terrence Ryan
Jack Beggs
Tony Marovich

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

If you want to ban business owners and executives from serving on City boards and commissions, then vote for Proposition F.
If you think board members of non-profit corporations and employees of community agencies have nothing to contribute to City government, then vote for Proposition F.
If you believe union members and labor officials should not have a voice at City Hall, then vote for Proposition F.

But if you share our belief that these individuals have legitimate concerns and expertise that is valuable in running major City departments, then join us in voting NO on Proposition F.

Proposition F is a simplistic, sloppily-drafted, meat axe approach to a problem already resolved by Mayor Feinstein's ban on commissioners lobbying on behalf of private clients.

Proposition F is not good government and it is not reform.
Proposition F is bad legislation. VOTE NO.

Hon. Douglas Engmann
Hon. Charlotte Berk

Hon. Eugene Friend
Hon. Phyllis Lyon

Hon. Amy Meyer
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Walter Jebe
Hon. Bruce Lilienthal
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Jean Korium
Hon. Thomas Horn
Hon. Henry Berman
Hon. Robert McCarthy
Hon. Richard Giggenheim
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Hon. Patrick McGrew
Hon. Kirk Miller
Hon. Melvin Lee
Hon. Jerry Berg
Hon. Bonnie Gibson
Hon. Mary Noel Pepys
Hon. Mark Buell
Hon. Tim Carrico
Hon. Jo Hanson
Hon. Kevin Malone
John Sanger
Tom Moore

Donald Didier
Jim Wachob
Anne Daley
Linda Post
Lyne Williams
Todd Dickinson
Peter Hanson
Herbert Kurlan
William Scootis
Vin Hart
Iris Fluellen
Noam Rand
John Schmidt
James Mock
Thomas Karwaki
Wendy Goldberg
Joseph Schwartz
Belle Lazarus
Antonio Barrios
Bruce Barrett
Charles Howell
Walter McGuire
Sharon Duval
Joyce Mauriello

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

We're sympathetic to the need for political reform. But it's a complicated problem, and Proposition F just isn't the way to go.

Frankly, we can't tell who is and isn't affected by this measure. While a handful of people sometimes might abuse their positions, that's no reason to question the integrity of so many solid citizens who give tirelessly to public service. Proposition F is simply the wrong approach. Please join us in voting NO.

William E. McDonnell
Frances May McNear
N. A. Sapunar
Caroline and Michael Figoni

Martin D. Murphy
Eugene C. Payne III
Suzanne B. McCarthy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Concerned about elected officials spending $400,000 to run for supervisor and $1 million on a mayor's race? Then vote NO on Proposition F.

That's right. NO.

Proposition F isn't going to do anything about campaign spending. Prop F simply limits the size of contributions, reducing the current limit from $1,000 to $500. Supervisors can and will continue spending outrageous sums on their re-election campaigns. With Proposition F they'll just spend twice as much time raising money from twice as many sources, and that makes special interests even more powerful. They can always find ways around campaign limits.

We need campaign spending reform, but Proposition F doesn't provide it. Please join us in voting No on F.

District 8 Democratic Club
Stephen L. Tiber
Rain Gravani
Alan Rozniek
Miriam Blonstein

Linda Chapman
Dale Carlson
James Firth
Delveo Brush
Lew Serbin
Debra Stein
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

When campaign contributions are limited, political freedom suffers. Your right to free speech includes not only your right to express your views, but also your right to support as much as you want, any candidate who speaks for you.

Minority viewpoints depend heavily on the contribution of a few dedicated supporters to get your message out. To limit your financial support of your beliefs is to silence your political voice.

Only incumbents, who have many opportunities for free media exposure benefit from this assault on free speech. The dangers of a campaign contribution limit far outweigh any possible benefit from this proposition. Defeat Proposition F!

San Francisco Libertarian Party
Michael R. Fowler, Secretary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

You may think Prop F only applies to big-time lawyers and a few legislators who represent developers. Think again!
Prop F would prohibit many community leaders from public service. If it passes, board members and employees of community and charitable organizations could be banned from serving on City boards and commissions.

We appreciate the public need for a government free of "influencing peddling." But restrictions on "compensated advocacy" ought to be clearly and carefully crafted to protect the voices of community leaders who argue on behalf of the public interest, not private special interests.

Vote No.

Hon. Juanita Del Carlo
Mission Hiring Hall

Bob Ross
Publisher, Bay Area Reporter

Hon. Jeffrey Ken Mori
Japanese Community Youth Council, Inc.

Bill O'Callahan
American Red Cross

Hon. George Suncin
Horizons Unlimited

Hon. Jean Rita Alviar
Mission Education Project

Hon. Greg Day
Pulk Street Town Hall

Hon. Naomi Gray
Hon. James Foster

Carol Wong
Marlena Marseille

Lee Woods
Jo Daly

Dennis Collins
Hon. H. Welton Flynn

(Organizations listed only for purposes of identification.)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will have no effect on developers' lawyers.

None.

It won't make any difference to state legislators either.

Don't kid yourself. This is not "reform" and it isn't "good government." Proposition F will allow the special interests and influence peddlers to continue exercising influence over our elected officials. It has so many loopholes, lobbying will actively continue, untouched, in the back rooms of City Hall.

And developers will always find ways around campaign contribution limits. As Common Cause has noted, Prop F simply makes tracing their dollars more difficult for the public.

Real reform would directly attack the source of huge contributions—the developers and other special interests that employ the lobbyists to peddle their influence.

VOTE NO.

Sue Hester
Calvin Welch
David Looman
Michael Mason

Rich Waller
Susan Khugerman
Rene Cazeneve
Margie O'Driscoll

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
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South Africa Boycott

PROPOSITION G

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid? YES 300 NO 301

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has adopted an ordinance prohibiting the City, with certain exceptions, from purchasing goods or services from companies doing business with South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a declaration of policy that says the City must try to avoid doing business with companies that significantly profit from or help maintain the Apartheid system in South Africa. It calls on other public bodies and private groups to adopt similar policies. It directs the Board of Supervisors to identify the companies which have the greatest ties to Apartheid so that the public can also boycott those companies.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to avoid doing business with companies that help maintain Apartheid, and you want a public boycott of those companies.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

“The proposed Declaration of Policy be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “G” Got on Ballot

On November 6, 1985 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for the City to boycott businesses with significant ties to South Africa had qualified for the June ballot.

Arlo Hale Smith, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,546 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on October 11.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,941 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.
South Africa Boycott

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This measure calls for a public boycott of companies that aid apartheid.
Any claim of "conflict" between Proposition G and existing anti-apartheid legislation is imaginary: It is the legislative intent of supporters of this measure that it can be construed as a directive for making existing law tougher.

Personal attacks have no legitimate place in a ballot measure campaign. As proponent of this measure, I repudiate all such tactics.
Vote NO on apartheid. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Arlo Hale Smith

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Boycotts are grassroots politics. They've helped the farm-workers, they've helped win integration, and they can help end the legal racism called "Apartheid".
A Gallup poll found 77% of South Africa's black majority favoring international economic boycotts to force the Apartheid regime to accept reform peacefully.
After the Boycott Initiative made the ballot, the San Francisco Supervisors unanimously passed a similar city purchasing policy. The issue that remains is whether to call on the general public to join in, boycotting companies identified by the Supervisors as the worst offenders in each industry.
The companies that would be targeted consider profits to be the "bottom line". Economic pressure is all they understand.
The AFL-CIO, NAACP, and NOW have called a boycott of Shell Oil because of its profiteering from South Africa's oppressive economic conditions. Proposition G supports that and would put the same pressure on other industries as well.

This proposition is supported by the elected county central committee of the Democratic Party, the Peace-and-Freedom Party and the Humanist Party, and by leading attorneys, such as Terry Francois, Terence Hallinan, Tony Serra, Lewis Hope Lee, Marc Van Der Hout, Abby Ginsberg and Terence Redmond.
If South Africa were a democracy, its majority would long ago have voted to end Apartheid. We need to vote Yes — because they can't.

Atty. Arlo Hale Smith, Democratic Party County Central Committee
Paul Kangas, Peace and Freedom Party
Lois Salisbury, Public Advocates*
Dr. Kevin Danaher, Food First*
Jesse James, Mission Rebels
Terry Collins, Community Activist
Stony Geibert, Election Action
Robert McCall, Hotel & Restaurant Employees
Executive Board Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Attorneys speak out against Apartheid:
South African police can arrest anyone without charge. They can hold you incommunicado — no contacts with family, lawyers or press.
They regularly censor news, books, music. They have banned Christmas caroling, funerals and other peaceful gatherings. Groups which criticize the government are forbidden to hold meetings.
Blacks are subject to legal segregation; their property and employment rights are greatly restricted; often, they are simply murdered.
As attorneys, we help people who have legal rights that are being violated. But what can we do for those who have no legal rights?

Boycotts and other economic sanctions are the only way to make the Apartheid government accept reform peacefully.
In the Court of World Public Opinion, Apartheid has been convicted of crimes against humanity. By imposing a sentence of economic isolation, we can end Apartheid.
Vote Yes — take a stand for justice.

Terence Hallinan
Arlo Hale Smith
Terry Francois
Karen Anderson Ryer
Robert R. Bryan
Ann Menasche
Rachel Ginsburg
Leo Pauli
Gabriel Gesmer
Ona Prouchtovich

* Indicates endorsement by a local group
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is a moderate, responsible but effective proposal to bring economic pressure on the South African government to establish constitutional rights for all of its citizens. Vote Yes.

Terence Faulkner, Republican
Mike Garza, Republican

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

All decent Americans abhor apartheid. However, boycotting U.S. investment in South Africa is counterproductive; it only penalizes the actual victims of apartheid.

U.S. international firms have acted as progressive agents for change through the Sullivan principles. Their investments have improved the social and economic condition of the labor force.

It is improper to penalize their positive contributions.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

We are individuals and organizations working actively to end the racist system of apartheid in South Africa. And we are voting NO on Proposition G.

Why?
(1) Because Proposition G will weaken San Francisco’s present divestment law. This law requires companies doing business with the city to sign affidavits that they will make no new contracts with South Africa.
Proposition G has no such provision.
(2) Proposition G provides no mechanism or funding to carry out its declared purpose of “boycotting” South Africa.
Proposition G will not stop South African products from entering the Port of San Francisco.
Vote against this useless, confusing, and deceptive initiative.

Preserve the stronger divestment law San Francisco already has.
Vote NO on Proposition G!

Yvonne Golden
Geraldine Johnson
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
AFT 2221 Anti-Apartheid Committee
Artists Against Apartheid
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Coalition of Conscience
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club Executive Committee
ILWU 10 and SEIU 250 Southern Africa Liberation Support Committees
National Conference of Black Lawyers
San Francisco Anti-Apartheid Committee
Southern Africa Freedom Committee/All Peoples Congress

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.
The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1983 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION H:
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Several city and private agencies conduct various programs related to AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a declaration of policy that says San Francisco should support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council, consisting of a Committee on Education and a Fund-Raising Committee. The Research Committee would make recommendations on the most useful AIDS research projects and try to prevent duplication of efforts. The Education Committee would inform the public about the latest research and about ways to prevent AIDS. The Fund-Raising Committee would seek donations and grants for AIDS research and education projects.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

“The proposed Declaration of Policy for an AIDS research and education council and the formation of advisory committees of civic leaders would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, additional expenditure of public funds for AIDS research may result, the amount of which cannot be determined.”

How “H” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for AIDS research had qualified for the June ballot.

Stony Gebert, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 10,540 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on December 6, 1985.

A check of each signature on the petition showed that 7,564 of the signatures were valid. This is more than 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We need a council to expose and address major AIDS issues without the impasse of present medical/political bias. As taxpayers, we are subsidizing a treadmill of continual AIDS casualties. There are major oversights where AIDS is concerned. Only recently was it learned that CDC statistics suggest 79% of early AIDS cases appear drug-related. We hear AIDS is 100% fatal. Perhaps that is because death may also be drug-related in the way of immuno-suppressive antibiotic and radiation overloads to already compromised immunity systems. Prevailing medicine is both tunnel-visioned and high-profit motivated. Also well-funded. This solution may be part of the problem. Some physicians are beginning to feel where AIDS is concerned many current practices are ethically, medically bankrupt.

Remissions occur. Largely through immunity-enhancing, holistic medicine. Significantly, only 1% of AIDS cases occur among people at risk in the Asian community. Perhaps this is due to less drug abuse or use of an unfunded, ignored resource: herbology as part of diet. More options: homeopathy, acupuncture, etc.

If, as anticipated, upwards of 40% of those testing positive come down with AIDS, we may become overburdened. To ignore all of the above becomes part of the problem. Vote Yes on Proposition H.

Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Rich McKirkey, Former Orderly,
Marketing Associate, Pacific Bell
Joseph P. Clady, AIDS Hospice, Shanti Counselor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There is great need for research and education about AIDS and related conditions. We need to attack the disease, not its victims. Knowledge is the only vaccine available today. Vote Yes.

John Lorenzini, President,
People With AIDS Alliance
Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Jan Beck, Steven Russell, Eugene Ewins, ARC/AIDS Vigil

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There are many possible treatments for AIDS and related conditions which are not being examined by the federal government, especially therapies based on natural substances and processes.

Vote Yes for an AIDS Research Council open to all viewpoints.

Scott Gregory, M.D.
Paul Kangas

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A tape recording (Talking Book) of the San Francisco Voter Information pamphlet is available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar’s Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name_____________________________________________________

Address__________________________________________________ Apt. #________

Telephone No. (required)_____________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): ______________________

Second choice locations (if any)______________________________

Signature__________________________________________________
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PROPOSITION I

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway? YES 307 NO 308

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the Freeway with a surface roadway.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City's policy to remain as it is, and you want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a policy statement asking whether or not the Embarcadero Freeway should be torn down.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to change the City's policy, and you do not want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

"The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway demolished, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by at least $10.2 million in local funds. Potential private sector financing and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost."

How "I" Got on Ballot

On March 3 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy placing the question of demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway before the voters had qualified for the June ballot.

Richard Hongisto, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 11,119 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,720 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
Embarcadero Freeway
Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land now under the Broadway ramps is put back on the tax rolls, with low-rise buildings limited by restrictive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when united with Proposition J, recognizes these facts:

1) The Embarcadero Freeway is what is left of a never-completed elevated freeway that would have rimmed the City through North Beach and Marina neighborhoods to the Golden Gate Bridge.

2) Today this massive freeway, which separates us from our waterfront, would never be built.

3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.

For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman’s Wharf will be preserved.

5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked for this new system.

6) Only that portion of the Embarcadero Freeway east and north of the Main and Beale Street ramps—basically the portion directly on the waterfront—will be removed to make way for the new system. The removal cost, approximately $10 million to be paid for with privately-generated new revenues, is a relatively small part of the overall new system.

As for Proposition I, vote “YES, let’s tear down the Embarcadero Freeway.” Then turn to Proposition J and support the plan for a beautiful waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Removing the Embarcadero Freeway will allow San Francisco to:

- Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero.
- Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway.
- Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula.
- Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero.
- Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.
- Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won’t benefit San Francisco. Don’t let outsiders determine our future. Vote YES on I.

Hon. Toby Rosenblatt       Chuck Forester
Jack Wholey               Fritz Arko
Roger Boyer              James T. Chappell, AICP
A. Lee Knight           Robert Hernandez, AIA
Robert Bradford        Robert Berner
Edward A. Green          H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AICP
Gail Bloom           Bonnie B. Jones
Donald A. Crosby, AIA    Randall Rossi
Rai Y. Okamoto         Karl Limbach
Robert Meyers          Hon. Charlotte Berk
Ralph Hortado             Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Susan Bierman  Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima   Hon. James Bronkema
Hon. Douglas G. Wright  Jon Tichnell
Anita Sanchez       Jane Winslow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON I

This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY—VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds—without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city’s fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT—VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. The traffic problem is only going to get worse. New construction on only 37 intersections will not solve the congestion problem. It will just slow down travel within the city.

Travel within the city would be slowed down at all hours. Vote no on the destruction of the freeway.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled. Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. No current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for growth and to pay for itself as land value increases and because waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when used with these facts:

1) The Embarcadero was completed elevated freeway through North Beach and Gate Bridge.

2) Today this massive structure

FROM:

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?

(JIRIMO SU APLICACION?)

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON I

This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY—VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds—without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city's fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT—VOTE YES ON 1

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don’t let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on 1.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 1

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to 15.7 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown, Fisherman's Wharf and the financial district would be reduced.

Travel within the city would be slowed down at all hours. Vote no to the destruction of the freeway.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 1

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:

- Tearing down will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
- Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
- If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
  - By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will in-

crease from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
- Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
- MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
- Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City’s plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Judith Tornske

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 1

Tear it down? The concept is preposterous! There are 70,000 cars a day whizzing by on this high speed downtown elevated waterfront freeway! Where will they all go?

Aside from the outrageous demolition costs involved, (some engineers estimate $40,000,000 of taxpayer money!), eyeball ob-

servation, logic, and just plain “common sense” dictates that ground level “total gridlock” will result if this expensive free-

way is now destroyed.

Nostalgic individuals must realize that the times have changed! We can’t bring the Bay back up to Montgomery Street! On behalf of San Francisco’s overburdened taxpayers, we urge a NO vote!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
W. F. O’Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 1

Do NOT be misled.
Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 1

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, clos-
ing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Pru-
dence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?

YES 310  ╞═>
NO  311  ╞═>

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a policy statement that says that the City would replace the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt a policy statement which says that the Embarcadero Freeway would be torn down if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt a policy statement to replace the Embarcadero Freeway under these conditions.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway replaced with a tree-lined six lane boulevard and other traffic and transit improvements, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by approximately $27.5 million. This includes a one-time freeway demolition cost of $10.2 million plus $17.3 million required to match potential federally-funded transit improvements. Potential financing by the State and private sector and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “J” Got on Ballot

On March 5 a declaration of policy regarding the future of the Embarcadero Freeway was delivered to the Registrar from the Mayor and several supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows the Mayor or four or more supervisors to submit a declaration of policy to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

In addition to Mayor Feinstein, the March 5 document was signed by Supervisors Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker, Molinarl, Kennedy and Nelder.

POLLS ARE OPEN
FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J
San Franciscans now have a chance to remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with an at-grade, six-lane parkway, which will open our waterfront and restore views blocked for years by this large freeway.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for traffic and transit improvements:
• New, shorter freeway ramps connecting directly with The Embarcadero;
• A tree-lined, at-grade, 6-lane Embarcadero Boulevard, with a new waterfront Muni line, a jogging and bicycle path from Fisherman's Wharf to Mission Bay;
• Extension of Muni Metro south to the Caltrain station at 4th and Townsend;
• New ramps connecting I-280 with The Embarcadero;
• Changes in traffic flow and improvements to existing freeway ramps.

Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf will be preserved and enhanced.

The Board of Supervisors has specified that the Embarcadero Freeway will be torn down only if preliminary engineering during the next two years confirms—as traffic and environmental studies already have—that removal of the freeway will not result in more problems than it solves.

San Francisco became eligible for $88 million in federal highway funds for this new system when the Supervisors approved the plan in 1980. The $10.2 million cost of freeway demolition itself can be paid from revenues from low-rise development of the parcels now under the Broadway ramps and the increased values of nearby properties. Strict waterfront zoning limits the size of any development.

Traffic and environmental studies by the California Department of Transportation since 1980 clearly indicate that the new waterfront transportation system will be vastly superior to the existing situation, and that traffic congestion levels will not be notably different with the elevated structure removed.

Vote Yes on J and let's remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with a parkway and transit system—once again let us see our waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J gives the voters a chance to be heard on an important and timely issue. This issue is the replacement of a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway as one element of a comprehensive package of transportation improvements in the Waterfront area.

Last fall, the Board of Supervisors adopted for further study a set of traffic and transit improvements for the Waterfront. These improvements include:
• a new landscaped surface-level boulevard
• replacement of the Clay/Washington and Broadway on and off ramps with new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom
• removal of the unused stub of I-280 and construction of new ramps connecting the new waterfront boulevard to Route I-280
• a new light rail transit line linking Fort Mason with the Caltrain Depot
• extension of the Muni Metro to the train depot, improving

the Peninsula Commute Service

A YES vote on Proposition J does not allocate funds for these projects. It does allow for further design and engineering studies, including cost analysis, assessment of impacts on traffic, and other matters. The studies will then be presented to the Supervisors so that they can make an informed decision on the plan. If the studies prove positive, San Francisco will be able to transform its Waterfront for the benefit of all.

Proposition J will insure that the City will not proceed with the removal of any of the Freeway until all the studies are completed and all potential consequences are assessed. This is the responsible approach. Vote YES on J.

SPUR
League of Women Voters
Embarcadero Citizens Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SAN FRANCISCO'S NEIGHBORHOODS ASK YOU TO VOTE YES ON J.

REDUCE TRAFFIC CONGESTION—YES ON J!
Traffic backed up by the Embarcadero Roadway slows travel and creates congestion in North Beach and other nearby neighborhoods. J will speed traffic flow.

IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION—YES ON J!

Proposition J will provide regular streetcar service along the Embarcadero and extend Muni Metro service to the south, ultimately extending to Bayview-Hunter's Point.

PROMOTE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY—YES ON J!
If Proposition J does not pass, San Francisco could lose $88 million in federal funds for traffic improvements.

(continued)
RESTORE THE WATERFRONT—YES ON J!
San Francisco's waterfront could become a focal point for the city, graced by a grand promenade, instead of the dismal, deteriorating eyesore it is now.
San Francisco's neighborhoods join together to ask your support for an improved Embarcadero. We guarantee the freeway will not be removed unless it is replaced by facilities that assure a smoother, more efficient traffic flow. YES ON J!
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Robert Bradford
Ruth Gravanis
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Anita Sanchez
Nancy Katz
Robert Katz
Beverly Mills
North Beach Neighbors
John Behanna
Herbert D. Kosovitz
Jerry Hurtado
Gregory E. Jones
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors
Dale A. Carlson
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Ralph Hurtado
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Chuck Forrester
David M. Hartley
Donald P. Black
Mrs. Bland Platt
Richard Reinhardt
James W. Haas
James Ream
Jill M. Jones
Peter J. Locke
Marjorie G. Stern
John B. Lowry
Lawrence Ferlinghetti
Nancy Peters
Steven Taber

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J
SUPPORT PUBLIC TRANSIT—VOTE YES ON J.
SAVE SAN FRANCISCO FROM GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON J.
The revitalization of the Northeastern Waterfront...as included in San Francisco's Master Plan and transit plans, as overwhelmingly approved by the Board of Supervisors and as urged by Mayor Feinstein...will allow almost $900 million in unused federal highway funds to be used for vital downtown and waterfront transit and street improvements which will be a key to reducing needless auto congestion in San Francisco.
PROPOSITION J SUPPORTS IMPORTANT TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS TO THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT. It will:
— extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific/CalTrain depot
— create a new rail line (possibly using historic streetcars) to connect the entire waterfront from Mission Bay to the Ferry Building to Fishermans Wharf and Fort Mason
— set the stage for a possible streetcar line along Third Street
Since the city of San Francisco adopted the Transit First policy in the early 1970's, transit investments in the Muni Metro,
in new electric trolley an articulated bus service, and in BART and Golden Gate Transit, have saved downtown San Francisco from gridlock!
IF you are concerned about the future of transit in San Francisco, IF you are concerned about reducing needless auto congestion, THEN we urge you to join Mayor Feinstein and the majority of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in voting Yes on Proposition J.

Norman Rolfe
San Francisco Muni Coalition
California Transit League
Jack Wholey
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Regina Sneed
Tony Kilty
Hon. Jack Morrison
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Bay Area Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Hon. Amy Meyer, Recreation and Park Commissioner
Alan Lubliner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J
A SOUND BUSINESS PROPOSITION—YES ON J!
Common sense and good business demand we make the most of our resources. San Francisco's waterfront is an economic and civic asset unrivaled anywhere—yet much of it is cut off by an ugly, noisy, elevated roadway. The traffic improvements called for by Proposition J will benefit workers, tourists, property owners, neighborhoods, and business.
—Traffic flow and transit will move quickly on a realigned, reorganized Embarcadero Roadway, allowing easier, more pleasant access to waterfront businesses.
—An improved and beautified Embarcadero will create new commercial opportunities and increase the value of existing property and businesses.
—New jobs and an expanded tax base will generate increased revenue for the city as several lots now covered by freeway ramps return to productive private ownership. Though limited to low rise development (40 to 65 feet), tax revenues from development will more than make up the city's share of the project.

Robert Meyers
Dennis J. Potts
Kenneth R. Lorch
M. Arthur Gersler, Jr., FAIA
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones
Randall Rossi
Karl A. Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsed
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
Jon Twichell
Fritz Arko
Michael J. O'Shea
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J OFFERS RESIDENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO A ONCE IN A LIFETIME OPPORTUNITY TO RECAPTURE THEIR WATERFRONT.

Covering the Embarcadero into a tree-lined boulevard and building a new streetcar line will make the waterfront more pedestrian and transit oriented, that is, more people oriented.

A freeway structure that is a source of objectionable noise and casts a pall over a large part of the waterfront will be removed. The waterfront will be opened up to sunlight and fresh air and made more inviting and cheerful to those who wish to walk on one of the world’s outstanding waterfronts. Air pollution that is now retained by the existing elevated structure will be dissipated.

The transit orientation of the new waterfront will encourage energy conservation. Proposition J will:

—Create a six-lane, tree-lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero
—Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway
—Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula

—Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero
—Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line
—Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won’t benefit San Francisco. Don’t let outsiders determine our future.

VOTE YES ON J FOR A BETTER SAN FRANCISCO.

Sierra Club
Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage
Willinda McCrea*
Bob Cramer*
Rebecca Evans*
Richard Livingston*
Marilyn Clements*
Jennie Lew*
Jeffrey Heme*
Jane Winstow*
Roger Boyer
A. Lee Knight
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Patrick S. Hobin
Monica Halloran
Walter K. Morris
Lisa Klairemont
Jeffrey Heller
Bob Iannaco
George T. Rockrise, FAIA
Jon Twichell
Marc Kaszy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J GIVES US A CHANCE TO CORRECT A COLOSSAL MISTAKE!

The Embarcadero Freeway should never have been built. The original plan was to build a freeway from bridge to bridge, destroying the Northern Waterfront, Fisherman’s Wharf, Fort Mason, and Marina Green in the process. When the people of San Francisco saw what was happening, they stopped it in mid-air—literally.

Walk under it. Hear the noise. Feel the gloom. See how it cuts out light.

It’s time to remove this mistake.

The new waterfront plan will give us a tree-lined boulevard, a new streetcar line, and a Muni Metro extension to the Southern Pacific/Caltrain depot. It will give us a transit and pedestrian oriented waterfront that will give us pride and pleasure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J!

San Francisco Tomorrow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, with a membership of 1700 working architects in San Francisco, urges a “YES” vote on Proposition J. In 1968 the citizens of San Francisco stopped highway planners from ringing our waterfront with freeways. Today voters have another opportunity to return the waterfront to our citizens. Removal of the Embarcadero Freeway is one part of a carefully researched transit plan for San Francisco. This proposition supplies an unique opportunity to carry out a broad range of transportation improvements that will have many positive effects on the City of San Francisco.

Removal of the freeway will:

1. Return the waterfront to the people by removing this barrier to access and view.
2. Facilitate needed MUNI improvements.
3. Encourage development of the Embarcadero as a grand civic boulevard uniting the City of San Francisco.

The members of the American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition J and “YES” on Proposition J.

Donald Kennedy, FAIA
President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans love their City, the ambiance, the Bay, waterfront, the views, the healthy neighborhoods.
Freeway builders did their damnest to destroy the City and divide our neighborhoods.
Now we can remove that damned spot, the concrete dinosaur, the hideous barrier that destroys our scenic views, the fence that keeps us from the Bay, the concealer of the Ferry Building.
Correct a mistake.

VOTE YES ON J.
Miriam Blaustein
Charlene Clark
Marie Cleary
Zach Cowan
Dick Grosboll
Rick Haupman

Tony Kilroy
Jean Kralovek
Ira Kurlander
Jack Morrison
Andy Nash
Norman Rolfe

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

NO ON PROPOSITION J.
"J" is for JOKE—a cruel joke on us. What will J really do?
Add traffic to every street east of Gough. Delay the construction of waterfront streetcar service. Cost millions in local dollars needed to improve MUNI. Create a ground-level freeway on the waterfront as big as Van Ness, with more cars.
I'm a private citizen who's concerned about traffic and what it's doing to our City. If you are too, vote NO on Proposition J.

Steve Colman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
• Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
• Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
• If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
— By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
— Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
— MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
— Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Blair C. Pascoe

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION A

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by "*

3.020 Office of Risk Management
There is established under the chief administrative officer an office of risk management which shall review, analyze and report to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the finance committee of the board of supervisors the practices of the several departments, boards and commissions of the city and county regarding loss prevention and risk management, including the insurance requirements of the city and county. The office shall also establish and assist in the implementation of planning and operational guidelines regarding risk management and loss prevention for each department, board or commission. The chief administrative officer may appoint, at his or her pleasure, or contract with, a qualified individual or organization for the operation of the office. The qualifications of the individual or organization operating the office shall include relevant education, training and experience in insurance and risk management.

3.400 City Attorney
(a) The city attorney shall be an elective officer. He shall furnish an official bond in the sum of ten thousand dollars ($10,000). He shall appoint, and at his pleasure may remove, all assistants and employees of his office. He shall devote his entire time and attention to the duties of his office. He must, at the time of his election, be an elector of the city and county, qualified to practice in all the courts of the state, and he must have been so qualified for at least 10 years next preceding his election.

The city attorney must represent the city and county in all actions and proceedings in which it may be legally interested, or, for or against the city and county, or, any officer of the city and county in any action or proceeding, when directed by the supervisors, except where a cause of action exists in favor of the city and county against said officer. Whenever any cause of action exists in favor of the city and county, the city attorney shall commence the same when within his knowledge or when directed to do so by the supervisors. He shall give his advice or opinion in writing to any officer, board or commission of the city and county when requested. Except as otherwise provided in this charter, he shall not settle or dismiss any litigation for or against the city and county, unless his written recommendation, he is ordered so to do by ordinance.

The city attorney shall prepare, or approve as to form, all ordinances before they are enacted by the supervisors. He shall approve, by endorsement in writing, the form of all official or other bonds required by this charter or by ordinance before the same are submitted to the proper commission, board or office for final approval, and no such bonds shall be finally approved without such approval as to form by the city attorney. Except as otherwise provided in this charter provided, he shall prepare in writing the draft or form of all contracts before the same are executed on behalf of the city and county. He shall examine and approve all contracts or assignments of any of the title of all real property to be acquired by the city and county.

He shall keep on file in his office copies of all written communications and opinions, also all papers, briefs and transcripts used in matters wherein he appears; and books of record and registers of all actions or proceedings in his charge in which the city and county are plaintiff or any officer or any officer thereof, is a party or is interested.

(b) The duties of the city attorney in connection with the bureau of delinquent revenue collection shall be transferred to and performed by the attorney for said bureau who shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

c) There is established in the office of the city attorney a bureau of claims investigation and administration which shall have the responsibility of investigating, evaluating and processing for the several boards, commissions and departments all claims for money or damages made upon the city and county pursuant to section 7.03 of this charter or the general law of the State of California. Claim investigation functions of the police department in existence on June 4, 1986, shall continue as an adjunct to the bureau established under this section. Claims functions of the public utilities commission shall remain under that commission unless transferred to the bureau of claims investigation and administration by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the bureau shall also have the power to investigate events and occurrences giving rise to potential civil liability against the city and county and adjust and settle demands, within dollar limits to be established by ordinance, prior to their presentation as claims. There shall be established by ordinance a revolving fund to satisfy such demands adjusted prior to their presentation as claims. The bureau shall be responsible for the investigation of all claims and the analysis of civil policies and practices upon which the bureau shall report and advise the several departments.

The city attorney shall appoint a chief of the bureau who shall serve at his or her pleasure. The chief of the bureau may appoint, subject to confirmation by the city attorney, investigators who shall serve at the pleasure of the chief; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of civil claims investigator or any equivalent classification on the date of approval of this amendment by the electorate shall continue to have civil service status to said position under the civil service provisions of this charter.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by horizontal strikethrough.

7.000 Materials, Supplies and Equipment
The purchase of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreements for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchase thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head, be made by the department head. Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract. All purchases in excess of one thousand dollars ($1,000) shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases and a permanent record of all such quotations shall be kept. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) for materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000), fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of materials, supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two or more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchase of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned and may advertise for
bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends acceptance of bids, the department head shall direct the rejection of any other bids submitting the same specifications as the bid, stating his reasons in writing therefore; and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall direct the rejection of all articles which may be below standards, specifications or samples furnished. He shall not approve any bill or voucher for goods not in conformity with specifications, or which are at variance with any contract.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall also have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops herebefore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for and in use in all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of such property in any department to stores or to other departments.

7.033 Requisition, Contract and Payment
All purchase orders and contracts shall be based on written requisitions, or, for materials, or supplies in common use in the various departments, on the purchaser’s records of average use by all departments.

Purchases in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) must be approved by the chief administrative officer. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall approve all bids and vouchers for materials, supplies, equipment, and contractual services before the controller shall draw and approve warrants therefore. All contracts for the purchase of materials, supplies and equipment shall be made after inviting sealed bids by publication. All sealed bids received shall be kept on file. When an award of contract is made, notice that the same has been made shall be given by one publication, and any interested person may examine the bids and records at the purchaser's office.

The purchaser of supplies shall issue purchase orders and contracts only for the purpose of purchasing materials, supplies and equipment. He shall have the signature powers for purchase orders and contracts, except where the chief administrative officer shall require from all bidders information concerning their experience and financial qualifications, as provided by general law relative to such investigations authorized by department of public works.

The purchase of supplies with the approval of the chief administrative officer for bids in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or the department head concerned, with the approval of the board or commission to which he is responsible, may reject any and all bids and readvertise for bids.

The department head or the purchaser of supplies, as the case may be, shall have power to sign such contract for the estimated expenditures thereunder not in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000). Any contract involving the expenditure of more than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), if for the purchase of materials, supplies or equipment, shall require the joint approval of the purchaser of supplies and the chief administrative officer. If such contract is for any public work or improvement, it shall require the joint approval of the department head and the chief administrative officer for amounts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), relative to departments under his jurisdiction, or the signature of the department head and the approval by resolution of the board or commission concerned for departments not under the chief administrative officer.

The board of supervisors, by ordinance, shall establish procedure whereby appropriate city and county departments may file sealed bids for the execution of any work to be performed under contract. If such bids is the lowest, the contract shall be awarded to the department. Accurate unit costs shall be kept of all direct and indirect charges incurred by the department under any such contract, which unit costs shall be reported to and audited by the controller monthly and on the completion of the work.

In any case where the lowest price, or unit cost, bid is not accepted, and a contract is entered into with another bidder, written report shall be made to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the controller by the officer authorized to execute the contract, with the reasons for failure to accept such low bid.

If any provision of this section is in conflict with any provision of section 7.100 of the charter, the provision contained in section 7.100 shall govern and control.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.

7.201 Public Works Contract Procedure by Ordinance
Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter and, in particular, the provisions of section 7.200, the board of supervisors shall have authority to determine the monetary limits not to exceed $50,000 in any one contract, or contracts, to be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder, for the construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements. The lowest responsible bidder, for the construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements shall be the person, firm, or corporation that submits the lowest responsible and reasonable bid for such work. All bids shall be subject to the approval of the board of supervisors, or the chief administrative officer, as the ordinance may provide, and shall be awarded to the contractor whose bid is the lowest responsive and responsible offer, taking into account the lowest total responsible and reasonable bid and not less than ten days after advertising by one publication for sealed pro- posals for the work, improvements or purchase contemplated. Each such advertisement shall contain the notice of the right to reject any and all bids. The controller shall have the signature powers for the awarding of any such contract and shall receive from all bidders information concerning their experience and financial qualifications, as provided by general law relative to such investigations authorized by department of public works.

The purchase of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer for bids in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or the department head concerned, with the approval of the board or commission to which he is responsible, may reject any and all bids and readvertise for bids.

The department head or the purchaser of supplies, as the case may be, shall have power to sign such contract for the estimated expenditures thereunder not in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000). Any contract involving the expenditure of more than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), if for the purchase of materials, supplies or equipment, shall require the joint approval of the purchaser of supplies and the chief administrative officer. If such contract is for any public work or improvement, it shall require the joint approval of the department head and the chief administrative officer for amounts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), relative to departments under his jurisdiction, or the signature of the department head and the approval by resolution of the board or commission concerned for departments not under the chief administrative officer.

The board of supervisors, by ordinance, shall establish procedure whereby appropriate city and county departments may file sealed bids for the execution of any work to be performed under contract. If such bid is the lowest, the contract shall be awarded to the department. Accurate unit costs shall be kept of all direct and indirect charges incurred by the department under any such contract, which unit costs shall be reported to and audited by the controller monthly and on the completion of the work.

In any case where the lowest price, or unit cost, bid is not accepted, and a contract is entered into with another bidder, written report shall be made to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the controller by the officer authorized to execute the contract, with the reasons for failure to accept such low bid.

If any provision of this section is in conflict with any provision of section 7.100 of the charter, the provision contained in section 7.100 shall govern and control.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.

7.201 Public Works Contract Procedure by Ordinance
Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter and, in particular, the provisions of section 7.200, the board of supervisors shall have authority to determine the monetary limits not to exceed $50,000 in any one contract, or contracts, to be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder, for the construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements. The lowest responsible bidder, for the construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements shall be the person, firm, or corporation that submits the lowest responsible and reasonable bid for such work. All bids shall be subject to the approval of the board of supervisors, or the chief administrative officer, as the ordinance may provide, and shall be awarded to the contractor whose bid is the lowest responsive and reasonable offer, taking into account the lowest total responsible and reasonable bid and not less than ten days after advertising by one publication for sealed proposals for the work, improvements or purchase contemplated. Each such advertisement shall contain the notice of the right to reject any and all bids. The controller shall have the signature powers for the awarding of any such contract and shall receive from all bidders information concerning their experience and financial qualifications, as provided by general law relative to such investigations authorized by department of public works.

The purchase of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer for bids in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or the department head concerned, with the approval of the board or commission to which he is responsible, may reject any and all bids and readvertise for bids.

The department head or the purchaser of supplies, as the case may be, shall have power to sign such contract for the estimated expenditures thereunder not in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000). Any contract involving the expenditure of more than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), if for the purchase of materials, supplies or equipment, shall require the joint approval of the purchaser of supplies and the chief administrative officer. If such contract is for any public work or improvement, it shall require the joint approval of the department head and the chief administrative officer for amounts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), relative to departments under his jurisdiction, or the signature of the department head and the approval by resolution of the board or commission concerned for departments not under the chief administrative officer.

The board of supervisors, by ordinance, shall establish procedure whereby appropriate city and county departments may file sealed bids for the execution of any work to be performed under contract. If such bid is the lowest, the contract shall be awarded to the department. Accurate unit costs shall be kept of all direct and indirect charges incurred by the department under any such contract, which unit costs shall be reported to and audited by the controller monthly and on the completion of the work.

In any case where the lowest price, or unit cost, bid is not accepted, and a contract is entered into with another bidder, written report shall be made to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the controller by the officer authorized to execute the contract, with the reasons for failure to accept such low bid.

If any provision of this section is in conflict with any provision of section 7.100 of the charter, the provision contained in section 7.100 shall govern and control.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.
point two commissioners to terms of one year each, one commissioner to a term of two years, one commissioner to a term of three years and one commissioner to a term of four years. The expiration of the terms of the commissioners shall be for four years from the commencement thereof. Not less than one-four members of said commission shall be of the same sex, and one member shall have prior experience representing labor and one member shall have prior experience representing management.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of one hundred dollars ($100).

Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of considering and adopting examination questions shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission, after the regular daily working hours of 8am to 5pm. Such persons or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

In accordance with section 3.590, the commission shall have the power and it shall be its duty to appoint an executive assistant to be the administrative head of the affairs under its control which shall serve at its pleasure provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of assistant secretary to the civil service commission on the effective date of this section as amended shall continue to have civil service status in the position of executive assistant under the civil service provisions of this charter. 3.661 General Powers and Duties

(a) The civil service commission shall be the employment and personnel department of the city and county and shall determine appointments on the basis of merit and fitness as shown by appropriate tests including training and experience required, all places of employment in the departments and offices of the city and county not specifically exempted by this charter from the civil service provisions thereof, or which may be created hereinafter by general law and not specifically exempted from said civil service provisions. The commission shall classify all positions other than those specifically exempted from the civil service provisions of this charter, but which, by the provisions of section 8.100, thereof, are subject to classification for salary standardization purposes on the basis of duties and responsibilities of the employment and training experience required. The civil service commission shall be the judge of such classification. The classification shall be made in accordance with the duties and responsibilities and time to time may reclassify the positions to the various classes of the classification. The allocation or reallocation of a position shall not adversely affect the civil service rights of an occupant regularly holding such position. No person shall hold a position outside the class to which he has been appointed; provided that every employee of any department or office shall discharge any of the duties pertaining to such department or office to which his chief may temporarily assign him.

(b) The class titles and class numbers assigned to positions by the classification shall be used in all records, reports, statements and communications, including the compensation schedule, annual budget and salary ordinance, payrolls, and appropriation ordinances.

The commission shall adopt rules to carry out the civil service provisions of this charter and, except as otherwise provided in this charter, such rules shall govern applications, examinations, eligibility, duration of eligible lists, certification of eligible applicants, appointments, promotions, transfers, resignations, lay-offs or reduction in force, temporary emergency due to lack of work or funds, reemployment, or completion of work, the filling of positions, temporary, seasonal, and permanent classification; approval of payrolls; and such other matters as are not in conflict with this charter. The commission may, upon one week's notice, make changes in the rules, which changes shall thereafter be printed, and be in force, provided that no such changes in rules shall affect a case pending before the commission. The secretary may certify eligible payrolls and conduct examinations under the rules of the commission.

(c) The commissioners shall have power to institute and prosecute legal proceedings for violations of any of the civil service provisions of this charter.

(b) The civil service commission shall establish an inspection service for the purpose of investigating the conduct of and action of appointees in all positions and of securing records of service for promotion and other purposes. All departments shall cooperate with the commission in making its investigations and any person preventing the commission or its agents shall be subject to suspension.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the civil service commission shall have the right to establish procedures to review and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of color, religion, national origin, race, sex, physical handicap, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. The determination reached under civil service commission procedures shall be final and shall be enforced by every employee and officer. 3.661 General Powers and Duties

(a) The civil service commission shall have the power to inquire into the operation of the personnel system of the city and county to ensure compliance with the principles set forth in section 3.810. After such inquiry, the Commission may recommend to the personnel director, as established pursuant to section 3.663, the mayor or any other officer of the city and county such action as the commission believes necessary to carry out the principles set forth in section 3.810. In any hearing and investigation conducted by the civil service commission or by any hearing officer it appoints, the commission or the hearing officer shall have the power to subpoena and require the attendance of witnesses and the production of records as provided in section 3.791.

(b) The civil service commission may require periodic reports from the personnel director in a manner and form which it shall prescribe.

(c) The civil service commission may hear appeals from an action of the personnel director with respect to:

1. Allegations of discrimination. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions, the commission may hear allegations of discrimination and shall forthwith be enforced by every employee and officer.

2. Allegations of fraud; and

3. Allegations of conflict of interest, pursuant to section 3.108.

(d) No action by the personnel director which is the subject of any appeal shall be stayed during the appeal process except by the unanimous vote of the civil service commission.

(e) The commission shall be notified of the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal of personnel regulations and may comment on such proposals. The adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing fraud or allegations of discrimination shall be subject to ratification by the commission.

In addition, the adoption, amendment, or repeal of any personnel regulation governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfers, resignations and terminations shall be subject to ratification by the commission. The commission shall ratify or reject any such regulation within 60 days of receipt. The commission's failure to act shall be deemed approval.

3.662 Department of Personnel Administration

There is hereby established a department of personnel administration which shall consist of a personnel director and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the civil service commission and whose job function is placed under the department of personnel administration shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job function had not, by amendment to this charter, been placed under the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration.

The personnel administration shall provide for personnel administration for the city and county and shall provide for means to recruit, select, certify, appoint, train, evaluate, promote, career development, classify positions, administer salaries, administer employee discipline, discharge and other related personnel activities in order to maintain an effective and responsive work force.

3.663 Personnel Director

(a) A personnel director shall be appointed and serve at the pleasure of the mayor; provided, however, that the personnel director shall be selected from candidates nominated by any civil service commission and confirmed by vote of the board of supervisors. The personnel director shall be the chief actuarial officer of the personnel department and shall be the chief actuary of the city and county.

(b) The personnel director shall conduct appropriate examinations for employment, establish eligible lists based on those examinations and provide for certification of eligibles. The action of the personnel director on examination matters including,
to constitute approval by the commission.

(b) The personnel director shall establish a system of job classification. The provisions of section 8.200 shall govern whenever new classifications are created or existing positions are reclassified. The personnel director shall be the judge of such classifications, and shall determine their existence.

(c) From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the department of personnel administration shall determine whether a position within a classification is, "in character," temporary or permanent. Appointments may be made on a permanent, or where confirmation is required, on a provisional basis.

(d) Exempting sections 3.500, 3.660, 3.661, 8.105, 8.107, all but the second to the last paragraph of section 8.341, section 8.346, the last sentence of section 8.400, all but the three words in the first sentence of the third paragraph of section 8.401, sections 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.406, 8.407 and this section, wherever the words "civil service commission" or "commission" appear in the personnel provisions of this charter, they shall be replaced by the words "department of personnel administration," "department," "personnel director," or "director" as the context permits, the word "and" shall be replaced by the words "or regulations," the words "commission" or "commission," the words "general manager, personnel" and "secretary of the civil service commission" shall be replaced by the words "personnel director" and the words "section 3.661" shall be replaced by the words "section 3.662" or "section 3.663," as appropriate.

(e) The clerk of the board of supervisors, after consultation with the city attorney, is hereby directed to conform the language of the charter as herein amended when next the charter is submitted for republication.

(f) The personnel director shall investigate all employee complaints concerning job related conduct of City and County employees and shall promptly report to the source of the complaint.

(g) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall provide effective and efficient management through personnel programs that encourage high productivity and exemplary performance.

(h) The personnel director shall report to the board of supervisors on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicaps, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except those fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the personnel director shall forthwith be enforced by every employee and officer, unless the decision is appealed to the civil service commission in accordance with personnel regulations.

(i) The personnel director shall report to the board of supervisors on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicaps, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except those fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the personnel director shall forthwith be enforced by every employee and officer, unless the decision is appealed to the civil service commission in accordance with personnel regulations.

(j) The personnel director shall report to the board of supervisors on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicaps, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except those fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the personnel director shall forthwith be enforced by every employee and officer, unless the decision is appealed to the civil service commission in accordance with personnel regulations.

(k) The personnel director shall report to the board of supervisors on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicaps, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except those fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the personnel director shall forthwith be enforced by every employee and officer, unless the decision is appealed to the civil service commission in accordance with personnel regulations.
more than the minimum passing mark established by the civil service commission for inclusion on the list of eligibles resulting from the original promotional examination or any such list that may be kept on file for the purpose of filling positions as they become vacant. If an eligible is granted seniority in such appointment from the date of his name being reached in the eligible list, he shall be entitled to the permanent position. The commission shall provide for such waiver of temporary or seasonal employment as it may deem just to each case. In making such classification, the commission shall make every effort consistent with current conditions to maintain adequate registers of eligibles established through the regular examination procedure provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules to carry out the provisions of this section and to govern the administration of limited tenure appointments. In time of national emergency declared by the President of the United States or by the Congress or while any act authorizing compulsory military service or training is in effect, the provisions of this section may be made operative upon recommendation of the civil service commission, subject to the approval of the board of supervisors by ordinance enacted by a two-thirds vote of the board. Authority for limited tenure appointments, if established pursuant to the authority of this paragraph, shall cease six months after repeal by the board of supervisors of the ordinance which authorized such appointments.

8.332 Temporary and Emergency Appointments

When no list of eligibles is available on an existing list for a position in the class requisitioned by the appointing officer, the civil service commission shall be authorized to fill the position by appointment from the eligible list in order to provide temporary or emergency service or to meet unforeseen emergencies. The appointment shall be made within the class to which the position is filled or the next lower classified position. In the event that an eligible is not available on the list, the civil service commission shall make the appointment from a list of eligibles established by a special examination. The civil service commission shall adopt rules to carry out the provisions of this section and to govern the administration of temporary and emergency appointments.

8.329 Certification of Eligibles; Rule of Three

Whenever a position controlled by the civil service provisions of this chapter is to be filled, the appointing officer shall make a requisition to the civil service commission for a person to fill it. Thereupon, the commission shall certify to the appointing officer the names and addresses of the three persons standing highest on the list of eligibles for such position. In case the position is promotive, the commission shall certify the names of the three persons standing highest on such list. If there are fewer than three names on such list, the certification shall be made, there shall be certified the number thereon. The appointing officer shall fill the position by the appointment of one of the persons certified. The provisions of this section as herein amended at the election of November 2, 1976, shall be applicable only to lists of eligibles finally adopted by the civil service commission and not to lists for excess of duty positions established under Section 8.323 of this chapter or on or after the effective date of this amendment. In making such certification, sex shall be disregarded except when a statute, a rule of the commission or the appointing officer specifies sex.

From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the commission shall determine whether the position is: In character, temporary, seasonal or permanent; and shall notify the candidate in accordance therewith to the end that the candidate may have knowledge of the probable duration of employment. The commission shall provide for such waiver of temporary or seasonal employment as it may deem just to each case. In making such classification, the commission shall make every effort consistent with current conditions to maintain adequate registers of eligibles established through the regular examination procedure provided in Sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof.

8.331 Limited Tenure Appointments

When in time of war declared by the Congress of the United States eligible are not available for appointment from registers established through the regular examination procedure as provided under this title, the appointment may be made in accordance with the provisions of this section. The limited tenure appointments under this title may be made when the commission certifies to the appointing officer, the names and addresses of persons standing higher on the list of eligibles who are not then current employees; subject to demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the commission. The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to requisitions for permanent positions filled from and after January 1, 1980.

8.330 Duration of Lists of Eligibles

The civil service commission may remove all names from the list of eligibles after they have remained thereon for more than two years and all names thereon shall be removed at the expiration of four years. The commission may, however, provide in the examination announcement that the list of eligibles are secured thereby shall automatically expire at a date not less than two or more than four years after the adoption of such list.

8.331 Limited Tenure Appointments

When in time of war declared by the Congress of the United States eligible are not available for appointment from registers established through the regular examination procedure as provided under this title, the appointment may be made in accordance with the provisions of this section. The limited tenure appointments under this title may be made when the commission certifies to the appointing officer the names and addresses of persons standing higher on the list of eligibles who are not then current employees; subject to demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the commission. The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to requisitions for permanent positions filled from and after January 1, 1980.

8.330 Duration of Lists of Eligibles

The civil service commission may remove all names from the list of eligibles after they have remained thereon for more than two years and all names thereon shall be removed at the expiration of four years. The commission may, however, provide in the examination announcement that the list of eligibles are secured thereby shall automatically expire at a date not less than two or more than four years after the adoption of such list.

8.331 Limited Tenure Appointments

When in time of war declared by the Congress of the United States eligible are not available for appointment from registers established through the regular examination procedure as provided under this title, the appointment may be made in accordance with the provisions of this section. The limited tenure appointments under this title may be made when the commission certifies to the appointing officer the names and addresses of persons standing higher on the list of eligibles who are not then current employees; subject to demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the commission. The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to requisitions for permanent positions filled from and after January 1, 1980.

8.330 Duration of Lists of Eligibles

The civil service commission may remove all names from the list of eligibles after they have remained thereon for more than two years and all names thereon shall be removed at the expiration of four years. The commission may, however, provide in the examination announcement that the list of eligibles are secured thereby shall automatically expire at a date not less than two or more than four years after the adoption of such list.

8.331 Limited Tenure Appointments

When in time of war declared by the Congress of the United States eligible are not available for appointment from registers established through the regular examination procedure as provided under this title, the appointment may be made in accordance with the provisions of this section. The limited tenure appointments under this title may be made when the commission certifies to the appointing officer the names and addresses of persons standing higher on the list of eligibles who are not then current employees; subject to demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the commission. The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to requisitions for permanent positions filled from and after January 1, 1980.

8.330 Duration of Lists of Eligibles

The civil service commission may remove all names from the list of eligibles after they have remained thereon for more than two years and all names thereon shall be removed at the expiration of four years. The commission may, however, provide in the examination announcement that the list of eligibles are secured thereby shall automatically expire at a date not less than two or more than four years after the adoption of such list.

8.331 Limited Tenure Appointments

When in time of war declared by the Congress of the United States eligible are not available for appointment from registers established through the regular examination procedure as provided under this title, the appointment may be made in accordance with the provisions of this section. The limited tenure appointments under this title may be made when the commission certifies to the appointing officer the names and addresses of persons standing higher on the list of eligibles who are not then current employees; subject to demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the commission. The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to requisitions for permanent positions filled from and after January 1, 1980.

8.330 Duration of Lists of Eligibles

The civil service commission may remove all names from the list of eligibles after they have remained thereon for more than two years and all names thereon shall be removed at the expiration of four years. The commission may, however, provide in the examination announcement that the list of eligibles are secured thereby shall automatically expire at a date not less than two or more than four years after the adoption of such list.

8.331 Limited Tenure Appointments

When in time of war declared by the Congress of the United States eligible are not available for appointment from registers established through the regular examination procedure as provided under this title, the appointment may be made in accordance with the provisions of this section. The limited tenure appointments under this title may be made when the commission certifies to the appointing officer the names and addresses of persons standing higher on the list of eligibles who are not then current employees; subject to demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the commission. The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to requisitions for permanent positions filled from and after January 1, 1980.
mayor shall request and the supervisors shall make supplemental appropriation therefor in the manner provided herein for supplemental appropriations.

8.340 Dismissal During Probation Period

Any person appointed to a permanent position shall serve a probationary period. The civil service commission personnel director shall, by rule establish a probationary period of not less than six months' service in the grade of the position for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed rank of the police department, fire department, sheriff's department and San Francisco International Airport police force shall be for twelve months except that the period of the uniformed rank of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve months' service from the day following completion of the prescribed department field training officer program, but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment; provided further that probationary members of the uniformed ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in section 8.343 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four months may be established for executive and management grade positions for a time during the probationary period the appointing officer may terminate the appointment upon giving written notice of such termination to the employee, and to the civil service commission specifying the reasons for such termination. Except in the case of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments the civil service commission shall review the termination. The civil service commission shall by rule establish the procedures for such review. If the appointment resulted from an entrance examination the commission may declare such person dismissed or may reprimand the person. The list of eligible under such conditions for further appointment as the commission may deem just and if the appointment resulted from a promotional examination the employee shall have the right of appeal and hearing before the civil service commission. The commission shall render a decision within thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and may declare such person dismissed and order the return of such person to position with no prejudice, and the commission may in its discretion order that the employee be paid salary from the time of the termination of the appointment; or (c) order the return of such person to a position in the class or classification from which the person was promoted or reinstated. The employee's eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same competitive classification under such conditions as the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall be final immediately prior to the expiration of the probationary period the appointing officer shall report to the personnel director of the presence or absence of the person for the position, and if competent, shall recommend permanent appointment. Nothing in this section shall preclude the civil service commission from reviewing terminations for the purpose of future employability including terminations in the uniformed ranks of the police department.

8.407 Definition of Generally Prevailing Rates of Wages

Notwithstanding any provision of section 8.401 or any provision of any other section of this chapter to the contrary, generally prevailing rates of salaries and wages for those employees covered by sections 8.401 et seq. of the charter shall be determined by the civil service commission as set forth below.

The civil service commission personnel director shall conduct a comprehensive investigation and survey of basic pay rates and wages and salaries in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment for like work and like service, based upon job classifications as provided in section 3661.3 et seq. of this charter and shall make its findings, based on facts and data collected, as to what are the generally prevailing basic pay rates in the class of employment solely in the manner hereinafter provided. A benchmark class is defined as a "key class" within an occupational grouping selected as the class for which a representative sample of data will be collected.

Basic pay rate data for public and private employment shall be collected from Bay Area counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, San Francisco and Santa Clara; provided, however, that for any benchmark class of employment for which the civil service commission personnel director determines there is insufficient data from Bay Area public jurisdictions the commission personnel director shall survey major public agencies in the state employing such class, major public agencies to be defined as these employing more than 3,000 persons.

The commission personnel director shall collect basic pay rate data for like work and like service from Bay Area public jurisdictions as follows:
(a) the counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara.
(b) the ten most populous cities in these five Bay Area counties based on the latest federal decennial census.

Agencies of the state and federal governments and from school districts and other special districts in the six Bay Area counties as determined by the civil service commission personnel director. The civil service commission personnel director shall collect private basic pay rate data from recognized governmental Bay Area salary and wage surveys of private employees in the city and county of San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. The data collected shall be limited to basic rates of pay and salaries actually being paid by public and private employers for like work and like service.

The term "prevailing rates of wages" for employees governed by charter section 8.401 and this section shall be defined as the rate ranges developed from the middle weighted average of the primary basis of the maximum pay rates, excluding fringe benefits, for surveyed public employments and the median of the pay rates for private employment to be determined as follows:
(1) compute the average in each state and the midpoints from public employments data base by the number of employees in the given classification from each data base;
(2) add the products of (1);
(3) divide the sum in (2) by the total number of employees surveyed for that classification; and
(4) extend this figure by 10 percent to establish the maximum of the range and reduce this figure by 10 percent to establish the minimum.

When fixing rates of compensation the board of supervisors shall fix basic pay rates as close as reasonably possible to prevailing rates, provided, however, that the board shall not exceed the minimum rate of pay for any class in excess of the maximum prevailing rate for that class; provided further, however, that no employee shall have his basic pay rate reduced to conform to prevailing rates except as provided for in section 8.406. For those classifications where the service is of temporary character the schedules of compensation shall provide for minimum, not less than three intermediate, and maximum salary steps and for a method of advancing the salaries of employees from minimum to intermediate to maximum with due regard for seniority of service.

The term "basic pay rate" as used in this section is hereby defined as applying only to the basic rate of wages, with included range scales, and does not include any other benefits of employment or working condition benefits.

It is the declared intent of the qualified electors of the city and county that neither the board of supervisors nor the mayor or the mayor and board of supervisors shall be required to provide any benefits of employment except those enumerated already provided for in the charter and any addition, deletion or modification of benefits of employment enumerated in the charter shall be submitted, as a charter amendment, to the qualified electors of the city and county. The qualified electors expressly state that they understand that benefits of employment are sometimes referred to as "fringe benefits" of employment and the qualified electors expressly reserve the right to either grant or deny such benefits except those conditions of employment commonly referred to as "working conditions". Any reference to "working conditions" shall mean those compensations which must necessarily be provided in order for the employee to perform his job description duties efficiently and safely, and shall include but not be limited to such working conditions and benefits as are typically included in the administrative provisions of the salary standardization ordinance and the salary ordinance.

The board of supervisors may, in its discretion, provide for the special compensation benefits for employees covered under this section and section 8.401 of this charter only in accordance with the following provisions:
(a) the civil service commission personnel director shall determine, certify and recommend to the board of supervisors that the working condition benefit is equitable or necessary for the efficient and safe performance of the employee's duties as enumerated in his job description.
(b) such special compensation benefit, as recommended by the civil service commission personnel director, is substantially comparable for like work and like service to that provided for the job classification and is provided to not less than 50 percent of the employees of the class in the jurisdiction covered by the salary survey.

8.908 Initiative, Referendum, and Recall

(a) The registered voters shall have power to propose by petition, and to adopt or to reject at the polls, any ordinance, act or other measure which is within the power conferred upon the board of supervisors to enact, or any legislative act which is within the power conferred upon any other board, commission or officer to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinance, act, or amendment, when proposed shall be submitted to the voters of the city or county and the measure may be so proposed by filing with the registrar a petition setting forth said measure in full, signed by registered voters of the city and county as many in number as the percentages hereinafter required of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor as at the last preceding regular municipal election.

Any declaration of policy may be submitted to the electors in the manner provided for the submission of ordinances; and when approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting on said declaration, it shall thereupon be the duty of the board of supervisors to enact an ordinance or ordinances to carry such policies or principles into effect, subject to the referendum provisions of this charter.

Any ordinance which the supervisors are empowered to pass may be submitted to the electors by a majority of the board at a general election or at a special election called for the purpose, said election to be held no earlier than twenty days from the date of the call.

Any such ordinance may be proposed by one-third of the supervisors, or by the mayor, and when so proposed shall be submitted to the electors at the next succeeding general election. No ordinance passed by the supervisors granting any public utility franchise
or privilege, shall go into effect until the expiration of sixty days from the date it becomes final. At the end of such sixty days such ordinance shall be in force and effect, unless within such period there shall be filed with the registrar a petition signed by registered voters equal in number to five percent of the entire vote cast for mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election, requesting that such ordinance be submitted to the electors. In case such petition is filed, such ordinance shall not go into effect until approved by a majority of the voters voting thereon at a general election.

If, before the time any other ordinance involving legislative matters becomes effective, there shall be filed with the board of supervisors a petition signed by qualified electors of the city and county equal in number to at least ten percent of the entire vote cast for all candidates for mayor at the last preceding general municipal election at which a mayor was elected, protesting against the passage of such ordinance the same shall be suspended from going into operation, and it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to reconsider such ordinance, and if the same be not entirely repealed, said board shall submit the ordinance to the vote of said electors either at the next general municipal election or at a special election to be called for that purpose, and such ordinance shall not go into effect or become operative unless and until a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon shall vote in favor thereof. The provisions of section 9.109 and 9.110 of the charter shall apply to and govern the verification and certification of such petition.

Annual budget and appropriation ordinances, supplemental appropriation ordinances, the annual salary ordinance, or ordinances amending the same, the ordinances levying taxes, any ordinance appropriating money from the emergency reserve fund, ordinances authorizing the city attorney to compromise litigation, and ordinances necessary to enable the mayor to carry out any of the powers vested in him in the case of public emergency as defined in section 3.100 of the charter, ordinances enacted pursuant to section 8.410 of the charter, as well as ordinances relative to purely administrative matters, shall not be subject to referendum.

Any elective official, the chief administrative officer, the controller or any member of the board of education or public utilities commission may be recalled by the electors. The procedure to effect such recall shall be as follows: A petition demanding the recall from office of the person sought to be recalled shall be filed with the registrar. Said petition shall contain a statement of the grounds upon which the recall is sought. Any insufficiency of form or substance in such statement shall in no way affect the validity of the election and proceedings held thereunder. No recall petition shall be filed against any officer until he has held his office for at least six months.

(b) In the event the representative of the board of supervisors, mayor and the representatives of recognized employee organizations do not reach an agreement through the meet-and-confer process on matters contained in the annual salary standardization ordinance by March 15 of any year, the mayor shall recommend and the board shall approve or reject a proposal of compensation which reflects the meet-and-confer process for the classifications covered by Section 8.410 of the charter. The last good faith offer presented by the mayor or his or her representative.

In any year when an agreement on matters contained in the salary standardization ordinance has not been achieved, the civil service commission personnel director, upon receipt of a written demand from a recognized employee organization made upon the mayor and the personnel director shall prepare, prior to April 1, a schedule of compensation and administrative provisions which reflect additional rates that would be payable, and working conditions, based upon the last demands made by the recognized employee organization(s) which participated in the meet-and-confer process.

Said schedule shall be submitted to the registrar of voters for submission to the electors of the city and county at a general election or a special election called for the purpose, and said special election shall be held no less than sixty (60) days from the date of the call. No such schedule shall be withdrawn after it has been received by the registrar of voters. At said election, the ballot shall contain the following two alternatives:

(1) Approval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

(2) Disapproval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands. If a majority of the valid votes cast in the election favor paying the additional rates set forth in the schedule of compensation based upon the last demands of the recognized employee organizations which engaged in the meet-and-confer process, it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to amend the salary standardization ordinance to reflect said increased rates.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION E

NOTE: All sections are new.

Be it ordained by the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. This ordinance may be called the “City College Public Lands Preservation Ordinance.”

Section 2. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall approve or disapprove an exemption as an EXCEPTION, any building permit application for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, located across Phelan Avenue from the presently occupied campus of City College and consisting of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted, between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

Section 3. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall revoke or rescind, WITH NO EXCEPTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS, any building permit application previously approved or any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, which consist of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

Section 4. The term “building permit” includes building permits, site permits and any other permits for the performance of construction work.

Section 5. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of the ordinance shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. No provision of this ordinance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent implementation of the policy stated above.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION F

NOTE: All sections are new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The People of the City and County of San Francisco desire and are entitled to a local government whose officers do not engage in, assist or promote compensated advocacy on behalf of private interests before City and County commissions and boards while also serving as City and County officers.

Section 2. No officer of the City and County may, during the term of office, engage in compensated advocacy before any City and County board or commission, or any member of the board or commission or its staff, in order to represent any private interest, for which representation the officer receives, directly or indirectly, any compensation, reward or gift.

Section 3. Officers of the City and County shall not discuss matters pending before their commission or department with other City and County officers or state legislators when those other officers or state legislators are acting as compensated advocates for a private interest.

Section 4. No member of the California State Legislature shall appear before any City and County board, department or commission as a compensated advocate representing a private interest.

Section 5. In the financing of county and city campaigns: (a) No person other than a candidate shall make, and no campaign treasurer shall solicit or accept, any contribution which will cause the total amount contributed by such person with respect to a single election in support of or opposition to such candidate, including contributions to political committees supporting or opposing such candidate, to exceed the limits for contributions to any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, which consist of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

Section 6. Any person violating the terms of this ordinance shall be subject to the penalties set forth in San Francisco Charter Section 8.105. Such penalty shall include, but not be limited to, removal from office.

Section 7. If any provision of this ordinance, or its application to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, it is the expressed intent of the people of the City and County of San Francisco that the remainder of the ordinance and application of such provision, or any other provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.
rates and the same shall be in lieu of said annual compensation, and notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, said rates shall become effective and be payable as if adopted prior to April 1, of any year.

The provisions of sections 3.100 and 3.100-1, relating to the emergency powers of the mayor, shall not be applicable to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

11.105 Effective Date of Amendments
The effective date of the amendments, additions and deletions to the civil service provisions of the charter shall be ninety (90) days after the acceptance and filing thereof with the Secretary of State.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION G
We the people of San Francisco declare this to be our policy:
(1) IT IS IMPROPER TO PROFIT FROM OR PROVIDE SUPPORT TO THE RACIST POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SYSTEM IN SOUTH AFRICA, KNOWN AS APARTHEID.
Therefore it is necessary to sever commercial ties to South Africa, until people of all races obtain equal rights in that country, including equal voting rights.
(2) COMPANIES HAVING SUBSTANTIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH APARTHEID MUST BE CONSIDERED IRRESPONSIBLE.
(a) The Board of Supervisors must determine which companies doing or seeking business with the City have the greatest ties to Apartheid. Companies that have a significant involvement in profiting from or maintaining the Apartheid system, may, on that basis, be deemed "irresponsible bidders."
In purchasing goods and services and awarding other contracts, the city must give priority to avoiding such companies; the degree of the preference must be in proportion to the company's complicity with Apartheid, according to the following criteria:
— how much business the company does in or with South Africa;
— how much the company profits from that business;
— how much support the company provides the Apartheid government in taxes, loans, payments or other funding;
— the nature of the company's South Africa business;
— the degree of the company's cooperation with South African political censorship or secrecy agreements;
— the degree to which the company provides the South African government with the technology, materials and other means to maintain and enforce Apartheid.
(b) City funds must not be deposited or invested with any bank or other company which does business in or with, or makes loans to, South Africa.
(c) If any exception to the above policies is found to be necessary or appropriate, the responsible official must promptly and publicly report it to the Board of Supervisors, clearly describing the exception and the reasons for it.
(2) The term "city" includes all agencies, departments, officials, employees, units and subunits of the city and county of San Francisco, and all funds administered by or on behalf of the city or county.
(3) WE CALL ON ALL OTHER PUBLIC BODIES AND PRIVATE OR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS TO ADOPT SIMILAR POLICIES.
(4) WE CALL A GENERAL PUBLIC BOYCOTT, FOCUSING ON THOSE COMPANIES HAVING THE GREATEST TIES TO APARTHEID.
The Board of Supervisors must determine and announce which company or companies are the worst offenders within each major industry, so that the public can focus its boycott on those companies.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION H
SUMMARY: THIS INITIATIVE STATES THAT THE AIDS EPIDEMIC IS A MAJOR PUBLIC HEALTH PROBLEM OF CONCERN TO EVERYONE, REQUIRING INCREASED SUPPORT FOR RELATED MEDICAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION. IT CALLS FOR A COUNCIL FOR AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION OR SIMILAR UNITED EFFORT TO STOP AIDS.
We the people of San Francisco hereby adopt the following policy:
The Aids epidemic has rapidly become a major public health problem, costly both in human lives and in general community resources;
The first steps in dealing with such a crisis are:
— the scientific research needed to discover and understand the nature, causes, co-factors, prevention, diagnosis and treatment of the disease, and
— the education of the public about the lessons of that research;
A proper program of research and education pays for itself in the long run;
Promotion is urgent, because of the rapidly growing number of persons affected, increasing not only the suffering but also the difficulty of eradicating the disease;
The leadership and support of such an effort is everyone's responsibility;
While San Francisco's role in the overall effort against AIDS has been viewed as a positive example to other areas, the continued rapid increase in the spread of the disease means that we cannot afford to rest on our laurels or leave further responsibility to others.
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:
We call on all appropriate government bodies as well as medical, professional, charitable and community organizations and concerned individuals to join together in an all-out effort to stop AIDS;
We call for support to an organized united effort along the lines of an AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION COUNCIL, including, in some form:
— A COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, to provide informed evaluations as to priorities among research projects and proposals, recommending those which are most cost-effective and most likely to produce early results useful in the prevention or treatment of the disease, to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts or neglect of promising approaches, and to provide the council with complete and up-to-date information regarding comparative results of experimental treatments, prevention programs and other existing research;
— A COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, to inform the public regarding prevention and other research findings, and to inform relevant government officials and the general public, concerning the factual basis for a re-ordering of current public funding priorities toward an increased war against disease, including research and education against AIDS and related conditions;
— A FUND-RAISING COMMITTEE, to solicit donations, lobby for grants, organize benefits and other fund-raising projects spreading the financial burden by appealing to many sources;
We ask the council and committees to be responsive and accessible to public input, to include representation of all interested groups, to consider all viewpoints, and to be capable of prompt action;
We ask appropriate city officials to determine whether a suitable form of such a council already exists; if it does, we wish the city to support it actively; if not, we wish the city to seek to encourage its formation by such means as may appear proper.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION I
SUMMARY: This initiative asks "Shall we tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?" The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated portion of Route 480 known as the Embarcadero Freeway. This initiative declaration of policy will give the voters the opportunity to establish the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco regarding the proposed teardown of the Embarcadero Freeway.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION J
Shall the City replace a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if such replacement would open up the Waterfront to its citizens, improve the tax base, and create a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic?
Candidates

FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER
JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco
My age is 42

My qualifications for office are: The Bill of Rights guarantees that every person accused of a crime shall have the effective assistance of counsel. Whether an individual is rich or poor, that person is entitled to a competent and dedicated attorney.

In San Francisco it is the duty of the Public Defender to uphold this sacred right. In every case, we provide the client with the best defense under the law.

In the last 7 years, my outstanding staff has done this work with the highest degree of professionalism. In the next 4 years, that same strong, professional, independent and ethical representation will continue.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John D. Bardis, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Sara Barton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative In Congress, 5th District
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 16th St., Clerk
Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Artist/Community Organizer
Brian Getz, 55 22nd Ave., Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., International Vice President, ILGWU
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for Children & Youth
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070 26th Ave., Executive Assistant to Sala Burton M.C.
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Sycamore Way, Attorney
Carole Middan, 561 28th St., Community Health Director
Linda Ann Post, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative
Jim Rivaldo, 430 Steiner St., Political Consultant
Julie Tang, 785 18th Ave., Member, SF Community College District
Governing Board
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel W. Walker, 562 Campbell Ave., President — Local 250-A Transport
Workers Union of America
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilarius Ave., Minister
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor
C. R. Zanca, 1966 Pacific Ave., Auto Repair Proprietor

FOR ASSESSOR
SAM DUCA

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I was elected your Assessor in 1978 and re-elected in 1982. My years in the Assessor’s Office were spent in a professional appraisal capacity personnel and administration. I have two university degrees, the coveted MAI designation, and am the recipient of a special Congressional Advisory Board award from the United States Congress. I have served in an advisory capacity, both nationally and internationally, in property tax administration and will continue to serve the taxpayers of the City and County of San Francisco in dealing with Article XIII A of the State Constitution. My community involvement includes participation in cultural, civic business organizations.

Sam Duca

The sponsors for Sam Duca are:
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
Eugene L. Friend, 2910 Lake St., Investor
Nancy Polosi, 40 Presidio Ter., Housewife and volunteer in politics
Walter H. Shorestein, 740 El Camino del Mar., Chairman, Milton Meyer & Co.
Stanley Smith, 15 Harst Ave., Union Official
Emma W. Louis, 1257 Jackson St., Housewife
Alfred S. Withey, 2590 Jackson St., Ch. of Exec. Comm. of Diversified Holding Co.
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hinkle Way, Physician
Gerard Baker, 2330 Hyde St., Investor
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 225 Washington St., Retired
Joseph C. Orengo, Sr., 866 Faxon Ave., Publicity Dept. — S.F. Giants
James A. Scatena, 101 St. Elmo Way, Chairman of the Board, Scatena York Co.
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher
Frances May McAteer, 150 Santa Ana Ave., Recreation & Park Commissioner
Frederick F. Campagnoli, 2609 Larkins St., Attorney
Bette Brooks, 1738 26th St., Field Representative
Jess Teruel Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Businessman
Cyril I. Magnin, 994 California St., Merchant
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John H. Swanson, 145 Lake Merced Hill South, Bowling Alley Owner
Frances G. Goldman, 745 El Camino Del Mar, Child Guidance
Irna M. Bernardo, 282 34th Ave., Housewife
Leo J. Murphy, 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Charles M. Cunningham, 475 Connecticut St., Self Employed
Lawrence V. Eppinette, 815 Fell St., Conf. Secretary
Mary M. O'Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Volunteer & Homemaker
Elizabeth R. Duca, 16 Wawona St., Homemaker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Application for Absentee Ballot
is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

Name ____________________________

Residence Address:__________________

Mailing Address:____________________

Signature ________________________

If the person to whom this pamphlet is addressed no longer resides at this address, please draw a diagonal slash (/) through the address label and drop the pamphlet in the mailbox.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:
The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.
This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
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<table>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>6-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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# Candidates

- Sam Duca, Assessor                | 79  |
- Jeff Brown, Public Defender       | 79  |

# Propositions

## Proposition A
Would centralize the City's risk management and claims investigation functions.

- Analysis                           | 19  |
- Arguments                          | 20, 21 |
- Legal Text                         | 71  |

## Proposition B
Would make technical changes in the role of the Purchaser regarding contracts.

- Analysis                           | 22  |
- Arguments                          | 23  |
- Legal Text                         | 71, 72 |

## Proposition C
Proposition C was removed from the ballot by the Board of Supervisors on April 22.

## Proposition D
Would re-write the civil service provisions of the City Charter.

- Analysis                           | 24, 25 |
- Arguments                          | 26, 35 |
- Legal Text                         | 25, 73-77 |

## Proposition E
Would ban development of the Balboa Reservoir site (near Ocean & Phelan Avenues) for three years.

- Analysis                           | 36  |
- Arguments                          | 37-50 |
- Legal Text                         | 77  |

## Proposition F
Would ban "compensated advocacy" by City officials and legislators and would place a lower limit on campaign contributions.

- Analysis                           | 51  |
- Arguments                          | 52-56 |
- Legal Text                         | 77  |

## Proposition G
Would declare it to be City policy that businesses with ties to South Africa be boycotted.

- Analysis                           | 57  |
- Arguments                          | 58, 59 |

## Proposition H
Would declare it to be City policy that an AIDS research council be established.

- Analysis                           | 60  |
- Arguments                          | 61  |

## Proposition I
Would declare it to be City policy that the Embarcadero Freeway be torn down.

- Analysis                           | 63  |
- Arguments                          | 64, 65 |

## Proposition J
Would declare it to be City policy that a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway be torn down, subject to certain conditions.

- Analysis                           | 66  |
- Arguments                          | 67-70 |

# Credits
The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The active members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Suzanne Guyette, Mary Ann Aronson, Mary Martin and Tom Owen.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 5, 1986.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
- are a U.S. Citizen,
- are at least 18 years of age on election day,
- are a resident of California, and
- are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, such as this one, you can only choose among the candidates of your party.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Senator, State Assemblymember, County Central Committee, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your polling place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters' Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 3, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in”. If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

Q—Can a worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
- mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—An application form is not necessary. You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
- your home address,
- the address where you want the ballot mailed,
- then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail by absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 3, 1986.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS CONCERNING VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

Notas: Si hace algun error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del “Votomatic.”

第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

第二步
請記憶票卡插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perforé con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

第三步
副把票之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del “Votomatic” y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人用戶。
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO ÚNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADDO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perforé la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perforé la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perforé la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SI" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borradas están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precinct y obtenga otra.

選民須知:

請用針在投票紀錄器上之打孔針在選票上打孔；千萬不要用鋼筆或鉛筆。

選民須知：

選民在選票上所選的任何候選人，請在選票上所選侯選人姓名對應的圓點上打孔。如果有兩個或以上

候選人選同一職位，請在選票上所選侯選人姓名對應的圓點上打孔，但不

要超過您選舉的候選人數。

選民在選票上所選候選人，請在選票上所選候選人的選票信封所標明的選舉官

所標明的職位和候選人的姓名。

選民在選票上所選的任何候選人，請在選票上所選"YES"或"NO"字樣打孔。

選票上有用鋼筆或鉛筆者，選票作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔錯誤，請撕毀選票；或者撕毀了非候選候選人的選票信封，要

把該選票遞交給選舉區的當選員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

please begin voting on the next page.

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
**GOVERNOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE &quot;DUKE&quot; DEUKMEJIAN</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM H.R. &quot;BILL&quot; CLARK</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VICEGOVERNOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.L. &quot;BILL&quot; RICHARDSON</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE CURB</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECRETARY OF STATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RALPH E. WINKLER</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL CYRUS</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE NESTANDE</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(WRITE-IN)* To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>MARZ GARCIA</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILLIAM CAMPBELL</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAN STANFORD</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DON A. SEBASTIANI</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN)</td>
<td>No Candidate has filed</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>BRUCE GLEASON</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAWRENCE J. STRAW, JR.</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DUNCAN M. JAMES</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN)</td>
<td>No Candidate has filed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>CLAUDE W. PARRISH</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. JOHN SHIMMON</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WRITE-IN)</td>
<td>No Candidate has filed</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Role and Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED ZSCHAU</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>U.S. Congressman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH</td>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles County Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL ALLEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM H. PEMBERTON</td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychologist-Semanticist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH WILLIAM KNOWLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td>Retired Newspaper Publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTHUR B. &quot;ART&quot; LAFFER</td>
<td></td>
<td>Presidential Advisor-Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE C. MONTGOMERY</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lawyer and Businessman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELDREDGE CLEAVER</td>
<td></td>
<td>Writer-Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN W. SPRING</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOBBI FIEDLER</td>
<td></td>
<td>Member of Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED DAVIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Retired Police Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE HERSCHENSOHN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Television Commentator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT W. NAYLOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Member, California Legislature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-INS) To vote for a candidate not on the ballot, write the name and office title on the long shoot of your ballot.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States Representative</td>
<td>MIKE GARZA</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td>RUSSELL GRAY</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRI</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the State Assembly</td>
<td>TIMOTHY C. WIKLE</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEFF CORINO</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Committee</th>
<th>COMITÉ DEL CONDADO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
<td>ELECCIÓN PRIMARIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 3, 1986</td>
<td>3 DE JUNIO DE 1986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPUBLICAN PARTY</th>
<th>共和黨</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER, COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE</th>
<th>VOTO POR NO MAS DE 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DONALD DONALDSON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATE</th>
<th>VOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wm. Kemen</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Mark</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT McCURIE</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. MARTIN KELLER</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. GOETZ</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAMONA ALBRIGHT</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESLIE &quot;Lee&quot; PAYNE</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE O. KELLEY, SR.</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH KETTER</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. S. DOLSON</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABBE WALLACE</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. F. HARTY</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voted for 28,187,000 persons. No candidates reached 10,000 votes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daniel Nusbaum</strong></td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jeanne Baird</strong></td>
<td>213</td>
<td>Educational Project Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bill Honig</strong></td>
<td>215</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sam Duca</strong></td>
<td>222</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jeff Brown</strong></td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.*
## MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $850,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>COMMUNITY PARKLANDS ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for acquiring, developing, improving, rehabilitating, or restoring urgently needed local and regional parks, beaches, recreational areas and facilities, and historical resources.</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>WATER CONSERVATION AND WATER QUALITY BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $150,000,000 to provide funds for water conservation, groundwater recharge and drainage water management, and clarifies language in the Clean Water Bond Law of 1984.</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>DEPOSIT OF PUBLIC MONEYS IN CREDIT UNIONS. Authorizes Legislature to provide for deposit of public moneys in any credit union. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect. Legislation already approved implementing measure could result in greater interest income to state and local governments.</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. Provides exception to property tax limit when acquisition or improvement of real property approved by two-thirds of voters. Fiscal Impact: By itself, measure has no fiscal effect. No increase can occur in local property tax rate unless bond issue is approved by two-thirds vote. State costs for tax relief programs could increase. State income tax revenues could decline as taxpayers deduct greater amounts for property tax payments.</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>ALLOCATION OF VEHICLE LICENSE FEE TAXES TO COUNTIES AND CITIES. Requires allocation of Vehicle License Fee taxes to local governments. Fiscal Impact: Measure would have no direct fiscal effect. Prevents Legislature from changing the law to take vehicle license fees away from counties and cities. Measure would not prevent state reducing other forms of aid to local governments or changing existing formula for dividing vehicle license fee revenues between counties and cities.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>LEGISLATORS' AND JUDGES' RETIREMENT SYSTEMS. Limits retirement allowances for persons entering Legislators’ and Judges’ Retirement Systems after January 1, 1987. Fiscal Impact: Minor savings to state in future years if rate of inflation exceeds increase in salaries paid to current officeholders.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1988. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $500,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en la compra de granja y casa para los veteranos de California.

ACTA DE TERRENOS DE PARQUES DE LA COMUNIDAD DE 1988. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $100,000,000 para proporcionar beneficio para la adquisición, desarrollo, mejoramiento, rehabilitación o restauración urgentemente necesitada por parques, playas, áreas de instalaciones de recreación, y los recursos históricos locales y regionales.

LEY DE BONOS PARA LA CONSERVACIÓN DE AGUA Y CONTROL DE LA CALIDAD DEL AGUA DE 1988. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $100,000,000 para proporcionar beneficio para la conservación del agua, restauración de agua subterránea, manzanas agrícolas del agua de drenaje, y clarificación del lenguaje en la Ley de Bonos para Agua Limpia de 1984.

DEPÓSITO DE FONDOS PÚBLICOS EN COOPERATIVAS DE CREDITO. Autoriza a la Legislatura para que dispone el depósito de fondos públicos en cualquier cooperativa de crédito. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. La legislación ya aprobada que pone en efecto la medida podría resultar en mayor ingreso de intereses para los gobiernos locales y estatales.

FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD: Disponen asistencias a los límites de impuestos a la propiedad en el caso de adquisición o mejoramiento de la propiedad inmueble si se acredita por dos terceras partes de los valores. Impacto Fiscal: Por sí sola, la medida no tiene ningún impacto fiscal. Sin embargo, cuando se agrega el beneficio local, la propiedad puede ocurrir a menos que una medida de bonos sea aprobada por las dos terceras partes de los valores. Los costos estatales por programas de gestión de impuestos pueden aumentar. Los réditos de los impuestos estatales a la renta podrían disminuir a medida que los contribuyentes de impuestos descuentan mayores cantidades por impuesto a la propiedad.

ASIGNACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS POR PAGOS DE LICENCIA DE VEHICULOS A LOS CONDADOY Y CIUDADES. Requiere la asignación a los gobiernos locales de los impuestos recaudados en pagos de Licencia de Vehículos. Impacto Fiscal: La medida no tendría ningún impacto fiscal directo. Impulsa que la legislación pueda ceder la ley para tomar los fondos provenientes de licencias de vehículos de las ciudades y condados. La medida no evitaría que el estado pueda reducir otras formas de existencia a los gobiernos locales o que pueda cambiar la fórmula actual de dividir los réditos provenientes del pago por licencia de vehículos entre los condados y ciudades.

SISTEMAS DE JUBILACIÓN DE LOS LEGISLADORES Y JUECES. Limita las pensiones de jubilación para aquellos personas que se unan al Sistema de Jubilación de los Legisladores y Jueces después del 1° de enero de 1987. Impacto Fiscal: Ahorros menores para el estado en altos futuros si la tasa de inflación asciende en los salarios que se pagan a los que actualmente ocupan cargos.
### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

#### NONPARTISAN BALLOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prop. No.</th>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Fiscal Impact</th>
<th>YES 262</th>
<th>NO 263</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>NONPARTISAN OFFICES. Prohibits a political party or party central committee from endorsing, supporting, or opposing a candidate for nonpartisan office. Fiscal Impact: No direct state or local government fiscal impact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prop. No.</th>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Fiscal Impact</th>
<th>YES 266</th>
<th>NO 267</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION: DISASTERS. Base-year value of property damaged or destroyed by disaster transferable to comparable replacement property in same county. Fiscal Impact: Local property tax revenues would decrease by an unknown amount. County assessor and tax collectors would have nonsignificant higher administrative costs. State would replace revenues lost by school and community college districts. State income tax revenues could increase due to lower property tax deductions on replacement properties. These state costs and revenues cannot be estimated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prop. No.</th>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>YES 270</th>
<th>NO 271</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>MULTIPLE DEFENDANTS TORT DAMAGE LIABILITY. Plaintiff's non-economic damage recovery limited to defendant's liability based on defendant's percentage of fault. Fiscal Impact: Substantial savings to state and local governments. Savings could be several millions of dollars in a year, varying significantly from year to year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### COUNTY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prop. No.</th>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>YES 273</th>
<th>NO 274</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>COUNTY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county correctional facilities and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of four hundred ninety-five million dollars ($495,000,000).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>YES 278</th>
<th>NO 279</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgements against the City?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C

**PROPOSITION C HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THE BALLOT BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.**
DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

262 SI 败成 263 NO 反对
CARGOS NO PARTIDARIOS. Prohibe a un partido político a un compañero candidato a un cargo no partidario. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo a los gobiernos estatales.

49

50

266 SI 败成 267 NO 反对
IMPUTOS A LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE DESASTRE. El valor en el año base de propiedad inmueble dañada o destruida por un desastre puede ser transferible a propiedad inmune de remplazo comparables en el mismo condado. Impacto Fiscal: Los renglones provistos de impuestos locales a la propiedad disminuirán en una cantidad desconocida. Las bajas y recuperaciones de impuestos del condado tendrán impactos insignificantes. Los gobiernos locales no estarían afectados. Los beneficios del impuesto local a la renta podrían aumentar debido a menores deducciones en el impuesto a la propiedad en las propiedades de remplazo. Estos costos y beneficios no se mencionan.

273 SI 败成 274 NO 反对
RESPONSABILIDAD CIVIL DE MÚLTIPLES PARTES DEMANDADAS EN JUICIOS DE ABRADOS INDEMNIZABLES. Limita la indemnización que puede recibir el demandante a daños no económicos en la responsabilidad del demandado basándose en el porcentaje de la culpa del demandado. Impacto Fiscal: Afecta sustancialmente para los gobiernos estatales y locales. Los daños podrían ser algunas millones de dólares al año, pero variarían significativamente de año a año.

51

52

278 SI 败成 279 NO 反对
“¿Debería la Ciudad establecer una oficina de administración del riesgo y un despacho de investigación y administración de demandas, para estudiar y reducir el riesgo de pleitos y sentencias contra la Ciudad?”

A

281 SI 败成 282 NO 反对
“¿Debería el Comprador a firmar contratos por menos de $50,000 sin la aprobación del Jefe Administrativo y a permitir que sus agentes firmen contratos en su lugar?”

B

C

OFFICIALMENTE ELIMINADA
正式撤消
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VOTER SELECTION CARD

PRIMARY ELECTION
JUNE 3, 1986

POLLS ARE OPEN
FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR CANDIDATE SELECTION

"¿Deberá la Ciudad transferir la administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil a un departamento de administración de personal que tenga poder para cambiar las normas del servicio civil que el presente conllevan en la Constitución?"

"¿Deberá la Ciudad aceptar o rechazar ninguna enmienda de con-..."
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

D  Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?
  YES 288  NO 289

E  Shall the City deny or revoke a building permit for construction at Balboa Reser-

voir at Ocean and Phelan Av?
  YES 292

F  Shall the City prohibit competition for public contracts before any city commission, candidate for municipal office, and private organization to Council?

G  Shall it be the policy of the people to nearest ties with South America?

H  Shall it be the policy of the people to membership in and private organizations to Council?

I  Shall it be the policy of the people to Freeway?

J  Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embar-
cadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?
  YES 310  NO 311

VOTER SELECTION CARD

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor___________</td>
<td>County Central Committee*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor_________</td>
<td>1.___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State_______</td>
<td>2.___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller___________</td>
<td>3.___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer___________</td>
<td>4.___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General_________</td>
<td>5.___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization_______</td>
<td>6.___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate _________</td>
<td>7.___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative_____</td>
<td>8.___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate_________</td>
<td>9.___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly_________</td>
<td>10.___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. Public Inst._______</td>
<td>(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor___________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender_________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to your sample ballot for the number of County Central Committee members to be elected. The number varies with each district.

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR PROPOSITIONS.
PROPÓSITOS DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

288 SI 贷成
289 NO 反对

"¿Debería la Ciudad transferir la administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil a un departamento de administración de personal que tenga poder para cambiar las normas del servicio civil que el presente cuestan en la Corte Constitucional?"

292 SI 贷成
293 NO 反对

"¿Debería la Ciudad negar a revocar cualquier permiso de construcción para edificar en la Represa Bolívar en las Avenidas Ocean and Phoenix en los próximos tres años?"

296 SI 贷成
297 NO 反对

"¿Debería la Ciudad prohibir la defensa remunerada efectuada por oficiales de la Ciudad y legisladores estatales ante cualquier comisión de la Ciudad, y limitar la cantidad con la que una persona pueda contribuir para un candidato o una oficina municipal en $500?"

300 SI 贷成
301 NO 反对

"¿Debería ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el bolstear las empresas que tengan mayor vinculación con la segregación racial sudaficana?"

303 SI 贷成
304 NO 反对

"¿Debería ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el apoyar a todas las organizaciones agrupadas, públicas y privadas, para establecer y mantener un Consejo para la Investigación y Educación sobre S.I.D.A. (A.I.D.A.)?"

307 SI 贷成
308 NO 反对

"¿Debería ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el demolir la Autopista Embarcadero?"

310 SI 贷成
311 NO 反对

"¿Debería ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el reponer parte de la Autopista Embarcadero, si esto aumentara el acceso del público a la zona de los muelles y mejorara el tráfico?"
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

**BALLOT**—An official list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT**—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL**—See Absentee Ballot, above.

** POLLING PLACE**—The place where you go to vote.

**PROPOSITION**—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

**MEASURE**—Another name for proposition.

**CHALLENGE**—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

**SUPERVISORS**—Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

**CHARTER AMENDMENT**—The charter is the basic set of laws for the city government. A charter amendment changes one of those basic laws. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

**ORDINANCE**—A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

**DECLARATION OF POLICY**—A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, the supervisors must carry out the policy, to the extent legally possible.

**INITIATIVE**—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

**PETITION**—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

**PERMIT**—A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building. Proposition E concerns the issuance of a permit.

**COMPENSATED ADVOCACY**—Compensated means being paid for doing something; Advocacy means speaking or writing on behalf of someone else. Proposition F concerns the issue of compensated advocacy.

**RISK MANAGEMENT**—This field covers two areas: (1) deciding on when it is better to buy insurance and when it is better to be self insured or uninsured, then shopping for the insurance; (2) identifying hazardous conditions on one’s property and seeing that they are corrected so that liability and damage claims will be avoided. Proposition A concerns risk management.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.
Risk Manager; Claims Investigation

PROPOSITION A

Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgements against the City?

YES 278
NO 279

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Consultants hired by the Chief Administrative Officer are available to City departments that have questions about "risk management", such as how to keep damage claims to a minimum and how to find the best insurance rates. In some cases, the departments use these consultants. In other cases, the departments make their own decisions. When damage claims are filed, some are handled by the City Attorney’s Office and some are handled by City departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would amend the City Charter to create an Office of Risk Management, under the Chief Administrative Officer. The office would set risk management guidelines for all City departments, boards and commissions. Proposition A would also establish a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration in the City Attorney’s Office. The bureau would be responsible for investigating, evaluating and processing all damage claims made against the City, except those claims made against the Public Utilities Commission and the Police Department. The bureau would also have the power to investigate potential suits against the City and to make settlements within dollar limits to be set by ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer and a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want damage claims and risk management decisions to continue to be handled the way they are now.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not affect the cost of government. However as a result of its potential future application and the exemption of certain employees from the civil service provisions of the Charter, costs may be affected in an amount presently indeterminate."

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 10 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted "No."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON A

Last fiscal year, over 6,400 claims and law suits were filed against the City, costing us more than $10 million in settlements. I believe that it is time to change the way we handle our claims, secure insurance, prevent risks and settle legitimate claims against the City.

Last summer, we appointed a task force of citizens, under San Francisco Bar President Jerry Falk, to make recommendations on how to streamline our procedures and save money at the same time. The present system is very slow, costly, and inefficient.

Currently, all claims are investigated by the department involved. The City Attorney cannot act on any claim until the department is ready. This results in delay and duplication of effort and increased costs. A centralized and accountable Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney would be more efficient, cost-effective, and professional. It would enable the City to settle many claims quickly, before litigation is begun, saving the City the costs of defending itself in court and lowering the average cost of settling a case.

This can be accomplished without creating new jobs by simply moving into one office the city positions presently scattered throughout the government.

Vote “Yes” on A. Reduce the cost of City government.

Adoption of this measure would also formally establish responsibility for Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer, where it has been unofficially since 1978. With this strengthened authority, the Risk Management Office would be responsible for the gathering of claims data on a City-wide basis, the creation of incentives for both reducing the possibility for injuries and damage and the number of claims for each department, the coordination of insurance purchasing and specific suggestions to avoid and reduce risk.

This amendment is presented with the recommendation of the Mayor’s Task Force on Claims and Judgments, the Chief Administrative Officer, City Attorney, the President of the San Francisco Bar Association, and the President of the Lawyers’ Club of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Risk Management

Each year the City spends almost $10 million to settle damage claims. It is estimated that the overall costs to the City for all risk-related activities exceeds $125 million a year. It is time for action to be taken to reduce these huge expenditures. This charter amendment is designed to do just that.

Claims Investigation and Adjustment

Right now, the City claims investigation process is decentralized and largely unorganized. Each department investigates its own claims. Investigators may or may not be specially trained for their duties. There is no uniformity of investigation procedure or claims reporting. In only a few departments do investigators contact injured parties within days of an accident in order to settle the claim quickly and economically.

This amendment will create a claims investigation and adjustment bureau in the Office of the City Attorney. Claims investigation and adjustment activities will be centralized, economized and made much more efficient. The new bureau will be able to respond immediately to accidents and claims, providing quick compensation to deserving persons while at the same time producing a prompt, professional investigation. This reform is greatly needed.

Board of Supervisors

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
This charter amendment was proposed by a citizens' task force appointed by Mayor Feinstein. Its mission was to propose ways of reducing the number and financial costs of claims and lawsuits against the City.

The amendment has two principal features. The first is to centralize within the City Attorney's office the investigation of claims filed against city departments. This will allow for improved training and supervision of the investigators, who presently are scattered throughout city government. The result will be more efficient, cost-effective and professional investigation of claims. By improving the quality of claims investigation, the City can identify those claims which have merit and attempt to reach early — and less costly — settlements. Meritless claims will be denied with greater confidence that if suit is filed it can be defended successfully.

The second major feature of the amendment will establish a Risk Management office under the Chief Administrative Officer. Risk management is a concept widely used in private business. Risk managers are professionals skilled in reducing the overall cost of claims. The Risk Manager would be responsible for coordinating the City's insurance program, data collection, and correcting problems within the City which lead to claims. The Risk Manager would review those claims which have been filed against the City. Where it appears that an unsafe condition or practice has led to a claim, the Risk Manager would suggest to the affected department that corrective measures be taken. Reports to the Mayor and to the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors of the recommended corrections and the actions taken would ensure that the various departments will be responsive.

The City cannot eliminate claims and lawsuits against it. But it can limit its exposure by managing the claims process more effectively. This measure will reduce injuries and reduce claims, and that is good for everyone.

Jerome B. Falk, Jr.
Chair, Mayor's Task Force on Claims and Judgments Against the City

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN
KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, May 31, 1986

12 Noon  State Senate, Assembly, Congress and State Propositions
1:00     Proposition A — Risk Management & Claims
1:15     Proposition B — Purchaser & Contracts
1:30     Proposition D — Civil Service
2:15     Proposition E — Balboa Reservoir
2:30     Proposition F — Compensated Advocacy
3:00     Proposition G — Apartheid
3:20     Proposition H — AIDS
3:30     Propositions I, J — Embarcadero Freeway
3:50     Statewide Candidates

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION B

Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchaser must get the approval of the Chief Administrative Officer before signing certain contracts for more than $15,000. Only the voters may change that dollar limit. The Purchaser must personally sign every contract that comes through his office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would raise the limit on contracts requiring the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval to $50,000. It would also allow the Board of Supervisors to change that limit by ordinance. Proposition B would also permit the Purchaser to name certain people in his office to sign contracts on his behalf.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval only on contracts for more than $50,000. You also want the Purchaser to be able to name certain people in his office to be able to sign contracts on his behalf.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to require the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval on contracts for more than $15,000. You also want him to sign all contracts himself.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

“Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 3 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 71
Purchaser & Contracts

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON B!

The City’s Charter requires that a permanent, non-elected City official, the Chief Administrative Officer, review all purchases and contracts above $15,000. Of course, CAO approval of major contracts is very important. But, due to inflation, the number of contracts that have to go to the CAO for approval is always increasing. Today there are too many documents requiring CAO approval. This slows down the purchasing process, occupies staff time—and ultimately costs the City money. Proposition B will raise the CAO approval level to $50,000, and help the City to improve the efficiency of its purchasing operations.

The City’s budget includes more than $250 million for purchases on tens of thousands of contracts. At the current $15,000 review limit, the CAO must approve thousands of documents every year—a costly, time-consuming process. In the long run the City loses money because of the inordinate length of time required to complete all the paperwork.

An adjustment must be made to remove the smaller contracts from this cumbersome process. Review and approval of contracts under $50,000 should be under the responsibility of the City Purchaser, a highly trained and experienced professional, who reports directly to the CAO. By changing the present $15,000 to $50,000, it will be possible for the CAO to give each document that comes to him the attention it requires. And, by placing its orders and paying its bills faster, both the City and businesses will benefit—especially small business and those owned by minorities and women.

Proposition B will allow future adjustments to the limit to be made by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility will ensure the City’s ability to adjust to inflation and changes in the market.

This amendment comes to you with the recommendation of auditors, controllers, bankers, and others who exercise top fiduciary responsibility within their own organizations.

VOTE YES ON B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will make essential changes to update the purchasing and payment procedures under the Chief Administrative Officer. These measures are necessary and desirable because they will save the City money by significantly increasing our management efficiency.

Right now, the City loses because it takes too long for contracts to be reviewed and payments okayed, which means that early payment incentives go unutilized. The CAO has to approve every contract greater than $15,000—and with City purchases last year over $250 million, the paperwork logjam is vast and overwhelming.

An increase in the review limit from $15,000 to $50,000 will make an adequate adjustment for inflation—$50,000 now is only about $15,000 in 1967 dollars. Proposition B will also enable the City Purchaser, who reports to the CAO, to maximize potential savings through early payments by designating appropriate personnel to approve contracts up to $50,000. These “Good Business” amendments are consistent with private sector practices and should be incorporated by the CAO in the City’s best interests.

Finally, Proposition B will give the City the ability to respond quickly to changes in the market place by allowing changes in the CAO review limit by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility is necessary to ensure that in the future we will not lose money because of institutional rigidity. Control is maintained with the necessity of Board action and Mayoral approval to adjust the review limit, and this same feature will allow for change when desired.

Vote yes on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON’T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civil Service

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the civil service system of the City of San Francisco. The structure of the civil service system and certain rules governing its operation are written into the Charter and can only be changed by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would make major changes. A Department of Personnel Administration would run the Civil Service system and would be able to change rules with Commission approval. Major features of Proposition D are described below. The complete charter amendment is printed in this voters’ handbook.

Department of Personnel Administration

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Certain civil service rules governing the general operation of the system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs, are written into the Charter and carried out by the Civil Service Commission. Only the voters can change these rules.

THE PROPOSAL: A department of Personnel Administration would be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. A Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor would run the Department. Certain rules governing examination, selection and appointment would be taken out of the Charter. The Personnel Director would be able to change these rules with the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

Civil Service Commission

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the general operation of the civil service system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs. The Commission also hears and decides appeals on civil service matters.

THE PROPOSAL: The Civil Service Commission would no longer be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. The Commission could investigate the operation of the system, approve rule changes proposed by the Personnel Director, and hear and decide appeals only on claims of job discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest.

Employee Relations

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors appoints an Employee Relations Director to negotiate contracts with City employees; the Board approves all contracts.

THE PROPOSAL: The Mayor or his or her agent would negotiate with City employees; the Board of Supervisors would still approve all contracts.

What your vote means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing civil service system.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE
How “D” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative Charter amendment rewriting the civil service provisions of the Charter had qualified for the June ballot.

Robert Bradford, Jonathan Bulkey, Lee Munsen and Mary Hilton, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 36,049 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 25,027 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 p.m.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy
(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, with regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. Consistent with the City’s and County’s affirmative action goals, no applicant or employee shall be selected, appointed or otherwise treated in any way unfairly or discriminatorily against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, union activities, political affiliation or sexual orientation.

(b) The purpose of the civil service system is to obtain for the city and county the best qualified persons to fill city and county positions in a timely and economical manner, using professional, fair and equitable personnel selection and personnel management practices with consideration of the following merit principles:

1. Recruiting, selecting and advancing employees on the basis of their ability, knowledge, skills and performance relative to the work to be performed.

2. Establishing equitable and adequate compensation, as provided elsewhere in this charter.

3. Training employees, as needed, to promote productivity and high quality performance and to facilitate career development.

4. Retaining employees during good service and separating employees for good cause.

5. Assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration, with proper regard for their privacy and constitutional rights; and assuring equal employment opportunity, based on the person’s ability to do the job.

6. Assuring that employees are protected against coercion for political purposes and are prohibited from using their official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the outcome of an election or a nomination for office.

(c) This charter does not limit the power of departments, agencies, or other subdivisions of the city and county in their exercise of management prerogatives including but not limited to:

1. Directing employees in the performance of their duties;

2. Hiring, promoting, transferring and assigning employees from those qualified;

3. Classifying positions in accordance with Section 3.663 (k);

4. Disciplining employees;

5. Laying off employees because of lack of work, lack of funds or other reasonable cause; and

6. Determining the mission of its departments and divisions, and its budget, organization, the number of its employees, and the numbers, types, classifications and grades of positions or employees assigned to an organization unit, work project, shift or tour of duty, and the methods and technology of performing its work.

8.310-Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, with regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. No person shall be appointed or otherwise treated in any way unfairly or discriminatorily against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, union activities, political affiliation or sexual orientation.

(b) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in subsection (a) or any other provisions of this charter, it shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, consistent with a policy of acquiring qualified personnel for the service of the city and county, to encourage the hiring of blind persons. It shall further be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that no otherwise qualified blind person shall be discriminated against in employment, re-employment, re-appointment, re-promotion or re-assignment, waiver of eligibility for appointment or re-appointment, promotion or re-promotion, discharge or re-discharge, waiver of eligibility, or any other terms for which they were appointed; and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the 1st day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by this amendment, shall begin on June 30, 1981, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following. The respective terms of the commissioners who shall hold office on the effective date of this section as amended shall expire at twelve o’clock noon on said date. Thereupon, the mayor shall ap

continued on page 73
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Vote YES and join 34,000 San Franciscans who signed petitions to get this crucial reform on the ballot. “D” clears the way to modernize Civil Service so that it is fair and efficient. The present system is a 50-year conglomeration of rules that tie the City’s hands—

— A protest by one applicant can hold up hiring for an entire job classification for months—even years.
— Often tests cannot be given frequently enough to maintain current tests of qualified employees. This leads to delays and temporary appointments that make hiring top candidates all but impossible.
— Appointments to jobs are restricted to the top three names on a list even though more than three people have the same score!
— Many provisions are out of date. Some deal with hiring during the Korean War. Others limit our ability to carry out affirmative action.

“D” would remove archaic rules from the Charter so they could be changed as the times require—subject to meet and confer and public hearings. Job tests could be expedited; hiring and promotions speeded up; opportunities opened to women and minorities.

Specifically, Proposition D:
1) Creates a Department of Personnel Administration at no additional cost. Like other U.S. cities, day-to-day administration would be the responsibility of a director, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Supervisors.
2) Makes the Civil Service Commission the oversight body to set policy and hear appeals. Rulings would have to be within 60 days, eliminating endless delays.
3) Moves the office of labor relations from the Supervisors to the Mayor, who must make the tough-minded decisions to balance the budget. Never again could the Board give labor $27 million for “comparable worth.”

This reform is the product of years of work with SPUR, League of Women Voters, Chamber of Commerce. Members of the Board of Supervisors could have put the reform on the ballot last year but bowed to some labor leaders, and 34,000 San Franciscans had to do the job for them.

Proposition D will enable City government to work better for you. Vote YES.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON ‘D’

Proposition D is a complex proposition with a simple goal: remove the archaic restrictions on the hiring, promotion, or firing of city employees and bring San Francisco’s personnel system into the modern age.

Archaic is the only way to describe a system that keeps equally qualified people from competing for a job, and that takes months—sometimes years—to fill vacancies.

For example, if 50 people score equally high on a competitive examination, shouldn’t they all have a chance for any job for which they are eligible? Not under the current system, which requires complicated tie-breaking rules not at all related to a person’s qualifications or abilities.

Or what about being able to hire the best person available for a given job? Currently, eligibility lists are frozen for two years and every person on each list, including the lowest-scoring, must be offered a job before the highest-scoring person on a more recent list. Private businesses couldn’t function saddled with such absurdities.

Proposition D cuts through the red tape. It creates a modern personnel department, with a director responsible for carrying out rules to ensure fairness and efficiency. Accountable to the Mayor, the director would be selected from a list provided by the Civil Service Commission, and subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.

The Civil Service Commission remains an independent body, with the right to approve new personnel rules and hold hearings on abuses. Also under ‘D’, negotiations with employee unions would be under the Mayor, subject to approval by the Supervisors, providing checks and balances in balancing our budget.

With greater accountability and continued checks and balances, Proposition D will open the way to more efficient government in our City.

Bill Maher, Supervisor
Louise Renne, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON ‘D’

Proposition D is a necessary reform to the City’s Civil System. As the City’s Chief Administrative Officer for almost ten years, I have found that quality employee hiring is difficult and the process causes long delays.

The current system is:
• inflexible. The City cannot hire and promote the most qualified persons.
• inefficiently administered by a commission. Other large

(continued)
cities do not have such a bureaucratic process.
• antiquated. Civil service rules represent practices of the 1950s rather than the 1980s.

The new system:
• allows the Mayor to appoint an effective personnel director, who controls administration and procedures.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

It's 1986 and we're still trying to manage City business as if it were 1932. As heads of City departments, charged with the daily responsibility of putting out fires, fighting crime, maintaining hospitals, parks, libraries and providing other essential services, we know from bitter experience about shortcomings of the existing Civil Service System.

Enacted with the City Charter in 1932, the system is foundering in red tape. Outdated rules are the subject of endless challenges. Tests are put off; vacancies go unfilled; promotions delayed; any appeal, however groundless, stops the process in its tracks.

Proposition D would take old procedures out of the Charter so they could be changed in an orderly process by the Civil Service Commission, which also would hear appeals.

Day-to-day administration of the tests — the content, scoring, all the myriad details of managing a complex system, would be put into a modern, highly professional personnel office. Tests would be speeded up. Hiring would keep pace with need. Promotions would be on the basis of competence. High performance would be the standard. Discipline could be imposed with working rights fully protected, and women and minorities would be assured equal opportunity.

Proposition D will help improve management and the quality of City services. Vote Yes on D.

Frank Jordan, Chief of Police
Emmet Condon, Fire Chief
Don Birrer, Director, Public Works
Mary Burns, General Manager, Recreation & Park
John Franz, City Librarian
Eugene Garland, Director, Port
Marvin Geistlinger, Purchaser
Willard Hamilton, Executive Director, Redevelopment Agency
Claire Isaac, Director, Arts Commission
Ray King, Director, Parking Authority
Dean Macris, Director, City Planning
Grant Mickins, Director, Human Rights Commission
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, PUC
Joyce Ream, Director, Aging
Ed Sarfian, General Manager, Social Services
Thea Shelley, Managing Director, War Memorial
Moira So, Executive Director, Community Development
Louis Turpen, Director of Airport
Dr. David Werdegger, Director, Health Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The hiring practices outlined in San Francisco City Charter have been virtually unchanged since 1931, a severe handicap in running a modern city. Proposition D is designed to streamline the charter and ensure that the rights of present city employees and candidates for city jobs are protected, while improving the hiring process itself. The initiative also builds management accountability in the city system.

Proposition D Is More Fair, More Efficient, More Economical

The day-to-day personnel functions, including hiring, will be consolidated under a Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. Decisions of the Director of Personnel on examination content and administration are final, unless a decision is stayed during the appeal process by a unanimous vote of the Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D will make it easier to modernize the many archaic Civil Service rules and procedures now included in the Charter, while maintaining a strong and independent Civil Service Commission to safeguard the merit system and protect the rights of city employees. Many detailed rules will come out of the Charter and will become personnel regulations. These regulations can then be modernized, but only through a process which includes public hearings and meet and confer sessions with the union involved. In addition, the Civil Service Commission must approve any changes or new regulations governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfer, resignation and terminations.

Proposition D Will Improve Performance And Public Confidence

The openness and fairness of the proposition will benefit everyone. Well-qualified job candidates will have a better chance of being hired, and well-qualified job holders will have a better chance of being promoted. This means generally better job performance in all departments, resulting in higher employee morale and more public confidence in city government.

Submitted by
Louis Hop Lee, President
Civil Service Commission
Lee Munson, Member Civil Service Commission and Treasurer, San Franciscans for Fair and Efficient Government

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Cities can survive only with strong management. The greatest budgetary restraint must be exercised to assure that full value is received for each tax dollar spent.

With firm limits on what it can spend and faced with a possible loss of Federal funds next year, the City must be managed with the greatest possible efficiency.

Essential to greater efficiency is the need for Civil Service reform. As members of City Commissions, we constantly confront the torturous delays and confused rules that gridlock the present system. The present system simply can't respond to the City's personnel needs.

Qualified applicants become frustrated and seek employment elsewhere. Promotions are blocked. Morale suffers. Temporaries fill in; overtime mounts. The ability to plan is crippled; management is weakened.

Proposition D would put the system on a business-like basis. A personnel department would handle day-to-day administration. The Civil Service Commission would be the watchdog to assure the integrity of the merit system.

This streamlined system would replace what is now inflexible and cumbersome. Testing could be accelerated; hiring made more efficient and promotions made on time. The result would be greater efficiency and elimination of costly waste.

Vote Yes on D.

Jerry E. Berg, President, Board of Permit Appeals
Henry Berman, President, Fire Commission
Mo Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Hector Chinchilla, Rent Board
Ben Harry Chuck, Housing Authority
Dr. Arthur Coleman, President, Port Commission
Owen Davis, Police Commission
J. Edward Fleischel, Airports Commission
H. Welton Flynn, President, Public Utilities Commission
James Foster, Health Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation & Park Commission
James Fussell, President, Housing Authority
Anne Halsed, Port Commission
Tommy Harris, Recreation & Park Commission
Tom Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Walter Jebe, Public Library Commission
Jeffrey Lee, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Philip Lee, President, Health Commission
Bruce W. Lilienhal, Small Business Advisory Commission
Jacqueline Nemirovski, President, Arts Commission
Toby Rosenblatt, President, Planning Commission
Dr. David Sanchez, President, Police Commission
Joan San Jule, Housing Authority
John Patrick Shute, President, Parking Authority
Marjorie G. Stern, President, Public Library Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D contains civil service reform measures urged by the League of Women Voters since 1969.

Proposition D will:
— Modernize the City's outdated personnel system by creating a Director of Personnel, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors
— Preserve the principles of merit through policies set by the Civil Service Commission
— Create a more responsive Civil Service system at no additional cost to the taxpayer

EFFICIENCY AND FLEXIBILITY

Proposition D transfers authority for day-to-day management of the City's personnel system from the Civil Service Commission to the Director of Personnel. This will:
— Prevent hiring delays
— Ensure only the most qualified individuals are hired and promoted
— Provide City managers with more administrative flexibility

FAIRNESS FOR EMPLOYEES

Proposition D will:
— Safeguard the rights of City workers
— Protect gains made in hiring women and minorities
— Retain the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit appeals board
— Retain the ability of the City’s unions to negotiate working conditions
— Create a system that can respond quickly and fairly to the needs of City workers

Proposition D will bring the Civil Service system into the 20th century by making the Mayor accountable for the management of a system employing more than 25,000 people. Hiring by merit is still guaranteed by the Charter. Please join us in voting for this Reform!

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
Esther Marks, Past President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote Yes on Proposition D the Civil Service Modernization Initiative.

Prevent abuse of a system that was intended to serve the public and protect against favoritism. Prevent situations like this: an employee failed to report to work for a week without explanation; he was telephoned, notified by certified mail and a message left under his door; he was terminated 13 days later; he did not appeal the termination and the civil service commission up-
held the termination. Two months later, the employee petitioned the commission for reinstatement. The employee got his job back, not because the process of termination was wrong but because the commission had a long standing objection to using “absent without leave” as a reason for firing.

The quality of public services is dependent upon the effectiveness of the staff who deliver them. The primary role of the civil service commission should be to facilitate recruitment and retention of the best available personnel. It must protect against favoritism and must assure that everyone has an equal and fair chance at employment.

The present system does not do that. We feel this initiative will make the system work better, for the managers, for the employees and for the public.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco government is huge, with a budget of more than $1 billion per year and 25,000 employees. It is expected to solve serious problems. This requires that the City have the ability to hire and promote talented people to do the job.

The present civil service system is so tied up in red tape that jobs remain vacant for six months to a year, and all too often someone who is not capable of doing a good job is hired. Your tax dollars are being wasted, and you are not receiving the quality of services you need and deserve.

Proposition D will modernize San Francisco’s civil service system. It separates the personnel department from the Civil Service Commission, and puts the department under the Mayor where it belongs. The Mayor is responsible for balancing the budget and delivering city services as efficiently as possible. She cannot do this unless she can find capable people to do the job. That is the task of the personnel department in any organization.

Proposition D will also insure that the independent Civil Service Commission has sufficient authority to require the personnel system to be fair in its treatment of City employees. The Commission will be able to issue subpoenas and require testimony of witnesses on investigations it conducts. Should it find that discrimination has occurred, it can issue orders that must be obeyed.

Most major American cities, and virtually all cities and counties in California, have the kind of civil service system that will be established by Proposition D. San Francisco’s present system is still mired in the past. It hobbles the ability of the City to deliver services and spend your tax dollars as efficiently as possible.

SPUR has not placed a statement in the Voter’s Handbook for any other issue over the past 15 years. We feel that Proposition D is so vital for San Francisco’s future that we are making this appeal for your support.

Vote “YES” on Proposition D.

SPUR—The San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Reform Initiative, will give San Francisco citizens the HIGH PERFORMANCE GOVERNMENT necessary to meet the many challenges of the future. Proposition D corrects the outdated and inflexible requirements originally written in San Francisco’s City Charter in 1931. It will eliminate the problems which prevent San Francisco’s personnel system from operating with efficiency the City’s voters and taxpayers deserve:

Proposition D insures City jobs will be filled from current lists of the most qualified employees.

Proposition D prevents ungrounded appeals from delaying for years the appointment or promotion of qualified employees.

Proposition D eliminates the repetitive tasks currently monopolizing the Civil Service Commission meetings and directs the Commission to serve as an appellate body to protect the City’s good employees.

Proposition D centralizes the day-to-day operation of the civil service system and makes the Director of Personnel responsible to the Mayor.

Proposition D simplifies the budgetary process by making the Mayor the City’s chief labor negotiator, responsible for setting working conditions within the City’s financial capacity.

Proposition D is the result of years of painstaking review by the most experienced, able and respected management experts in San Francisco. It is a plan intended to move City government out of the 1930s and equip San Francisco to enter the twenty-first century without being burdened by the red tape of the past.

After ten years of commitment to improving our City, the Mayor’s Fiscal Advisory Committee is convinced adoption of Proposition D is one of the most important issues facing the voters. CHANGE IS LONG OVERDUE. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by,
The Mayor’s Fiscal Advisory Committee

David Amacher
Jerome Anderson
Richard Blunt
Charles Chapman
Arthur Cooke, Jr.
Benson Dial
James Edgar
Ruben Garcia
Robert Hayden
Walter Hoodley
John Jacobs
Michael McGill
Ellen Newman
Roy Nordman
Frank Tai remot
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Civil Service

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PERSONNEL MANAGERS SAY YES ON PROPOSITION D

As the personnel managers for City Departments, we are charged with the responsibility of managing the City's personnel system. The activities include examinations, hiring, training, discipline, union-management relations, affirmative action and compensation. No one knows better than we the frustrations experienced in attempting to monitor an unbelievable sequence of overlapping bureaucratic activities in attempting to get the job done.

Proposition D will bring our personnel system into line with most other public personnel systems. The improved system will create the potential for being more responsive to the needs of operating departments. It will improve labor relations by transferring this function to the executive branch of government where it belongs.

Proposition D will streamline certain routine procedures resulting in a reduction of cost and time. Under the current system delays are experienced due to lengthy appeals during which time the departments' objectives are delayed.

Proposition D will create an atmosphere of increased accountability for department managers in the areas of affirmative action, discipline and job performance.

Proposition D has been endorsed by the San Francisco Council of Human Resource Managers, the association of over one hundred personnel managers in City government.

Proposition D strengthens merit system principles. Civil Service commissioners will have more time to enforce and protect these principles rather than being bogged down in the day-to-day activities of administration.

Proposition D will help bring about improved methods and practices in personnel administration and should result in a more competent and effective workforce which the citizens of San Francisco have a right to expect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alvin W. Schauf</th>
<th>Andrea R. Gourdin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Director</td>
<td>Manager, Bureau of Personnel &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Park Department</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha Ramirez</td>
<td>Public Utilities Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Officer</td>
<td>Moro Noguchi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Port</td>
<td>Senior Department Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward M. Gaziano</td>
<td>Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Director</td>
<td>Mary Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health</td>
<td>Senior Personnel Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Horan</td>
<td>Laguna Honda Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Personnel Officer</td>
<td>Thelma Poteet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Social Services</td>
<td>Senior Personnel Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Ilincic</td>
<td>San Francisco General Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Director</td>
<td>John Burke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco International</td>
<td>Personnel Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>Controller's Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will assist the Department of Public Works by streamlining the Civil Service process.

- Under the current system, the duration of eligible lists from 2 to 4 years hampers the Department from hiring graduates of colleges and universities on an annual basis. Consequently, many excellent candidates are not entered into the Civil Service System. Passage of the proposition will improve the quality of the pool of applicants and thereby the quality of public service given by the Department.

- The establishment of a Personnel Director to administer the day-to-day tasks of the system will speed up the decision making process to the advantage of employees and management alike.

- The proposition still calls for checks and balances in that the Commission will continue to hear appeals on discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest. The Commission will act as a watchdog while leaving the general administration to the Personnel Director.

The initiative will make for an improved system for employees, management and the citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Donald Birrer
Director of Public Works

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Passage of this amendment will update our civil service system. These changes will make it comparable to other merit system agencies. Some of these changes are:

(A) removal of administrative details from the charter which inhibit timely and effective personnel actions.

The following subjects will be placed in personnel regulations:

- Protests of written questions and answers
- Protests of tentative employment lists
- Promotional examinations

- Examinations for employees on military leave
- Certification of eligibles—Rule of three
- Duration of employment lists
- Temporary employee appointments
- (B) allows continuous up-dating of employment lists.
- (C) allows equitable treatment of job candidates with same test score.
- (D) realigns responsibilities: the Civil Service Commission dealing primarily with compliance and adjudication activities

(continued)
while the Personnel Department administers the day-to-day operation of the merit system.

Equally important the amendment retains important merit system provisions dealing with:
- Employee salary setting procedures
- Positions subject to merit system examinations
- Public hearing and meet and confer requirements
- Penalties for examination fraud
- Seniority, meritorious service and applicable educational credits for promotional examinations in the Police/Fire De-

partsments
- Termination of unsatisfactory employees
- Disciplinary suspensions
- Conflict of interest
- Creation of positions

Proposition "D" merits a 'YES' vote.

John J. Walsh
General Manager Personnel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Initiative, is a long-overdue reform to streamline antiquated hiring practices in San Francisco’s fifty-year-old charter. Proposition D will ensure that the best and brightest job candidates are chosen to serve our city, thus promoting excellence in job performance and helping to eliminate incompetence. This initiative builds management accountability in the city system, while giving the Civil Service Commission the independence to protect the rights of women and minorities.

A Better, More Efficient System at Less Cost

Proposition D consolidates personnel functions, including hiring, under a new Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. The Director has final authority over content of examinations given city job applicants, so more flexibility is possible in finding truly qualified candidates.

Proposition D redefines the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit systems appeals board and policy-setting body. The merit principles are spelled out in the Proposition. This allows the Commission to protect the rights of women and minorities at no cost to the public.

More Fair to Everyone

Proposition D greatly improves the city charter. Well-qualified job candidates have a better chance to be hired and well-qualified job holders have a better chance to be promoted. The public is rewarded with the better job performance, efficiency and friendliness one expects from good government employees. All of these improvements are at no additional cost to the taxpayer.

Submitted by
James W. Haas

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service System, as presently constituted, (vintage 1932!), is uncivil, and there is nothing “systematic” about it! It’s pure, unadulterated municipal lunacy and chaos! Remarkably, BOTH Management and Labor despise it. It certainly is NOT producing the best qualified persons to fill City jobs!

Let’s follow Mayor Feinstein’s recommendations. If this operation doesn’t dramatically improve, there are always FUTURE ELECTIONS where additional, more Draconian changes can be considered by the voters.

As matters now stand, it is far better to light a candle than just sit and curse the darkness! Any changes will be an improvement! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

For more than a half-century, San Francisco Mayors have abided by the employee examination, hiring and promotion policies administered by a strong and independent Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D is a deceptive and dangerous scheme that would give future Mayors and top-level bureaucrats the power to ignore competence and reward political loyalty.

Proposition D would take key Civil Service employment rules out of the City Charter and make them subject to wheeling and dealing by City Hall politicians.

There’s an old saying— “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.” Civil Service has worked well for more than 50 years. Proposition D is unnecessary, ineffective and even counter-productive. It’s not just deceptive, it’s dangerous.

Joseph L. Alioto
Former Mayor of San Francisco

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Time and time again, different groups have put various propositions on the ballot to weaken our Civil Service System and reintroduce political patronage into City employment practices.
And every time the voters have wisely rejected these schemes, no matter how cleverly they have been disguised.
Proposition D is just another power grab by bureaucrats at the top in City Hall.

We’ve said NO! loud and clear in the past. Let’s say NO one more time.

Submitted by:
TAXPAYERS FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT
Thomas Scanlon
City Treasurer, Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “D”!!!!

During the eight years while a member of the Board of Supervisors, I fought hard to reform the Civil Service Commission and to bring working conditions and city workers’ pay equitable to both workers and taxpayers. I fought to insure an independent Civil Service Commission that would remain just that—-independent and free from political influence and political patronage of particularly the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

I am truly saddened by the Mayor’s insistence in bringing this disastrous Proposition “D” before the voters. Some of the Supervisors rejected this misguided measure for what it is; an unwise consolidation of authority to hire, fire and promote city workers by the Mayor and newly created personnel officer.

My efforts to bring pay equity to both taxpayers and city workers were continually squashed by then Supervisor Feinstein and Supervisor Molinari. Finally, in 1975, shortly after a disastrous city strike, I was able to place on the ballot, for voter approval, a measure that almost eliminates the power of the Mayor and Supervisors to manipulate the pay of city workers. This measure was overwhelmingly passed by the voters that year and we have not had any labor unrest since that date.

Vote No on “D”!
“D” stands for disaster. It will undo many of these reforms.
Also, right now, the City is almost broke, thanks to the manipulation of Mayor Feinstein and her chief ally Supervisor Molinari.

If “D” passes the cost of operating our city government will increase in the next 24 months by not less than $60,000,000.
Contrary to the provisions of Proposition 13, property taxes would be increased, thus forcing up rents.

Vote No on “D”.

Don’t weaken our Civil Service Commission, whereby least deserving city employees could be promoted because of connection or clout.

Vote No on “D”.

We now almost have more problems than we can handle. We don’t want our city turned into another Chicago, wherefor for nearly half a century a corrupt political system flourished under Mayor Richard Daley.

John Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We join San Franciscans for Fair Employment in opposing the Civil Service Initiative, Proposition D.

This measure will severely hamper the well-being of the San Francisco Fire and Police Departments. These departments are two of the finest in the Country and have consistently protected life and property in a professional manner. They must continue that tradition with a civil service system based on MERIT and not political patronage.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.
Andrew C. Casper
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired
Keith P. Calden
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired
William F. Murray
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Our present Civil Service system was designed to keep corruption out of government. It has generally served that purpose well. This proposition would dismantle that system and in my opinion open the doors to nepotism, favoritism, patronage and corruption. Better a city government that is bureaucratic than one that is corrupt. Vote NO on D.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is an attack on the merit system and an attempt to return patronage to the Mayor's office by eliminating the authority of the Civil Service Commission and its built in checks and balances.

The present Civil Service system is not perfect, but corrections can be made within the Charter without destroying a system that has worked for over 50 years and has been free from fraud and corruption.

This proposition will do nothing to improve the caliber of public service and could have the opposite effect.

I urge you to vote NO on PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by
The San Francisco Police Supervisors and Investigators Association

Don Goad, Captain SFPD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D could be a dangerous first step toward weakening the independent, impartial administration of our City government.

Proposition D would transfer power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor. The Director's decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline and certification would be final. The Commission would have no right to hear examinations or disciplinary appeals.

With the transfer of duties and responsibilities from the Commission to the Mayor's appointed Personnel Director, the Mayor would have control over personnel functions. Currently, commissioners have independent status and can be dismissed for cause. The Personnel Director could be dismissed at will.

The Merit System could be replaced by a patronage system. Proposition D could open the door to rules permitting the Personnel Director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his or her position on the list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Proposition D is NOT a reform package. The checks and balances for efficient City government would be lopsided, with too much power in the hands of unknown future Mayors.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
John L. Molinar, President
Harry G. Britt
Richard Hongisto
Willie B. Kennedy
Wendy Nelder
Nancy Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Beware of PROPOSITION D!

Powerful special interest groups are attempting to remove key City employees from the independent and impartial Civil Service system in the name of "reform".

They want instead to make these employees answerable directly to future Mayors and politically-appointed Personnel Directors and department heads.

PROPOSITION D got on the ballot because the Chamber of Commerce and such companies as Pacific Bell and PG&E paid a professional southern California campaign firm, $70,000 to collect signatures.

They're trying to destroy the merit system and replace it with an old-fashioned patronage system.

Department heads will be able to ignore examination scores and reward loyalty rather than competence in promotions and hiring.

Don't let the Chamber of Commerce, big business and their allies in the City bureaucracy dictate who's hired, fired and promoted among public employees.

PROPOSITION D is not just deceptive, it's dangerous!

Vote NO on PROPOSITION D!

Libby Denebim
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Tim Wulfred
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Ron Huberman
Vice-Chairman, Democratic Central Committee
Jim Wacob
Democratic Central Committee
Roberto Echever
President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Rick Fuscus
President, Harvey Milk Lesbian Gay Democratic Club
Walter L. Johnson
Exec. Secty., S. F. Labor Council
Michael Berrick
Linda Paik
Sal Roselli
Deborah Stein
John Mehring
Pat Norman
Nancy Walker
Gwen Craig
Harry Britt
Louise Mimick
Carole Migden
Agar Jaicks
Jack Morrison
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D places too much power in the hands of ONE. Proposition D will provide for a personnel director to be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. The Mayor now appoints five members of the Civil Service Commission who also serve at her pleasure.

You work for years to climb the civil service ladder and then somebody comes along with an idea to cut you off at the pockets.

Proposition D will lock in all the employees employed in the Mayor’s office and will control the appointments of any new staff by the next Mayor elected in 1987 and years thereafter.

Like controlling your estate from the grave.

Vote NO on D.

Marguerite Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service Merit System has served our City well, giving San Franciscans an equal opportunity. It has helped us obtain employment and earn promotions based on objective examinations.

The Civil Service Merit system replaced the old patronage system that rewarded political loyalty more than competence.

Now the supporters of PROPOSITION D want to create a new Personnel Director, accountable only to the Mayor, and give department heads the absolute power to decide who works for the City and who gets promoted.

If PROPOSITION D passes, equal opportunity would give way to opportunity based on membership in the bureaucratic “establishment”.

Keep our Civil Service Merit System strong and free from the political abuses of the past.

Vote NO on D!

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly

Ben Tom
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board

Jeanne Miller
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board

A. Richard Corbatos
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board

Dr. Sedonia Wilson
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board

Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, President
S. F. Community College Governing Board

Julie Tang
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board

Alan S. Wong
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board

Henry Der

Albert Chang

Rudy Moraz

Robert “Bob” Morales

Yuri Wada

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Can you imagine studying for a civil service examination, being rated at the top of the eligible list and never receiving the promotion? That’s exactly what Proposition “D” will do should the electorate adopt this amendment.

The civil service merit system has defects, but to totally eliminate the system and replace it with a patronage system where promotions are based on who you know, rather than what you know is scandalous.

Civil service was put into place to prevent scandal and the “favor seeking” individual from getting a paid position because he/she happened to support the right elected official.

Proposition “D” will allow one person, chosen by the Mayor, to decide who will be promoted, hired and fired. This is awesome power for one single individual to have at any level of government.

Our current Mayor may choose a fair person for this position, but will future Mayors be as careful? As each new Mayor assumes office, the civil service system will again change. The potential to favor one individual or group over others is great.

Proposition “D” has a great potential to diminish the quality of services we now provide to our citizens, as the future of how people are hired and promoted in the San Francisco Police Department is completely unknown.

It’s true our promotional system is fraught with delays and delays frustrate us all, but Proposition “D” is not the answer. Proposition “D” will only add to our existing problems. Several years ago, our citizens elected a Charter Commission to streamline city government and make civil service work more efficiently. The voters eventually rejected those proposals. The checks and balances that make our government stable were no longer present. It simply went too far.

Proposition “D” goes even further. It brings about a system of patronage and should be defeated lest we want to engage in “free-wheeling and dealing” of civil service jobs and promotions.

We urge a strong No vote against Proposition “D”!

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS’ ASSOCIATION

Bob Barry, President
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The purpose of the Civil Service Commission is to ensure that the merit system would be the only criteria in any examination process.

If Proposition D passes, all authority concerning examinations would be taken from the Civil Service Commission and given to a Personnel Director, who is appointed by the Mayor. This Personnel Director would have the authority to hire and fire at his discretion, with no appeal available. This proposition is contrary to everything the Fire Department and all City employees have strived for over the years.

The Civil Service Commission in its present form was instituted to prevent any possibility of a patronage system, where one person has complete control.

This proposition would do nothing to improve your Fire Department. If you are satisfied with the work and make up of the San Francisco Fire Department in its present form, “Vote No On Proposition D”. You will be doing a service for the San Francisco Fire Department, and the people of San Francisco.

Submitted by the San Francisco Fire Chiefs’ Association
John Flaherty, Battalion Chief SFFD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is bad government and bad politics, changing our independent civil service system into a system dominated by the Mayor:

..By shortening the six year terms of Civil Service Commission to conform to the Mayor’s four year term of office.
..By transferring most of the Commission’s powers to a Personnel Director who serves solely at the Mayor’s pleasure.

Keep politics out of employment services. Vote NO on Proposition D!

Alice B. Toklas, Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Roberto Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D fails to offer enough new and improved procedures to cure the current defects in the civil service system. Charter sections and civil service rules are repealed without specific known replacements.

Proposition D transfers power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created personnel director appointed by, and to serve at the pleasure of, the Mayor. The director’s decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline, and certification would be final. The commission would have no right to hear examination or disciplinary appeals.

There are hidden costs with Proposition D because the new Personnel Administration Department will employ a personnel director, and other employees “as may be necessary to carry out (its) functions and duties.”

The Merit System could be replaced by an old style Patronage System. Proposition D could open the door to rules which permit the personnel director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his/her position on the civil service testing list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Police and Fire Commissions would lose functions as a result of the personnel director’s new power. The director’s unlawful employment discrimination policy would be binding upon department administrators. The director’s procedure for employee dispute resolution must be used by all department heads and appointing officers.

Proposition D is not the answer. The checks and balances for efficient city government would be lopsided.

I urge a no vote on Proposition D.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, 17th Assembly District
Sala Burton
Congresswoman
Art Agnos
16th Assembly District
Milan Marks
State Senator

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
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Balboa Reservoir Development Ban

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?

Analysis by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission declared Balboa Reservoir South (located across Phelan Avenue from San Francisco City College) surplus in 1984 and made the site available for low, moderate and market rate housing. In July 1985, a City-community advisory committee chose a developer to build 203 single-family homes on the 13 acre site. Construction has not yet begun.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would prohibit granting new building permits and would revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site (Assessor’s Block 3180, Lot 1) between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit granting any new building permits and you want to revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to allow building permits to be granted for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

How “E” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for a three-year ban on development of the Balboa Reservoir site had qualified for the June ballot.

Sidney Kass and Jesse David Wall, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 12,430 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 10,012 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 77
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Having been responsible for providing leadership at City College from 1947 to 1977, we cannot stand by and see this site converted to housing. We must speak out. Such a move would preclude forever the logical and much needed campus expansion to what was once our West Campus. We left that site reluctantly to make way for water storage. If it is no longer required for that purpose, let us return it to City College.

Thousands of San Franciscans—high school graduates, dropouts, veterans, re-entering women—representing all of the city's diverse ethnic groups, have been prepared for transfer to four-year colleges, profitable careers, and have had their lives enriched at the City College of San Francisco. Without City College's open door and easy access, many would have been deprived of these opportunities.

Its 56 acre campus originally housed 3,000 students. Now it serves over 23,000. This campus, compared to other community colleges, can be best described as cramped, inadequate, and second rate. The condition of the campus is to be contrasted with the excellence of its programs—which are recognized as among the best in the nation.

Lou Batmale
Chancellor 1970-1977
Louis G. Conlan
President 1947-1970

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION ‘E’

We question:
1. Why no EIR was required when the proposed development could have a substantial impact.
2. Whether the future needs of City College for classrooms, housing, and parking have been considered.
3. What the impact on taxpayers is with below market land sale and construction financing by bonds.

This moratorium will permit adequate study of these issues. Vote YES on Proposition ‘E’.

Bruce Bonacker, President
Board of Directors, Glen Park Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don’t let a developer make a mint on land across from the most overcrowded college in the Bay Area! Parking is already an impossibility for residents near City College...adding 200 homes to this land would make the situation much worse.

It’s simple: a college which can't find room for more students at a time when more people are returning to education doesn’t serve the community.

This land is being sold at much less than its true value. The development wouldn’t do much to ease the City’s housing crunch, but it would undercut the future of City College and the peace of mind of the neighborhood.

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

You’d probably be upset. We certainly are. Please help us protect our neighborhood. Please vote YES on proposition E.

Westwood Park Residents:
Edna Bookle
Minnie Dornin
Eugene Eden
Donna Nicoletti
Robert Armstrong
Pauline Armstrong
Joel Martinez
Richard & Lisa Patterson
David Bean
H. Bozzone
William Burke
Richard Robel
Clyde Theriot
Danae Manus
Euna Manus

Sunnyside Residents:
Ellen Wall
Melissa Voluntad
David Wall

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let the greedy developers take this potentially picturesque open space.
A yes vote means you want more time to consider its future use. All we ask is time to think and plan.

John Barbagelata
Former member, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Suppose there was a publicly owned open space across the street from the main U.C. Berkeley Campus.
Can you imagine for one moment that it would be passed into private ownership?
Vote Yes on E for Equality and Excellence in Education

City College Students:
William Lew, Student
Tim McGuire, Student Council Member
Joseph Goldstein, Student Council Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

In 1952, the “Experts” said we needed reservoirs. They felt so strongly that they condemned the City College West Campus, destroyed the buildings, and constructed the reservoirs—all at taxpayer’s expense.
Now, in 1986 with more demand for water, the “Experts” say the reservoir is no longer needed. What is the concerned taxpayer to believe?
When in doubt, the city should hold on to the expensive things already paid for.

Stop the reservoir giveaway. Vote YES on E.

Taxpayers for Preserving the Reservoir.
Richard Patterson
Dorice Murphy
Lucille Carson
Daniel Gutierrez
Franz Wiese
Bernhard Scholand
Ruth Hanson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This is a Planning issue
We have been accused of trying to stop housing for poor people. Not true. In the first place, the price levels are certainly middle income and above, but our main objection is that this badly done plan is damaging to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as to the over-crowded community college across the street.

WHAT WE WANT
Even our critics point out that we originally SUGGESTED housing for that site, but they don’t talk about what else we suggested. We want two levels of parking under a City College Library, Bookstore, and Auditorium, with housing on top. Furthermore, let the housing be TRULY affordable—for students and seniors. We are trying to stop the bureaucrats’ subsidized middle income housing project because it makes our dream impossible.
We ask for three years to give the neighborhood and the college a chance to produce a better plan.
SNaP (Sensible Neighborhood Planning Committee)

Helen Crizer, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council, representing 17 neighborhood associations in the area of the surplus reservoir property in question has voted to endorse the three-year stop of private construction on the old West Campus of City College.
Dr. Louis Batalme, Chancellor of City College from 1970-1977.

Juanita Raven, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Be a sport.
Give City College a vote of support.
City has 23,000 students and badly needs a library. The only place to put it is in the reservoir site. City College has walked closely with San Francisco for five decades. The reservoir site has always been understood to be reserved for City College.

Until now, when someone wants it for housing. Housing is important, but it can be anywhere in town. But a City College library can only be located at the College.

Vote yes to support a book—and a reader.
Reading, studying, writing and research make up our town also.

It is hard to understand criticism of City for wanting to keep this area for a library. Sure, housing sites are at a premium—but even more so a library site for City which is one of the largest schools in the Nation.

Some people blast City for wanting a library because of the need for housing. Housing is needed. But some of those very same people want a big battleship stationed here that will bring in 15,000 new family members.

The Educational and cultural growth of San Francisco mandates living space for the City College library.

If this measure gets a no vote, it means there will be no site for a Library. This is the last chance. Vote YES to help out a book—and a reader.

State financing, when approved, will construct this building. It is the top building priority at City College.

A YES vote here means there will be time to think about the use of the site. During that three year period, cooler heads may realize this is the only site for a Library. If the housing goes in there will be no library there.

Vote yes for a book, for a good school and a better City.

John Riordan, Board of Governors
San Francisco Community College District.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Sunnyside Neighborhood Association is not against housing, but we are trying to stop a hasty and short-sighted plan. We are asking for this moratorium to get time for a better plan that will answer a variety of needs and benefit the entire city as well as our community.

This is a planning issue.

The release of the reservoir property as surplus by the water department came as a surprise to our neighborhood. The June 1984 “Residence Element” of the city’s Master Plan did not even list the land as surplus. By 1985 major decisions were being made for use of the land without adequate neighborhood input.

There were some meetings attended by a few people carefully selected for their zealous pro-housing views or potential financial gain. The resulting plan has gone out of control. Now it benefits only the developer and the lucky few who will get houses on free land.

Proposition E is not an attack on housing.
Please help us save our neighborhood against poor planning by voting YES on Proposition E.

Joe Mahoney, President
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION E

The Miraloma Improvement Club urges a YES vote on Proposition E.

Frank Mastro, President
Arnell Rodrigues

Maggie Kroll
Dorothy Evers

B. Sullivan
Dale Jones
Homer Bradford
Kathryn A. Small
Harry Small

Mr. & Mrs. Henry Taylor
Betty Woo Suen
Susan Piscitelli
Dale Brown

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION E

All the talk in the world can’t change the fact that City College has fewer acres of land relative to its student population than any college in the Bay Area.

Enrollment at City College is INCREASING, as is the enrollment of the San Francisco public schools from which City College draws most of its students. It is obvious that City College needs and deserves the reservoir land. The three year moratorium will gave time to produce a better plan which will have input by faculty, students and alumni who know the college’s needs and want to support it.

Sid Kass
Susie Langdon Kass
Phil Kass
City College Student
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The homeowners of Westwood Park, a neighborhood adjacent to the Balboa Reservoir, support the ballot initiative calling for a 3 year development moratorium. We believe that the City and City College should take additional time to determine their needs and how they might be met by using the Reservoir. In the event that City College does not need this property, we support its development as open space or as single family detached housing.

Westwood Park Association
Don C. Swander
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Let's not aggravate the traffic problem around City College before we first develop solutions for the existing problems. A three-year moratorium only buys our neighborhood and elected officials time to find solutions; it doesn't say no to housing. A YES vote is a vote for prudent development. A YES vote helps to preserve the family character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ken Hoeegger
Realtor and community Activist

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As representatives of the students of City College, we understand first-hand, the intense need to reserve a site for future school expansion. Preservation of the Balboa Reservoir, a site directly adjacent to the campus, is particularly crucial. The facilities that CCSF requires, such as a library and an auditorium, are essential to the main structure of the campus. Unlike classrooms, it would be unreasonable to build an auditorium or a library on an off-campus site, since these facilities are integral to the main function of the school.

In short, opposition to the moratorium based on the notion that alternate sites could be secured, is misleading. Once a site near the college is taken, any hope of expansion would be eliminated.

Associated Student Council of City College
Jack Lee, Vice President of Associated Counsel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Local 2121 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, representing City College faculty, urges a yes vote on Proposition E.

While this project provides short-term employment for a few, we are more concerned about the thousands of students who would benefit from planning and development that would better serve the community and the college.

Yes on E for continued excellence in community college education.

Anita Martinez, President
San Francisco Community College District
American Federation of Teachers

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is twice as crowded as any community college in northern California. It needs a much larger library, bookstore and auditorium, and more parking.
The college has always expected to use the empty SOUTH reservoir for educational needs. That land is finally surplus. Neither the college Governing Board nor the Chancellor attended the Mayor's planning sessions for the property and the faculty was not informed. When the 12.3 acre site was offered to a developer for $36,900 for subsidized housing, the Chancellor said, "We are at a crossroad and the correct path is for the Board of Supervisors, with the Mayor's support, to deed this surplus land to City College so that the college may continue to serve the city effectively for the next 50 years as it has for the past half century." The Mayor refused. Now only Board member John Riordan supports the correct path.
The Water Department says it may need the NORTH reservoir now used for student parking. If that crisis occurs, the Chancellor says, "We'll deal with the situation then." How, if the south reservoir is gone?

(continued)
When land is available other community colleges finance large projects through alliances with civic, athletic and cultural organizations, and through property sales. New methods for public funding are being developed.

The faculty would like three years of careful study to unravel misunderstandings and poor management, and to find the best way to be a good neighbor.

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E**

City College needs land now for desperately needed facilities, one of which is a library. City College has an enrollment of 23,000 students but our library has seating for 450. There are other possible locations for new housing, but City College can't be moved. Give us an opportunity to plan a development for the community and the college.

**Annie M. Young**
City College Library Faculty and Staff

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E**

- Donald Cunningham
- Anne Dowd
- Beverly Eighner
- David Lofting
- Alice Morris
- Kevin Nakagawa
- Thomas Nesbit
- David Spears

- Irma Stephenson
- Philip Tom
- Patricia Vega
- Rachel Webb
- Alfred Wong
- Dennis Woo
- Jason Yamasato

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E**

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty and staff members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

**Virgie Applin**
**Bill Carpenter**

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E**

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

**Darlene Allato**
**Mary Allen**
**Mary Amssler**
**Tom Angeloff**
**Robert Balestreri**
**Don Bateni**
**Diana Bernstein**
**Joe Berry**
**Anna Branson**
**Thomas Brendel**
**James Bristol**
**Richard Brongel**
**Laurent Broussal**
**Philip Brown**
**Barbara Cabral**
**John Callen**
**John Caris**

**Frank Cerrato**
**Rosemary Clark**
**Perry Close**
**Kurt Common**
**Walter Cribben**
**George Crippen**
**Patricia Davis**
**Guy DePrimo**
**Edward DierAAF**
**Sharon Edwards**
**Larry Ernst**
**Mary Erwin**
**Kwuy Fong**
**William Funte**
**Terry Greenfield**
**Robert Griffin**
**Michael Guthrie**

**Mary Hanna**
**YunKuang Ho**
**Peter Hoch**
**Ronald Hochede**
**Myrna Holden**
**Katherine Hondiam**
**Michael Hubert**
**Edward Hunt**
**Frank Ingersoll**
**Elaine Johnson**
**Wendy Kaufman**
**Jo Kennedy**
**Meredith Kow**
**Rossimold Kwok**
**Don LaFerry**
**James Lellas**
**Steve Levinson**

**Sue Light**
**Gary Ling**
**Amelia Lippi**
**Dave Labkert**
**Leon Luay**
**Dumane Macalou**
**Marion McManus**
**Patricia Madigan**
**Michael Malachowski**
**Mary Mari**
**Maria Mariani**
**Sylva Marshall**
**Valerie Meclan**
**Jose Mejia**
**Margit Michelmayr**
**Deanne Milan**
**Cindy Moody**

**Thomas Munro**
**David Myhre**
**Deborah Nagele**
**Glenn Nance**
**Herbert Naylor**
**William Neff**
**Dennis Plomkowski**
**Francine Podenski**
**Theoese Poydessus**
**Solomon Raju**
**Mary Riodon**
**Forbora Santrle**
**Marvin Schinnerer**
**Fred Schneider**
**Earl Scribner**
**Andy Seal**
**Ken Shen**

**Robert Struckman**
**MoSheer Tam**
**Edward Taylor**
**Piecer Thirty**
**Barbara Thomas**
**Clare Thompson**
**Willie Thompson**
**Mary Tharber**
**Robert Tricaro**
**James Traimier**
**Joanne Tunninina**
**George Vassos**
**Cherie Wetzel**
**Austin White**
**Joan Wilson**
**Rosalie Wolf**
**Christina Yee**
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Water Department has begun a resource study of water use, due for completion in two or three years. The study may well indicate that one or both reservoirs will be needed. The American Water Works Association states that reservoirs should be used in pairs. This is particularly important because it is the only reservoir at an elevation of 305 feet.

The Mayor twisted the arm of the Water Department to declare one of these reservoirs surplus before the water resource study is completed. Don’t let her get away with this kind of polit-}

ic manipulation.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Kurt Common
Ken Crizer
Ed Dierauf
Herb Naylor
CCSF Engineering Professors

Robert Bozina
Mack Crooks
Bob Davis
Helen Dilworth
Franz Enciso
Richard Exterman
Richard Fenner
Lawrence Ferrara
Ted Fleming
Peggy Gorham
William Grothkopf
David Hardiman

Judy Hubbell
Charles Hudspeth
Sieglinde Isham
Baruch Klein
John Kongismark
Joshua Law
Steven Lopez
Jerry Mueller
Madeline Mueller
Marvin Tartak
Frank Townsend
City College Music Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The South Balboa Basin has been unused since college leased buildings, including a large auditorium, were torn down on that site thirty years ago. We hope that three years of thorough planning would explore the possibility of returning a part of that property to the college for the development of a multi-purpose medium-sized auditorium which could be shared with community groups.

Joseph Alessi
Mary Argenti
Neyde Azvedo
John Bischoff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition E. This moratorium is necessary because there are too many worthy uses for this land to make a hasty and potentially very costly decision. Only through careful planning can the limited land available for development be best used.

Nicolás Alexander
Paul Hewitt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, as Physical Education Instructors, have always been committed to a diversified program for our students and community. The reservoir space is a natural land resource for a Multicultural Center.

Your YES vote on E will allow us the freedom to explore ways that this property could most constructively benefit all.

Nicolás Alexander
Paul Hewitt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, full-time faculty of the Computer and Information Science Department of City College, urge a YES vote to postpone the decision until additional planning and surveys can be conducted. The current proposal would negatively impact the College’s enrollment.

William Beaver
Ronald Cerruti, Chairman
Kirk Gibson
Howard Grainger
Frank Holden
Michael Kelly

Lene Johnson
Grover Klemmer
Paula McCullum
Art Octavio
Louise Scolirkes

George Lany
Norbert Ludkey
Charles Metzler
Charles Miller
Marilyn Schmank
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

A YES vote on Proposition E helps STOP a scheme to GIVE AWAY $12,300,000 worth of City land for $1,800,000 (or less) to a Redwood City real estate developer.

A YES vote will SAVE taxpayers $550,000 per year. The housing project will produce $240,000 in taxes, but supplying City services will cost $790,000 per year.

The Controller's cost estimate does NOT account for the $12,300,000 land value, since land sale below value is NOT technically a cost of government. The Controller also is NOT permitted to assume that the housing project will be constructed, since construction has NOT yet been ordered by the Board of Supervisors.

The plan does NOT restrict housing sales to moderate-income first-time buyers. The plan only restricts use of tax-subsidized funds. Any person favored by the developer or politicians can buy these dwellings and get the benefits of the public land giveaway.

The houses are made "affordable" by giving away the land far below market value, by City-backed low interest, and by cutting construction corners.

The real beneficiaries of the subsidized housing project are the financiers (NOT the project dwellers). Bondholders receive 9.6% average tax-free interest, which is equivalent to 24.6% taxable interest at 61% maximum tax. The developer and bond establishment receive $5,340,000; this is $26,300 (or 22.40%) for each $117,400 unit.

The City loses $51,700 worth of land GIVEN AWAY for each unit.

Vote YES on Proposition E for good fiscal management.

William Marquardt
Financial Analyst, SNaP
Helen Crizer, Treasurer, SNaP

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is by far the most crowded community college in the Bay Area. With 22,600 students on a 56 acre campus, it is more than twice as crowded as any of the others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of College</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Campus (acres)</th>
<th>Area/1000 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City College of SF</td>
<td>22,624</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laney College, Oakland</td>
<td>9,805</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot College, Hayward</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa College</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of San Mateo</td>
<td>13,820</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>11.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Marin</td>
<td>6,663</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given these facts, why does the Governing Board not try to get the old West Campus back? Why don't they support this moratorium to delay the land grab?

The Governing Board is under political pressure from City Hall. They have been threatened with the loss of the north reservoir parking lot and funding for special projects. Forgive them. Vote Yes on E.

Friends of City College
David Newton
Glen Simpson
Jack Baker
Thomas Velasquez
Tillie McCullough

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The student population at City College is increasing. This semester's enrollment is up 1,265 students over last semester.

The enrollment in the San Francisco public schools has been increasing by 1,218 per year for the last three years. City College draws most of its enrollment from public schools in San Francisco.

Obviously, City College will have a larger enrollment in the future years, and will be in desperate need of space if we do not give it back its old West Campus.

Please reserve this public land for the college.
Please vote YES on E.

Barbara Holman

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON E

In 1981, I launched a six-point program to expand San Francisco's housing supply and the voters had approved a City policy to add 20,000 new housing units within five years. This Proposition would destroy a major portion of the effort to build affordable, single-family housing in our city.

The Balboa Reservoir Site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now a site for development of 203 new single-family homes, most with three bedrooms and two baths. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed as other homes built under the City's program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom could not afford homeownership. It is believed that these new homes will sell rapidly.

The Balboa Reservoir site is one of the few sites large enough to accommodate a substantial number of new homes. Please do not let a few people stop a major opportunity for new housing. Vote no on Prop E.

Not only would Proposition E halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site, but the 9.8% fixed-rate, 30-year mortgage money set aside for the housing would also be lost.

Nothing constructive is accomplished by this measure—it does not provide additional land or facilities for City College. As a matter of fact, City College has neither plans nor money to use the property. Further, the Community College Board of Directors, the governing body for City College, has voted overwhelmingly to oppose the initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting "No on E."

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the site of the unused Balboa Reservoir and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost.

These homes are desperately needed for San Franciscans who can't afford to buy in the city where the average house is selling for over $160,000. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

The homes would be built on land that belongs to the City. Over two years ago, it was declared surplus and available for housing. It is not part of City College, and City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

We urge you to vote no on Proposition E if you want more affordable housing for San Franciscans.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

In 1980 San Franciscans voted overwhelmingly (63% yes to 37% no) to construct 20,000 housing units. Good progress is underway towards achieving the voter goal. A 1986 report by Mayor Dianne Feinstein states, "In the last five years, 3,559 new housing units completed with another 3,000 by 1988 and 20,000 more in 10 to 15 years. Most of this housing will be built in underutilized commercial districts; not in existing residential neighborhoods.

The 203 affordable owner occupied single family units slated for the southern portion of Balboa Reservoir are part of the 1988 total. Our progress in addressing the City's housing shortage will be curtailed if this ill-advised initiative is approved. SUPPORT OWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Housing production is essential to check rising prices and to maintain our social, economic, and ethnic population diversity.

As a San Francisco voter, you can be part of our housing progress by voting no on Proposition E.

Do not be misled. The Community College Governing Board opposes this initiative. The district does not have any future building plans for this housing site.

We encourage you to support the construction of family housing by voting no on Proposition E.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt construction of affordable housing at Balboa Reservoir site. This surplus public property, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City in 1984. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders. The housing is desperately needed. San Franciscans need affordable housing.

Doris M. Ward, Member
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

A critical issue facing San Francisco today is the lack of housing middle class San Franciscans can afford.

That is why I have joined these neighborhood associations to support the Balboa Reservoir neighborhood housing proposal. Those participating in the development of the proposal includes:

- O.M.I. Community Association
- Dorado Terrace Association
- Outer Mission-Ingleside
- Political Action Committee
- Greater Ingleside Community
- Mount Davidson Manor
- Ocean Avenue Merchants Association
- Ingleside Terrace Association
- The San Francisco Open Space Committee
- City College of San Francisco

From early in 1985 I worked closely with these neighborhood groups in the discussions between city government and community leaders concerning the development plans for this desperately needed new housing at the unused Balboa reservoir site.

THESE ARE THE REASONS YOU SHOULD VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

1. The neighborhood housing proposal that this initiative seeks to stop is the result of months of hard work by the largest coalition of neighborhood associations ever to join together to plan a housing development in San Francisco.

2. The housing at the Balboa Reservoir site was designed with the involvement of the coalition of neighborhood associations to enhance the surrounding community.

3. The governing Board of the Community College District has made clear that they have no plans for the site and no ownership rights to it. City College does not oppose the construction of this development and opposes this initiative.

4. Self-proclaimed “friends” of City College want to stop the proposal in order to preserve the site for future faculty parking. A clique of City College staffers involved in a neighborhood association pose as community opposition to this development even though a representative from this organization, the Sunnydale Neighborhood Association, had helped plan and support the proposal.

5. By masquerading as concerned neighbors these self-appointed “friends” of City College hope to prevent the construction of 204 critically needed units of housing and pull off one of the biggest land grabs in San Francisco’s history.

DON’T BE FOOLED. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Residence Element of the Comprehensive Plan of the City and County of San Francisco assesses the City’s housing needs and lays out specific steps to meet those needs. This document was adopted by the City Planning Commission in 1984 after extensive public review at neighborhood meetings and public hearings, and consideration of the detailed Environmental Impact Report.

The first objective of the Housing Element is “to provide new Housing for all income groups” in locations appropriate for residential development. To meet this goal, development of housing is to be aggressively pursued and encouraged on surplus, underused and vacant public land.

Proposition E would halt construction of affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site. This public property, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City in 1984. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

If you want more affordable housing in San Francisco vote no on Proposition E.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Susan J. Bierman, City Planning Commissioner
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on E.

Proposition E deprives San Franciscans of one of their last real chances to become homeowners at an affordable price. At the South Balboa Reservoir we have City-owned land on which 203 units of three-bedroom, two-bath homes can be built at low prices which average San Franciscans can afford to pay. These homes need to be built now, not in three years. In three years the low interest rates on mortgages and the bond financing will be gone. Two hundred families will have lost the opportunity to become homeowners, and the City will have lost the opportunity to ease the tight market in rental housing.

Nor does this ill-conceived initiative help City College in any way. City College does not need this land. Speculation that the College may at some future date find a use for the land is not founded on fact. The College may never be able to build on the reservoir. Their enrollment has dropped by over 4000 students in the last few years.

This initiative is designed to confuse you. It will make our housing shortage worse for three long years. If you support affordable housing in our City, Vote NO on Proposition E.

Bill Maher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Balboa Reservoir site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now planned for development of 203 new single family homes. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed — other homes built under this program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom would not otherwise be able to afford home ownership.

San Francisco has the most expensive housing in the nation where last year the average home sold for over $160,000. Housing is difficult to produce because the obstacles are great — little land on which to build, high construction costs and uncertain interest rates.

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost. The initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional land or facilities for City College. The Community College Board, the governing body of City College, in fact recently voted to oppose this initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No” on Proposition E.

John L. Molinari

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

In 1980, the voters of the City and County of San Francisco approved a measure making it City policy to add 20,000 new units of housing within five years. In 1984 in an effort to satisfy this objective, the Board of Supervisors adopted a policy encouraging the expansion of the City’s housing supply. Making surplus City-owned land, such as the site at Balboa Reservoir, available for affordable housing was an important part of that policy. A proposal to build 203 homes on the unused Balboa Reservoir site was advanced to help implement the pro-housing policy.

Approval of Proposition E would HALT construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.

The Balboa Reservoir homes would be built on land currently belonging to the City and County of San Francisco. The property IS NOT part of the City College, and City College has neither plans or money to buy the property and convert it for City College use.

The only debatable issue is the future of affordable housing on the Balboa Reservoir site.

As we are all aware, San Francisco has the most expensive homes in the United States. The average cost of a home is $152,000. Not many can afford such prices. However, the housing proposed for the Balboa Reservoir will give many more citizens the opportunity to become homeowners. The homes to be built will be sold to first-time buyers at prices ranging from $83,000 to $145,000.

Other homes built in San Francisco under the direction of similar affordable housing programs have been snapped up quickly by San Franciscans. Without the program, most would not have been able to purchase the home and become homeowners.

Again, if you desire to preserve the construction of more affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site, vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Willie B. Kennedy
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Additional single family housing is undeniably San Francisco’s most acute social need.

When some vacant surplus City land (12 acres) finally becomes available for 203 additional new private homes there will always be some selfish individuals who are in favor of new housing “just so long as it is not built across the street from me!” This unused, vacant City reservoir land hasn’t generated a dime of taxes for over thirty years! Let’s add 203 NEW homeowner taxpayers to the City’s rolls as quickly as possible.

Stop these self-serving no-growth obstructionists! Please vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Prop E would halt affordable housing construction at the Balboa Reservoir site. Many gay people need affordable housing, too, and we join with other community groups urging you to vote NO on Prop E.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Robert Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E, if approved, would block the construction of 203 badly needed single-family homes on the south portion of the Balboa Reservoir in San Francisco. Sixty percent of these homes would be available for purchase by moderate and middle income families at purchase prices between $80,000 and $120,000. They would be constructed on surplus public land and financed by the sale of mortgage revenue bonds to enable the developer to sell the homes at below market prices.

A neighborhood group headed by two city college faculty members is responsible for placing Proposition E on the ballot. The group contends that the land which is intended to be used for the project should be made available instead to City College for the construction of new teaching facilities even though enrollment at City College is declining and the City College Board has voted 6 to 1 to oppose the initiative.

Like many other areas of the country, San Francisco suffers from a shortage of housing. Purchase prices here are among the highest in the nation. The use of surplus public lands and revenue bond financing provide a means for making single family homes available to a broad spectrum of families at affordable prices.

The Balboa Reservoir project is supported by the leaders of 8 neighborhood groups in the area surrounding the location of the proposed project and by a majority of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, as well as by Mayor Dianne Feinstein. We urge you to encourage the construction of this type of housing in San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition E.

San Francisco Board of Realtors
William L. Jansen, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

SAVE OUR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS!
BERNAL HEIGHTS SAYS, “VOTE NO ON PROP E!”

We are residents of Bernal Heights in San Francisco. We’ve worked hard to build affordable family and senior citizen homes in our neighborhood.

We need more affordable housing in our City to survive. The real issue in Prop E is affordable family housing—a “yes” vote prevents the construction of 203 family homes. That’s crazy!

Join us in preserving what’s best in our City.

Vote “no” on Prop E!

Sylvia M. Yee, Bernal Heights Community Foundation Board of Directors***
Frank Hutchins, BHCF Board*
Mary Lou Bertolenti, BHCF Board*
Lela Havener, BHCF Board*
Elizabeth Egger, BHCF Board*
Sister Janet Simon, BHCF Board*
Stephen Antonaras, BHCF Board*
Lorenzo R. Dill, BHCF Board*
Barbara Bogen, BHCF Board*
Margaret C. Randolph, Northwest Bernal Block Club*
Maureen Lando, NWBBCC*
Tim Molinaro, BHCF Planning & Dev’t Committee*
Buck Bogen, BHCF P & D Committee*
***Organization for identification purposes only.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco Needs Affordable Housing—
Vote No on Proposition E

Everyone agrees that San Francisco needs affordable housing. The questions are how and where that affordable housing can be built.

The Balboa Reservoir housing development, to be built on the site of a reservoir built thirty years ago and unused since that time, answers those important questions for more than 200 San Francisco first-time homebuying families by providing:
- 203 new affordable three-bedroom, single family homes
- 9.8% fixed-rate financing
- A mix of 30% low-income, 30% moderate-income and 40% market-rate first time buyers
- A convenient site that has been declared “surplus” by the City and “available for development of affordable housing”

The Balboa Reservoir housing development is a small but significant step in the effort to generate affordable housing in our City.

Thousands of San Franciscans from every community, neighborhood group and viewpoint agree that the Balboa Reservoir development is good for San Francisco. Virtually every elected official, including the Governing Board of City College also agree.

All these San Franciscans ask you to say “yes” to affordable housing and “NO” to Proposition E.

San Francisco Coalition for Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar, Executive Director

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The viable plan for affordable single family housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site is being threatened by Proposition E. If Proposition E passes, 203 single family homes will be lost to the citizenry of San Francisco at a time when they are greatly needed.

The facts about the proposed housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site argue strongly against Proposition E. All 203 homes will be for first time home buyers. One-third of the homes will be available to households earning $27,000. Another third of the homes will be available to households earning $36,000. Adequate parking will be provided within the development itself, thus answering any concerns that traffic in the area will be congested.

City College has no need or plan to use South Balboa Reservoir for its facilities. City College’s priority is to develop its existing campus. South Balboa Reservoir should therefore be used for one of the City’s greatest needs: increased and affordable housing which is available to lower and middle income families.

As homeowners who live in the vicinity of South Balboa Reservoir, we welcome its planned use for single family housing and feel it will become an integral and contributing part of the community. We therefore urge you to vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Submitted by:
Stephen Graham, Chairman of the Housing Sub-committee of the Citizen’s Committee for Community Development
Roderick A. McLeod, Vice-Chairman of the Citizen’s Committee on Community Development

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Our neighborhood wants homes in the South Balboa Reservoir.
Vote No On Prop. E.

Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughney
Submitted by Patricia Vaughney

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

As Merchants as well as residents of Ocean Avenue, Greater Ingleside and San Francisco, we support the Development of the Balboa Reservoir as housing.

A Traffic Survey has stated that there will be minimal impact on the existing patterns of traffic by this development.

Additional City College Parking is being considered on another location off 1-280 to keep the college congestion away from the neighborhood’s streets.

City College has 44 more acres in which to expand and existing buildings at City College have viable means to expand.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
We believe that housing on the Balboa Reservoir is the most viable solution to develop a vacant piece of property that is directly adjacent to our stores on a Transpreferential Street. Affordable housing is in great need in San Francisco and is as much needed here as anywhere. We want to help provide this need. Vote No on Prop. E.

Ocean Avenue Merchants Assoc.
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughney
Submitted by Patricia Vaughney

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction on much-needed affordable, single-family housing at the long vacant south Balboa Reservoir site. This proposal would also block a major housing development that would bring jobs into an area of the city that has little industry or private business.

Sale prices for these units are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the San Francisco housing market, where the average home is selling for $160,000. Construction of these homes will help all young, first-time home buyers and will require only 5% down, instead of the 20% down payment on houses bought with conventional home mortgages.

This plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by nine nearby neighborhood organizations. If Proposition E is approved and this project is blocked, more young adults will purchase their first home in Vallejo or some other outlying area, further draining San Francisco of the young families that every growing community needs.

San Francisco residents will gain apprenticeships, jobs, contracts and subcontracts from this development.

This plan calls for 2 and 3 bedroom, family-sized houses, with space for another bedroom which can be finished when needed. Each house will have 2½ parking spaces in front and would not cause parking problems in the area. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

City College of San Francisco has no plans to buy the property, has no money for institutional expansion, nor any mention of this land in any master plan. Some supporters of this proposition are motivated by racist notions and have said they fear that this development will become another "Geneva Towers." This type of thinking is similar to support for apartheid practiced in South Africa and must be defeated by progressive San Francisco voters. Property values will increase, instead of a decrease as a result of this project.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition E.

Larry Ukali Johnson-Reed — President, O.M.I. Pilgrim Community Center Inc. Maria Campbell-Cassey — Program Director, Bay Area Engineering Societies Committee for Manpower Training, Inc.
Clara Mills-Bridgford — Program Director, O.M.I. Senior Center John C. Jackson Linda Rose-Gipson Jon Still — Secretary, Young Adult Committee Kenneth Butler

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sale prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided — 2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote "No" on Proposition E.

Affordable Housing Alliance — Mitchell Omerberg, Director
Bay Area Urban League — Gregory Best, Field Representative
Bernard Heights Community Foundation — Andre Lennell Daye
Community Educational Services — Dorothy Chen, Executive Director
Japanese Community Youth Council St. Francis Square Apartments, Inc. — Sandra Mayor-Jenkins, Secretary
Minority Contractors Association of Northern California — James Haugheby, Secretary, Board of Directors
National Community Congress — Dr. Eddie C. Welban
Parkmerced Residents Organization, Inc. — Ricardo A. Callejo, Esq.
Potrero Hill Neighborhood House — Enola Maxwell
San Francisco Building Trades Council — Stan Smith
San Francisco Housing & Tenants Council — Joseph Lacey
San Francisco Tenants Union — Jim Faye
Rev. Aima C. Brown — Local Pastor & Community Servant
Greg Day — Chairman, Citizens Committee on Community Development
Polly V. Marshall — Commissioner, San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
Regina A. Sneed
Jim Wachob — San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Michael E. Willis, AIA — Fleming Corporation
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided—2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Greater Ingleside Political Club—Frank Noto, Treasurer
Housing Conservation and Development Corporation—Lonnie Lawson,
Board of Directors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided—2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Bayview Baptist Minister Fellowship—Rev. N. B. Mills, President
Bread of Life Missionary Baptist Church—Rev. S. A. Bailey
Cosmopolitan Baptist Church—Rev. A. Ray Gentle
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Raymond M. Howard Sr.
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Carole Nelson
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Cornelius P. O’Reilly
Ingleside District Pastors—Rev. Paul Q. Theiss
Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee—Charles Gute, Chairman
St. Peters Housing Committee—Tessa Rouvel 

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON’T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
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Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: With certain exceptions, City officers, including elected officials and commission members, may represent clients before City boards and commissions other than their own, and be paid for their services. State legislators may represent clients before City boards and commissions, and be paid for their services. Any person may contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would prohibit City officers from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay. This proposition would prohibit State legislators from appearing before City boards, commissions and departments on behalf of clients for pay. City officers would be prohibited from discussing with these officers and legislators matters that the City is deciding. Proposition F would also prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit City officers and State legislators from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to allow City officers and State legislators to represent clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to allow any person to contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 77

How “F” Got on Ballot

On February 26 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for limitations on compensated advocacy and campaign contributions had qualified for the June ballot.

Quentin Kopp, Martha Gillham and Cheryl Arenson, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 9,400 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,986 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The purpose of Proposition F is to cut campaign contributions by large contributors (and thus reduce campaign spending) and eliminate undue influence by officeholders retained as paid lobbyists for projects requiring City approval.

Let's take a minute to analyze the untrue arguments against Proposition F:

- The opponents claim that Proposition F will force half the City's Commissioners to resign. In fact, Proposition F does not force any Commissioners to resign. It simply says they can't be a paid lobbyist and a City Commissioner at the same time. Does a commissioner value making money by lobbying more than public service?

- Some have also alleged that Proposition F will prevent duly-elected union leaders from serving as City Commissioners. No it won't. Proposition F prohibits "compensated advocacy"—that means lobbyists hired by an organization, not members of the organization itself. Proposition F does not apply to salaried employees of labor unions, corporations, or non-profit agencies. Moreover, Section 8.105 of the Charter precludes it specifically from applying to any member serving as a representative of any profession, trade, business, union or association on any board or commission which requires membership of representatives of specific professions, trades, businesses, unions or associations.

- Another untrue argument against Proposition F is that it prohibits City officials only from discussing pending issues with other City officials or State Legislators who are also acting as paid lobbyists in a matter and doesn't stop those officeholders from writing City officials about their clients' objectives. That's not so. Proposition F applies to all such lobbying, written or oral. (The dictionary defines "discuss" as "to examine by means of speech or writing."

End government decision-making by "insiders" and reduce the influence of money on local campaigns.

VOTE YES ON F.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
San Franciscans for Good Government

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

In all our years of observing San Francisco City government, we have found one maxim to be true time after time: a good idea gets copied, especially among politicians.

For no sooner did Quentin Kopp promise to bring Proposition F to the voters than did Mayor Feinstein come up with an informal, administrative version of her own. Fine, you say (and the Mayor says), then why vote Yes on Proposition F?

(1) The Mayor's remedy of asking City Commissioners who also act as lobbyists before City agencies to resign is nothing more than a hand slap, and is good only as long as she is mayor. It's not binding on future mayors and could be changed without any vote of the Board of Supervisors, let alone the people of San Francisco. Proposition F prohibits this kind of conflict-of-interest, and it will be the law, no matter who is mayor.

(2) The Mayor's action did nothing to state legislators who can also act as lobbyists before City Boards and Commissions, nor did her action stop the law or business partners of City Commissioners from picking up the slack in big-money lobbying. Proposition F will stop these practices in their tracks.

(3) What about the other half of Proposition F, which reduced the campaign contribution limit to $500 so that all San Franciscans can enjoy equal access to City officials, not just the ones with the big bucks? The Mayor can't do anything about this, and she hasn't. Only a Yes vote on Proposition F will reduce the weight of big money and ensure our full voice in City elections and City government.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. If it's important enough for the Mayor to copy part of it administratively, it's important enough to do the job right and make it a law.

John J. Barbagelata
Harry Aleo
June Cahn
Dorothy Partridge

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The worst and most persistent problem in American politics is that politicians and political races can be "bought". Reducing the size of campaign contributions will be a step forward in reducing the role of money in elections. Vote yes for more honest government.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

RESTORE to the people their rightful and equal power as individual voters by reducing the monetary clout and influence of private interests who make the laws and the policies as City officials and Commissioners or State legislators.

TELL the special interests that their money and influence can no longer interfere with representative government.

TELL the special interests that the voters will no longer tolerate the influence-buying which comes with large campaign contributions.

TELL the special interests that this measure will encourage highly talented citizens to serve San Francisco honestly and responsibly.

VOTE YES ON F.

Cheryl Arenson
Anne Renfrey
David Fucheco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

"Government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

These noble words from Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, cast in bronze at the entrance to City Hall, seem to have escaped the attention of some City officials who pass by them every day. For in San Francisco City government, Lincoln's simple formula for representative government would read quite differently: "Government of the powerful, by the lobbyists, and for the wealthy."

Government of, by, and for the privileged few is bad government. Government of, by, and for all the people is good government. It's as simple as that—as simple as Lincoln first put it.

Proposition F, the Good Government Initiative, will help San Franciscans maintain control of their government and will prevent undue influence by City officeholders.

To reduce undue influence, Proposition F outlaws the practice of City Commissioners and State Legislators representing special interests for pay before City Commissions and Boards. City Commissions should render their decisions deliberately and impartially, not be swayed by the political clout of the lobbyists appearing before them, or by any political favors those lobbyist/politicians might promise. "I'll scratch your back if you scratch my back" bargains do not belong in government. And until such backroom bargains are made illegal, City government will not belong to the rest of us either.

Proposition F also reduces the maximum amount that anyone can give to a local candidate from $1,000 to $500. If large contributors and other special interests can't give as much money, they can't buy as much influence with elected officials. And the lower the contribution limit, the less campaign spending and the more City government will be responsive to all San Franciscans.

You can "buy back" City government from the privileged and powerful with the most precious of all political commodities: your vote.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Mary Lohneis
Peter Fatooh
Judith Thorson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F, an initiative of the people, is needed to protect the voters and the integrity of the legislative process from being corrupted by the power of money and influence. It prevents City officials and State Legislators from lobbying the City on behalf of high-powered special interests. It also lowers the campaign contribution limit from $1,000 to $500, thus reducing the influence of those same special interests over our elections and elected officials.

The bogus argument that the Mayor won't be able to find qualified people to serve on City commissions if Proposition F is adopted ignores the plain fact that there are 700,000 people in San Francisco, a pool of civic-minded citizens more than large enough to accommodate the 250 commission appointments available in our City government. For example, there are plenty of architects to fill the one architectural appointment on the Art Commission, just as there are plenty of non-lobbyist business people and lawyers available to serve on other commissions.

Thousands of San Franciscans, not just the "insiders", are ready, willing, and able to serve the public.

Proposition F deserves your vote. Restore integrity to City government. Restore the confidence of the citizens of San Francisco in that government. Let's have no more Wilkes Bashford situations.

VOTE YES ON F.

Oscar Sutro
Martha Gillham
Marguerite Warrent

Oscar Sutro
Martha Gillham
Marguerite Warrent

Leonel Monterey
Tony Kilroy
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE "NO" ON F

This proposition disguises itself as "good government" but, in reality, would drive good people out of government. It is so cruelly drawn—so sweeping in its implications—that it would bar from government almost anyone with even a remote business or community tie to government.

It would purge from City commissions anyone who "directly or indirectly" receives compensation from any "interests" with an issue before any City agency. Effectively, this could discriminate against employees from community and neighborhood groups, civil rights organizations, non-profit corporations, labor unions, merchant and business groups, as well as architects, lawyers and other professionals.

Actually, there currently are no commissioners who represent any clients before any City agency. All who are appointed in my administration sign a statement saying they will not advocate for any paying client before any official body of the City while they are commissioners. This proposition simply is not necessary.

Proposition F also would lower the limit for any individual campaign contribution from $1000 to $500. Although this sounds good, it would permit a wealthy person with various businesses and numerous family members to contribute many thousands of dollars through different sources. This would encourage "hidden" contributions. We must strive for disclosure of contributions, not a system which drives contributions underground. Candidates must be able to raise funds enough to put their message before the voters. Reducing the contribution limit can be a tactic to discourage persons from challenging incumbents.

Vote no on Proposition F.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition F purports to achieve a noble objective: The removal of "influence peddling" from City Hall. In fact, Proposition F is so poorly-crafted, it may have exactly the opposite effect on City government. It is not a "good government" initiative. It is bad legislation.

Proposition F provides no definitions and no standards for the public to judge whether City officials comply with its restrictions. Its uncertainties will be chaotic and lead to endless, needless lawsuits.

A measure similar to Proposition F was rejected by the Board of Supervisors because no public hearings were ever held on the legislation. If the public had had a chance to comment on this initiative, it might not have the critical shortcomings, deficiencies and uncertainties that now warrant its rejection by responsible San Franciscans.

In the coming months, the Board will review good government measures that are comprehensible, effective and, most important, certain. Proposition F is a misguided disaster.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

This should properly have been titled the "SINK WILLIE BROWN ORDINANCE"! The "meat of the cocoanut" is in Section 4.

Supervisor Kopp's intentions are good, however this sloppily drafted and incomprehensible measure succeeds in "burning down the barn" to eliminate a couple of rats!

Under this proposal, to avoid any potential INDIRECT conflict of interest, (which is undefined!), one would have to be a destitute, unemployed welfare recipient to qualify for service on any City Board or Commission! The Mayor has already solved this "hired advocacy" problem with the "conflict of interest" affidavit she demands IN ADVANCE from any prospective appointee.

Quentin's proposed $500.00 campaign contribution limit is an "inside joke" and he, of all people, knows it! It merely obliges a heavy contributor to have his wife, children, business associates, or friends send in SEPARATE $500.00 checks if he wants to contribute more than $500.00 to a politician's campaign.

These proposals require additional City employees for enforcement and wind up doing far more harm than good. Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr., President
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Union members and labor officials have legitimate reasons for meeting with City officers. It is unfair and wrong to lump them in the same category as special interest lobbyists, yet that's exactly what Proposition F does. Working people deserve representation on City boards and commissions. VOTE NO!

Walter Johnson  
Secretary-Treasurer  
San Francisco Labor Council  
LeRoy King  
James Elliot  
Keith Eckman  
Reeva Olson  

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

If you want to ban business owners and executives from serving on City boards and commissions, then vote for Proposition F. If you think board members of non-profit corporations and employees of community agencies have nothing to contribute to City government, then vote for Proposition F. If you believe union members and labor officials should not have a voice at City Hall, then vote for Proposition F.

But if you share our belief that these individuals have legitimate concerns and expertise that is valuable in running major City departments, then join us in voting NO on Proposition F.

Proposition F is a simplistic, sloppily-drafted, meat axe approach to a problem already resolved by Mayor Feinstein's ban on commissioners lobbying on behalf of private clients.

Proposition F is not good government and it is not reform. Proposition F is bad legislation. VOTE NO.

Hon. Douglas Engmann  
Hon. Eugene Friend  
Hon. Charlotte Berk  
Hon. Phyllis Lyon

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

We're sympathetic to the need for political reform. But it's a complicated problem, and Proposition F just isn't the way to go.

Frankly, we can't tell who is and isn't affected by this measure. While a handful of people sometimes might abuse their positions, that's no reason to question the integrity of so many solid citizens who give tirelessly to public service. Proposition F is simply the wrong approach. Please join us in voting NO.

William E. McDonnell  
Frances May McAteer  
N. A. Sapunar  
Caroline and Michael Figoni

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Concerned about elected officials spending $400,000 to run for supervisor and $1 million on a mayor's race? Then vote NO on Proposition F.

That's right. NO.

Proposition F isn't going to do anything about campaign spending. Prop F simply limits the size of contributions, reducing the current limit from $1,000 to $500. Supervisors can and will continue spending outrageous sums on their re-election campaigns. With Proposition F they'll just spend twice as much time raising money from twice as many sources, and that makes special interests even more powerful. They can always find ways around campaign limits.

We need campaign spending reform, but Proposition F doesn't provide it. Please join us in voting NO on F.

District 8 Democratic Club  
Stephen L. Taber  
Beth Gravanta  
Alan Ruzicka  
Miriam Blauenstein  
Linda Chapman  
Dale Carlson  
James Firth  
Debra Barnes  
Lew Serbin  
Debra Stein
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

When campaign contributions are limited, political freedom suffers. Your right to free speech includes not only your right to express your views, but also your right to support as much as you want, any candidate who speaks for you.

Minority viewpoints depend heavily on the contribution of a few dedicated supporters to get your message out. To limit your financial support of your beliefs is to silence your political voice.

Only incumbents, who have many opportunities for free media exposure benefit from this assault on free speech. The dangers of a campaign contribution limit far outweigh any possible benefit from this proposition. Defeat Proposition F!

San Francisco Libertarian Party
Michael R. Fowler, Secretary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

You may think Prop F only applies to big-time lawyers and a few legislators who represent developers. Think again!

Prop F would prohibit many community leaders from public service. If it passes, board members and employees of community and charitable organizations could be banned from serving on City boards and commissions.

We appreciate the public need for a government free of “influencing peddling.” But restrictions on “compensated advocacy” ought to be clearly and carefully crafted to protect the voices of community leaders who argue on behalf of the public interest, not private special interests.

Vote No.

Hon. Juanita Del Carlo
Mission Hiring Hall

Bob Ross
Publisher, Bay Area Reporter

Hon. Jeffrey Kan Mori
Japanese Community Youth Council, Inc.

Bill O'Callahan
American Red Cross

Hon. George Suen
Hortons Unlimited

Hon. Jean Rita Alviar
Mission Education Project

Hon. Greg Day
Polk Street Town Hall

Hon. Naomi Gray

Hon. James Foster
Carol Wong

Marlena Marseille
Lee Woods

Jo Daly
Dennis Collins

Hon. H. Welton Flynn
(Organizations listed only for purposes of identification.)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will have no effect on developers’ lawyers. None.

It won’t make any difference to state legislators either.

Don’t kid yourself. This is not “reform” and it isn’t “good government.” Proposition F will allow the special interests and influence peddlers to continue exercising influence over our elected officials. It has so many loopholes, lobbying will actively continue, untouched, in the back rooms of City Hall.

And developers will always find ways around campaign contribution limits. As Common Cause has noted, Prop F simply makes tracing their dollars more difficult for the public.

Real reform would directly attack the source of huge contributions—the developers and other special interests that employ the lobbyists to peddle their influence.

VOTE NO.

Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
David Looman
Michael Marson

Rich Walker
Susan Klugerman
Reese Cazenave
Margie O’Driscoll

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON’T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
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PROPOSITION G
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has adopted an ordinance prohibiting the City, with certain exceptions, from purchasing goods or services from companies doing business with South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a declaration of policy that says the City must try to avoid doing business with companies that significantly profit from or help maintain the Apartheid system in South Africa. It calls on other public bodies and private groups to adopt similar policies. It directs the Board of Supervisors to identify the companies which have the greatest ties to Apartheid so that the public can also boycott those companies.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to avoid doing business with companies that help maintain Apartheid, and you want a public boycott of those companies.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “G”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:
“The proposed Declaration of Policy be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “G” Got on Ballot
On November 6, 1985 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for the City to boycott businesses with significant ties to South Africa had qualified for the June ballot.
Arlo Hale Smith, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,546 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on October 11.
A random check of the petition showed that 8,941 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:
It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.
(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
South Africa Boycott

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This measure calls for a public boycott of companies that aid apartheid.

Any claim of "conflict" between Proposition G and existing anti-apartheid legislation is imaginary: It is the legislative intent of supporters of this measure that it can be construed as a directive for making existing law tougher.

Personal attacks have no legitimate place in a ballot measure campaign. As proponent of this measure, I repudiate all such tactics.

Vote NO on apartheid. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Arlo Hale Smith

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Boycotts are grassroots politics. They've helped the farmworkers, they've helped win integration, and they can help end the legal racism called "Apartheid".

A Gallup poll found 77% of South Africa's black majority favoring international economic boycotts to force the Apartheid regime to accept reform peacefully.

After the Boycott Initiative made the ballot, the San Francisco Supervisors unanimously passed a similar city purchasing policy. The issue that remains is whether to call on the general public to join in, boycotting companies identified by the Supervisors as the worst offenders in each industry.

The companies that would be targeted consider profits to be the "bottom line". Economic pressure is all they understand.

The AFL-CIO, NAACP, and NOW have called a boycott of Shell Oil because of its profiteering from South Africa's oppressive economic conditions. Proposition G supports that and would put the same pressure on other industries as well.

This proposition is supported by the elected county central committee of the Democratic Party, the Peace-and-Freedom Party and the Humanist Party, and by leading attorneys, such as Terry Francois, Terence Hallinan, Tony Serra, Lewis Hope Lee, Marc Van Der Hout, Abby Ginsberg and Terence Redmond.

If South Africa were a democracy, its majority would long ago have voted to end Apartheid. We need to vote Yes — because they can't.

Attty. Arlo Hale Smith, Democratic Party County Central Committee
Paul Kangas, Peace and Freedom Party
Lois Salisbury, Public Advocates*
Dr. Kevin Danaher, Food First*
Jesse James, Mission Rebels
Terry Collins, Community Activist
Sunny Gebert, Election Action
Robert McCall, Hotel & Restaurant Employees
Executive Board Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Attorneys speak out against Apartheid:

South African police can arrest anyone without charge. They can hold you incommunicado — no contacts with family, lawyers or press.

They regularly censor news, books, music. They have banned Christmas caroling, funerals and other peaceful gatherings. Groups which criticize the government are forbidden to hold meetings.

Blacks are subject to legal segregation; their property and employment rights are greatly restricted; often, they are simply murdered.

As attorneys, we help people who have legal rights that are being violated. But what can we do for those who have no legal rights?

Boycotts and other economic sanctions are the only way to make the Apartheid government accept reform peacefully.

In the Court of World Public Opinion, Apartheid has been convicted of crimes against humanity. By imposing a sentence of economic isolation, we can end Apartheid.

Vote Yes — take a stand for justice.

Terence Hallinan
Arlo Hale Smith
Terry Francois
Karen Anderson Ryster
Robert R. Bryan
Ann Menasche
Rachel Ginsburg
Leo Paoli
Gabriel Gesmer
Ora Prouchovnick
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is a moderate, responsible but effective proposal to bring economic pressure on the South African government to establish constitutional rights for all of its citizens.

Vote Yes.

Terence Faulkner, Republican
Mike Garza, Republican

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

All decent Americans abhor apartheid. However, boycotting U.S. investment in South Africa is counterproductive; it only penalizes the actual victims of apartheid.

U.S. international firms have acted as progressive agents for change through the Sullivan principles. Their investments have improved the social and economic condition of the labor force.

It is improper to penalize their positive contributions.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

We are individuals and organizations working actively to end the racist system of apartheid in South Africa. And we are voting NO on Proposition G.

Why?

(1) Because Proposition G will weaken San Francisco's present divestment law. This law requires companies doing business with the city to sign affidavits that they will make no new contracts with South Africa.

Proposition G has no such provision.

(2) Proposition G provides no mechanism or funding to carry out its declared purpose of "boycotting" South Africa.

Proposition G will not stop South African products from entering the Port of San Francisco.

Vote against this useless, confusing, and deceptive initiative.

Preserve the stronger divestment law San Francisco already has.

Vote NO on Proposition G!

Yvonne Golden
Geraldine Johnson
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
AFT 2121 Anti-Apartheid Committee
Artists Against Apartheid
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Coalition of Conscience
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club Executive Committee
ILWU 10 and SEIU 250 Southern Africa Liberation Support Committees
National Conference of Black Lawyers
San Francisco Anti-Apartheid Committee
Southern Africa Freedom Committee/All Peoples Congress

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1983 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!
AIDS Research

PROPOSITION H

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Several city and private agencies conduct various programs related to AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a declaration of policy that says San Francisco should support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council, consisting of a Committee on Education and a Fund-Raising Committee. The Research Committee would make recommendations on the most useful AIDS research projects and try to prevent duplication of efforts. The Education Committee would inform the public about the latest research and about ways to prevent AIDS. The Fund-Raising Committee would seek donations and grants for AIDS research and education projects.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

Controller's Statement on "H"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

"The proposed Declaration of Policy for an AIDS research and education council and the formation of advisory committees of civic leaders would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, additional expenditure of public funds for AIDS research may result, the amount of which cannot be determined."

How "H" Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for AIDS research had qualified for the June ballot. Stony Gebert, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 10,540 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on December 6, 1985.

A check of each signature on the petition showed that 7,564 of the signatures were valid. This is more than 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We need a council to expose and address major AIDS issues without the impasse of present medical/political bias.

As taxpayers, we are subsidizing a treadmill of continual AIDS casualties. There are major oversights where AIDS is concerned. Only recently was it learned that CDC statistics suggest 79% of early AIDS cases appear drug-related. We hear AIDS is 100% fatal. Perhaps that is because death may also be drug-related in the way of immuno-suppressive antibiotic and radiation overloads to already compromised immunity systems. Prevailing medicine is both tunnel-visioned and high-profit motivated. Also well-funded. This solution may be part of the problem. Some physicians are beginning to feel where AIDS is concerned many current practices are ethically, medically bankrupt.

Remissions occur. Largely through immunity-enhancing, holistic medicine. Significantly, only 1% of AIDS cases occur among people at risk in the Asian community. Perhaps this is due to less drug abuse or use of an unfunded, ignored resource: herbology as part of diet. More options: homeopathy, acupuncture, etc.

If, as anticipated, upwards of 40% of those testing positive come down with AIDS, we may become overburdened. To ignore all of the above becomes part of the problem. Vote Yes on Proposition H.

Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Rich McKirkeby, Former Orderly,
Marketing Associate, Pacific Bell
Joseph P. Clady, AIDS Hospice, Shanti Counselor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There is great need for research and education about AIDS and related conditions.

We need to attack the disease, not its victims.

Knowledge is the only vaccine available today.

Vote Yes.

John Lorenzini, President,
People With AIDS Alliance
Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Jan Beck, Steven Russell, Eugene Ewins, ARC/AIDS Vigil

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There are many possible treatments for AIDS and related conditions which are not being examined by the federal government, especially therapies based on natural substances and processes.

Vote Yes for an AIDS Research Council open to all viewpoints.

Scott Gregory, M.D.
Paul Kangas

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED
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A tape recording (Talking Book) of the San Francisco Voter Information pamphlet is available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar’s Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name______________________________________________________________

Address__________________________________________ Apt. #__________

Telephone No. (required)__________________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): ______________________________

Second choice locations (if any)_____________________________________

Signature________________________________________________________
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

PROPOSITION I

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway? YES 307 NO 308

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the Freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a policy statement asking whether or not the Embarcadero Freeway should be torn down.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City’s policy to remain as it is, and you want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to change the City’s policy, and you do not want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway demolished, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by at least $10.2 million in local funds. Potential private sector financing and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “I” Got on Ballot

On March 3 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy placing the question of demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway before the voters had qualified for the June ballot.

Richard Hongisto, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 11,119 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,720 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land now under the Broadway ramps is put back on the tax rolls, with low-rise buildings limited by restrictive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when united with Proposition J, recognizes these facts:

1) The Embarcadero Freeway is what is left of a never-completed elevated freeway that would have ringed the City through North Beach and Marina neighborhoods to the Golden Gate Bridge.

2) Today this massive freeway, which separates us from our waterfront, would never be built.

3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.

4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf will be preserved.

5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked for this new system.

6) Only that portion of the Embarcadero Freeway east and north of the Main and Beale Street ramps — basically the portion directly on the waterfront — will be removed to make way for the new system. The removal cost, approximately $10 million to be paid for with privately-generated new revenues, is a relatively small part of the overall new system.

As for Proposition J, vote "YES, let's tear down the Embarcadero Freeway.” Then turn to Proposition J and support the plan for a beautiful waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Removing the Embarcadero Freeway will allow San Francisco to:

• Create a six-lane, tree-lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero.

• Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway.

• Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula.

• Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero.

• Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.

• Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won't benefit San Francisco. Don't let outsiders determine our future. Vote YES on I.

Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Jack Wholey
Roger Boyer
A. Lee Knight
Robert Bradford
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Donald A. Crosby, AIA
Rai Y. Okamoto
Robert Meyers
Ralph Hurtado
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Douglas G. Wright
Anita Sanchez

Chuck Forester
Fritz Arko
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones
Randall Rossi
Karl Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
Jon Twichell
Jane Winslow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK — VOTE YES ON I

This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY — VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds — without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city's fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT – VOTE YES ON 1

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on 1.

ABSENT VOTER BALLOT APPLICATION

Application must be received by the registrar of voters no later than 5/27/86.

Election Date June 3, 1986

PLEASE PRINT REGISTERED NAME:

FIRST NAME MIDDLE NAME LAST NAME

RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX NUMBER)

NUMBER AND STREET — DESIGNATE N, S, E, W

CITY ZIP

X

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT (DO NOT PRINT)

DATE (AREA CODE) DAYTIME TELEPHONE

I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.

(AREA CODE) RESIDENCE TELEPHONE

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Proc. No. 
A.V. Prec. No.
Balloo Type/Party
Affidavit No.
Signature and Registration Verified as Correct:

Date Deputy Registrar

DATE OF BIRTH

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 1

Do NOT be misled.

Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 1

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY
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Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should also be replaced. The waterfront plan requires removal of order to make way for growth back on the tax rolls, with tive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when unified with Proposition I, would never be built.

3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.

4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south.

Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman’s Wharf will...

FROM:

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION? (¡FIRMO SU APLICACIÓN?)

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON I

This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY—VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds—without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city’s fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON‘T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT—VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don’t let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to 15.7 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown, Fisherman’s Wharf and the financial district would be reduced.

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:

- Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
- Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
- If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that—By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
- Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
- MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
- Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City’s plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Judith Tornese

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Tear it down? The concept is preposterous! There are 70,000 cars a day whizzing by on this high speed downtown elevated waterfront freeway! Where will they all go?

Aside from the outrageous demolition costs involved, (some engineers estimate $40,000,000 of taxpayer money!), eyeball observation, logic, and just plain “common sense” dictates that ground level “total gridlock” will result if this expensive freeway is now destroyed.

Nostalgic individuals must realize that the times have changed! We can’t bring the Bay back up to Montgomery Street! On behalf of San Francisco’s overburdened taxpayers, we urge a NO vote!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
W. F. O’Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled.
Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a policy statement that says that the City would replace the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt a policy statement which says that the Embarcadero Freeway would be torn down if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt a policy statement to replace the Embarcadero Freeway under these conditions.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway replaced with a tree-lined six lane boulevard and other traffic and transit improvements, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by approximately $27.5 million. This includes a one-time freeway demolition cost of $10.2 million plus $7.3 million required to match potential federally-funded transit improvements. Potential financing by the State and private sector and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “J” Got on Ballot

On March 5 a declaration of policy regarding the future of the Embarcadero Freeway was delivered to the Registrar from the Mayor and several supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows the Mayor or four or more supervisors to submit a declaration of policy to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

In addition to Mayor Feinstein, the March 5 document was signed by Supervisors Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker, Molinari, Kennedy and Nelder.

POLS ARE OPEN
FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans now have a chance to remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with an at-grade, six-lane freeway, which will open our waterfront and restore views blocked for years by this large freeway.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for traffic and transit improvements:

- New, shorter freeway ramps connecting directly with The Embarcadero;
- A tree-lined, at-grade, 6-lane Embarcadero Boulevard, with a new waterfront Muni line, a jogging and bicycle path from Fisherman’s Wharf to Mission Bay;
- Extension of Muni Metro south to the Caltrain station at 4th and Townsend;
- New ramps connecting I-280 with The Embarcadero;
- Changes in traffic flow and improvements to existing freeway ramps.

Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman’s Wharf will be preserved and enhanced.

The Board of Supervisors has specified that the Embarcadero Freeway will be torn down only if preliminary engineering during the next two years confirms—as traffic and environmental studies already have—that removal of the freeway will not result in more problems than it solves.

San Francisco became eligible for $88 million in federal highway funds for this new system when the Supervisors approved the plan in 1980. The $10.2 million cost of freeway demolition itself can be paid from revenues from low-rise development of the parcels now under the Broadway ramps and the increased values of nearby properties. Strict waterfront zoning limits the size of any development.

Traffic and environmental studies by the California Department of Transportation since 1980 clearly indicate that the new waterfront transportation system will be vastly superior to the existing situation, and that traffic congestion levels will not be notably different with the elevated structure removed.

Vote Yes on J and let’s remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with a parkway and transit system—once again let us see our waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J gives the voters a chance to be heard on an important and timely issue. This issue is the replacement of a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway as one element of a comprehensive package of transportation improvements in the Waterfront area.

Last fall, the Board of Supervisors adopted for further study a set of traffic and transit improvements for the Waterfront. These improvements include:

- a new landscaped surface-level boulevard
- replacement of the Clay/Washington and Broadway on and off ramps with new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom
- removal of the unused stub of I-280 and construction of new ramps connecting the new waterfront boulevard to Route I-280
- a new light rail transit line linking Fort Mason with the Caltrain Depot
- extension of the Muni Metro to the train depot, improving the Peninsula Commute Service

A YES vote on Proposition J does not allocate funds for these projects. It does allow for further design and engineering studies, including cost analysis, assessment of impacts on traffic, and other matters. The studies will then be presented to the Supervisors so that they can make an informed decision on the plan. If the studies prove positive, San Francisco will be able to transform its Waterfront for the benefit of all.

Proposition J will assure that the City will not proceed with the removal of any of the Freeway until all the studies are completed and all potential consequences are assessed. This is the responsible approach. Vote YES on J.

SPUR
League of Women Voters
Embarcadero Citizens Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SAN FRANCISCO’S NEIGHBORHOODS ASK YOU TO VOTE YES ON J.

REDUCE TRAFFIC CONGESTION—YES ON J!

Traffic backed up by the Embarcadero Roadway slows travel and creates congestion in North Beach and other nearby neighborhoods. J will speed traffic flow.

IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION—YES ON J!

Proposition J will provide regular streetcar service along the Embarcadero and extend Muni Metro service to the south, ultimately extending to Bayview-Hunters Point.

PROMOTE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY—YES ON J!

If Proposition J does not pass, San Francisco could lose $88 million in federal funds for traffic improvements.

(continued)
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RESTORE THE WATERFRONT—YES ON J!
San Francisco’s waterfront could become a focal point for the city, grâce by a grand promenade, instead of the dismal, deteriorating eyesore it is now.

San Francisco’s neighborhoods join together to ask your support for an improved Embarcadero. We guarantee the freeway will not be removed unless it is replaced by facilities that will assure a smoother, more efficient traffic flow. YES ON J!

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Robert Bradford
Ruth Gravanis
Nancy Katz
Robert Katz
Beverly Mills
North Beach Neighbors
John Behanna
Herbert D. Kosovitz
Jerry Hurtado
Gregory E. Jones
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors
Dale A. Carlsen
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Ralph Hurtado
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Chuck Forester
David M. Hartley
Donald P. Black
Mrs. Bland Platt
Richard Reinhardt
James W. Haas
James Ream
Jill M. Jones
Peter J. Leckie
Marjorie G. Stern
John B. Lowry
Lawrence Ferlinghetti
Nancy Peters
Steven Taber

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SUPPORT PUBLIC TRANSIT—VOTE YES ON J.
SAVE SAN FRANCISCO FROM GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON J.

The revitalization of the Northeastern Waterfront... as included in San Francisco’s Master Plan and transit plans, as overwhelmingly approved by the Board of Supervisors and as urged by Mayor Feinstein... will allow almost $90 million in unused federal highway funds to be used for vital downtown and waterfront transit and street improvements which will be a key to reducing needless auto congestion in San Francisco.

PROPOSITION J SUPPORTS IMPORTANT TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS TO THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT. It will:
—extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific/CalTrain depot
—create a new rail line (possibly using historic streetcars) to connect the entire waterfront from Mission Bay to the Ferry Building to Fishermans Wharf and Fort Mason
—set the stage for a possible streetcar line along Third Street
Since the city of San Francisco adopted the Transit First policy in the early 1970’s, transit investments in the Muni Metro, in new electric trolley an articulated bus service, and in BART and Golden Gate Transit, have saved downtown San Francisco from gridlock!

IF you are concerned about the future of transit in San Francisco, IF you are concerned about reducing needless auto congestion, THEN we urge you to join Mayor Feinstein and the majority of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in voting Yes on Proposition J.

Norman Rolfe
San Francisco Muni Coalition
California Transit League
Jack Whaley
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Regina Sneed
Tony Kilroy
Hon. Jack Morrison
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Bay Area Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Hon. Any Meyer, Recreation and Park Commissioner
Alan Lubliner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A SOUND BUSINESS PROPOSITION—YES ON J!
Common sense and good business demand we make the most of our resources. San Francisco’s waterfront is an economic and civic asset unrivaled anywhere — yet much of it is cut off by an ugly, noisy, elevated roadway. The traffic improvements called for by Proposition J will benefit workers, tourists, property owners, neighborhoods, ... and business.

Traffic flow and transit will move quickly on a realigned, reorganized Embarcadero Roadway, allowing easier, more pleasant access to waterfront businesses.

An improved and beautified Embarcadero will create new commercial opportunities and increase the value of existing property and businesses.

New jobs and an expanded tax base will generate increased revenue for the city as several lots now covered by freeway ramps return to productive private ownership. Though limited to low rise development (40 to 65 feet), tax revenues from development will more than make up the city’s share of the project.

Robert Meyers
Dennis J. Potts
Kenneth R. Lerch
M. Arthur Gentler, Jr., FAIA
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones
Randall Rossi
Karl A. Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
Jon Tivichello
Fritz Arko
Michael J. O’Shea
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J OFFERS RESIDENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO A ONCE IN A LIFETIME OPPORTUNITY TO RECAPTURE THEIR WATERFRONT.

Converting the Embarcadero into a tree-lined boulevard and building a new streetcar line will make the waterfront more pedestrian and transit oriented, that is, more people oriented.

A freeway structure that is a source of objectionable noise and casts a pall over a large part of the waterfront will be removed. The waterfront will be opened up to sunlight and fresh air and made more inviting and cheerful to those who wish to walk on one of the world's outstanding waterfronts. Air pollution that is now retained by the existing elevated structure will be dissipated.

The transit orientation of the new waterfront will encourage energy conservation. Proposition J will:

— Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero
— Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway
— Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula
— Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero
— Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line
— Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won't benefit San Francisco. Don't let outsiders determine our future.

VOTE YES ON J FOR A BETTER SAN FRANCISCO.

Sierra Club
Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage
Willinda McCrea*
Bob Cramer*
Rebecca Evans*
Richard Livingston*
Marilyn Clemens*
Jennie Law*
Jeffrey Hesse*
Jane Winston*
Roger Boyer

A. Lee Knight
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Patrick S. Hobin
Monica Halloran
Walter K. Morris
Lisa Klairmont
Jeffrey Heller*
Bob Isaacson
George T. Rockrise, FAIA
Jon Twichell
Marc Kasky

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J GIVES US A CHANCE TO CORRECT A COLOSSAL MISTAKE!

The Embarcadero Freeway should never have been built. The original plan was to build a freeway from bridge to bridge, destroying the Northern Waterfront, Fisherman's Wharf, Fort Mason, and Marina Green in the process. When the people of San Francisco saw what was happening, they stopped it in mid-air—literally.

Walk under it. Hear the noise. Feel the gloom. See how it cuts out light.

It's time to remove this mistake.

The new waterfront plan will give us a tree-lined boulevard, a new streetcar line, and a Muni Metro extension to the Southern Pacific/Caltrain depot. It will give us a transit and pedestrian oriented waterfront that will give us pride and pleasure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J!

San Francisco Tomorrow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, with a membership of 1700 working architects in San Francisco, urges a “YES” vote on Proposition J. In 1968 the citizens of San Francisco stopped highway planners from ringing our waterfront with freeways. Today voters have another opportunity to return the waterfront to our citizens. Removal of the Embarcadero Freeway is one part of a carefully researched transit plan for San Francisco. This proposition supplies an unique opportunity to carry out a broad range of transportation improvements that will have many positive effects on the City of San Francisco.

Removal of the freeway will:

1. Return the waterfront to the people by removing this barrier to access and view.
2. Facilitate needed MUNI improvements.
3. Encourage development of the Embarcadero as a grand civic boulevard unifying the City of San Francisco.

The members of the American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition I and “YES” on Proposition J.

Donald Kennedy, FAIA
President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans love Their City, the ambiance, the Bay, waterfront, the views, the healthy neighborhoods. Freeway builders did their damnest to destroy the City and divide our neighborhoods. Now we can remove that damned spot, the concrete dinosaur, the hideous barrier that destroys our scenic views, the fence that keeps us from the Bay, the concealer of the Ferry Building. Correct a mistake.

VOTE YES ON J.

Miriam Blaustein
Charlene Clark
Marie Cleaseby
Zach Cowan
Dick Grosboll
Rick Hauptman

Tony Kilroy
Jean Kortum
Ira Karlander
Jack Morrison
Andy Nash
Norman Rolfe

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

NO ON PROPOSITION J.

"J" is for JOKE—a cruel joke on us. What will J really do? Add traffic to every street east of Gough. Delay the construction of waterfront streetcar service. Cost millions in local dollars needed to improve MUNI. Create a ground-level freeway on the waterfront as big as Van Ness, with more cars.

I’m a private citizen who’s concerned about traffic and what it’s doing to our City. If you are too, vote NO on Proposition J.

Steve Colman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:

• Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
• Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
• If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that—By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
• Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
• MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
• Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City’s plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Blair C. Pascoe

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION A

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by boldface type.

3.202 Office of Risk Management

There is established under the chief administrative officer an office of risk management which shall review, analyze and report to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the finance committee of the board of supervisors the practices of the several departments, boards and commissions of the city and county regarding loss prevention and risk management, including the insurance requirements of the city and county. The office shall also establish and assist in the implementation of planning and operational guidelines regarding risk management and loss prevention for each department, board or commission. The chief administrative officer may appoint, at his or her pleasure, or contract with, a qualified individual or organization for the operation of the office. The qualifications of the individual or organization operating the office shall include relevant education, training and experience in insurance and risk management.

3.401 City Attorney

(a) The city attorney shall be an elected officer. He shall furnish an official bond in the sum of ten thousand dollars ($10,000). He shall appoint, and at his pleasure may remove, all assistants and employees of his office. He shall devote his entire time and attention to the duties of his office. He must, at the time of his election, be an elector of the city and county, qualified to practice in all the courts of the state, and he must have been so qualified for at least 10 years next preceding his election.

The city attorney must represent the city and county in all actions and proceedings in which it may be legally interested, or, for or against the city and county, or, any officer of the city and county in any action or proceeding, when directed so to do by the supervisors, except where a cause of action exists in favor of the city and county against said officer. Whenever any cause of action exists in favor of the city and county, the city attorney shall commence the same when within his knowledge or when directed so to do by the supervisors. He shall give his advice or opinion in writing to any officer, board or commission of the city and county when requested. Except as otherwise provided in this charter, he shall not settle or dismiss any litigation for or against the city and county, unless, upon his written recommendation, it is ordered so to do by ordinance.

The city attorney shall prepare, or approve as to form, all ordinances before they are enacted by the supervisors. He shall approve, by endorsement in writing, the form of all official or other bonds required by this charter or by ordinance before the same are submitted to the proper commission, board or office for final approval, and no such bonds shall be finally approved without such approval as to form by the city attorney. Except as otherwise in this charter provided, he shall prepare in writing the draft or form of all contracts before the same are executed on behalf of the city and county. He shall examine and approve the title of all real property to be acquired by the city and county.

He shall keep on file in his office copies of all written communications and opinions, also all papers, briefs and transcripts used in matters wherein he appears; and books of record and registers of all actions or proceedings in his charge in which the city and county or any officer or board thereof, is a party or is interested.

(b) The duties of the city attorney in connection with the bureau of delinquent revenue collection shall be transferred to and performed by the attorney for said bureau who shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

(c) There is established in the office of the city attorney a bureau of claims investigation and administration which shall have the responsibility of investigating, evaluating and processing for the several boards, commissions and departments all claims for money or damages made upon the city and county pursuant to section 7.783 of this charter or the general law of the State of California. Claim investigation functions of the police department in existence on June 4, 1986, shall continue as an adjunct to the bureau established under this section. Claims functions of the public utilities commission shall remain under that commission and transferred to the bureau of claims investigation and administration by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the bureau shall also have the power to investigate events and occurrences giving rise to potential civil liability against the city and county and adjust and settle demands, within dollar limits to be established by ordinance, prior to their presentation as claims. There shall be established by ordinance a revoking fund to satisfy such demands adjusted prior to their presentation as claims. The bureau shall be responsible for the investigation of all claims and the analysis of city policies and practices upon which the bureau shall report and advise the several departments.

The city attorney shall appoint a chief of the bureau who shall serve at his or her pleasure. The chief of the bureau may appoint, subject to confirmation by the city attorney, investigators who shall serve at the pleasure of the chief; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of civil claims investigator or any equivalent classification on the date of approval of this amendment by the electorate shall continue to have civil service status to said position under the civil service provisions of this charter.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by boldface type; deletions are indicated by horizontal strikethrough.

7.100 Materials, Supplies and Equipment

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreements for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract. All purchases in excess of one thousand dollars ($1,000) shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases and a permanent record of all such quotations shall be kept. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) for materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements or contractual services in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of materials, supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two or more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned and may advertise for
bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers or of dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall direct the rejection of all articles which may be below standards, specifications or samples furnished. He shall not approve any bill or voucher for articles not in conformity with specifications, or which are at variance with any contract.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall also have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for and in use in all departmental garages of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.

7.103 Requisition, Contract and Payment

All purchase orders and contracts shall be based on written requisitions, or, for materials, or supplies in common use in the various departments, on the purchaser's records of average use by all departments. Purchase orders and contracts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), shall not be approved by the chief administrative officer. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall approve all bids and vouchers for materials, supplies, equipment, and contractual services before the controller shall draw and approve warrants therefor. All contracts for the purchase of materials, supplies and equipment shall be made after inviting sealed bids by publication. All sealed bids received shall be kept on file. When an award of contract is made, notice that the same has been made shall be given by one publication, and any interested person may examine the bids and records at the purchaser's office.

The purchaser of supplies shall by rules and regulations, approved by the chief administrative officer and the controller, designate and authorize the purchasing department to exercise the purchaser's signature powers for purchase orders and contracts approved as provided in this charter.

7.200 Public Works and Purchasing Contracts

The construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements, and the purchasing of supplies, materials and equipment, when the value of the contract involved exceeds the sum of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), shall be done by contract, except as otherwise provided by this charter. It shall constitute official misconduct to split or divide any public work or improvement or purchase into two or more units for the purpose of evading the contract provisions of this section.

In an emergency, provided an actual emergency be declared by the board of supervisors to exist, and when authorized by resolution of said board, any public work or improvement may be executed in the most expeditious manner. Notwithstanding any other provision in this section or this charter contained, upon the approval of the chief administrative officer declaring the work to be emergency in character, there may be expended by the department of public works the sum not to exceed five hundred dollars ($500) for new construction of any type in or upon unimproved or unaccepted streets.

Any public work or improvement estimated to cost less than the sum of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) may be performed under contract or written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county.

Any public work or improvement executed by the city, other than routine repair work, shall be authorized by the chief administrative officer when the cost exceeds fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or by the heads of departments not under the chief administrative officer, only after detailed estimates have been prepared and submitted by the head of the department concerned.

There shall be separate accounting for each work or improvement so executed, which accounting shall include all direct, indirect and supervisory elements of cost chargeable to such work or improvement, and each cost accounting shall be reported to the chief administrative officer, or to the mayor when such work shall have been performed by departments not under the chief administrative officer. All such accounts shall be reviewed by the chief administrative officer. Improvement costing less than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) and not performed by the city and county labor, materials, and supplies shall, if not performed under contract, be covered by written order or agreement which shall be based on not less than three bids, notice of which shall be given by three days' posting. Records of such bids shall be kept by the department.

When the expenditure for any public work or improvement shall exceed the sum of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), the same shall be done by contract, except as otherwise provided in this charter. The head of the department in charge of or responsible for the work for which a contract is to be let, or the purchaser of supplies in the case of purchases of materials, supplies and equipment, shall let such contract to the lowest reliable and responsible bidder not less than ten days after advertising by one publication for sealed proposals for the work, improvements or purchase contemplated. Each such advertisement shall contain the reservation of the right to reject any and all bids. The officer responsible for the awarding of any such contract shall require from all bidders information concerning their experience and financial qualifications, as provided by general law relative to such investigations authorized by department of public works.

The purchase of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer for bids in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), or the department head concerned with the approval of the board or commission to which he is responsible, may reject any and all bids and readvertise for bids.

The department head or the purchaser of supplies, as the case may be, shall have power to sign such contract for the estimated expenditures thereunder not in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000). Any contract involving the expenditure of more than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), if for the purchase of materials, supplies or equipment, shall require the joint approval of the purchaser of supplies and the chief administrative officer. If such contract is for any public work or improvement, it shall require the joint approval of the department head and the chief administrative officer for amounts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), relative to departments under his jurisdiction, or the signature of the department head or other authority on the board or commission concerned for departments not under the chief administrative officer.

The board of supervisors, by ordinance, shall establish procedure whereby appropriate city and county departments may file sealed bids for the execution of any work to be performed under contract. If such is the lowest, the contract shall be awarded to the department. Accurate unit costs shall be kept of all direct and indirect charges incurred by the department under any such contract, which unit costs shall be reported to and audited by a controller monthly and on the completion of the work.

In any case where the lowest gross price or unit cost bid is not accepted, and a contract is entered into with any other bidder, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the controller by the officer authorized to execute the contract, with the reasons for failure to accept such lowest bid.

If any provision of this section is in conflict with any provision of section 7.100 of the charter, the provisions contained in section 7.100 shall govern and control.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.

7.200 Public Works Contract Procedure by Ordinance

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter and, in particular, the provisions of section 7.200, the board of supervisors shall by ordinance determine the monetary limits not to exceed fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), within which the construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements may be done by contract or by written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county, consistent, save as to monetary limits, with the manner provided for in section 7.200 and section 7.100.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.
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point two commissioners to terms of one year each, one commissioner to a term of two years, one commissioner to a term of three years and one commissioner to a term of four years. Therefore, the terms of the commissioners shall be for four years from the commencement thereof. Not less than one-four members of said commission shall be of the same sex, and one member shall have prior experience representing labor and one member shall have prior experience representing management.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of one hundred dollars ($100).

—Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of considering and adopting examination questions shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission. After the regular daily working hours of 8 am to 5 pm. Such person or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such persons.

In accordance with section 3.500, the commission shall have the power and it shall be its duty to appoint an executive assistant to be the administrative head of the affairs under its control who shall serve at its pleasure; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of assistant and officers of the city and service commission on the effective date of this section as amended shall continue to have civil service status in the position of executive assistant under the civil service provisions of this charter.

3.661 General Powers and Duties

(a) The civil service commission shall be the employment and personnel department of the city and county and shall determine appointments on the basis of merit and fitness, as shown by appropriate tests. The commission shall classify, and from time to time may reclassify, in accordance with duties and responsibilities of the employment and training and experience required, all places of employment in the department and officers of the city and service commission, specifically exempted from the civil service provisions thereof, or which may be created hereafter by general law and not specifically exempted from said civil service provisions: The commission shall likewise classify all other positions or other places of employment in the city and county service specifically exempted from the civil service provisions of this charter, but which, by the provisions of section 8.401, thereof, are made subject to classification for salary standardization purposes on the basis of duties and responsibilities of the employment and training and experience required: The civil service commission shall be the judge of such classifications.

(b) The commission shall also, in accordance with duties and responsibilities, allocate, and from time to time may re-allocate, the positions to the various classes of the classification. The allocation or re-allocation of positions shall not adversely affect the civil service rights of any commission or any holding such positions. No person shall hold a position outside of the classification to which he has been appointed; provided that every employee of any department or office shall discharge any of the duties pertaining to such department or office to which his chief may temporarily assign him in accordance with the classification.

(c) The commission shall adopt rules to carry out the civil service provisions of this charter and, except as otherwise provided in this charter, such rules shall govern applications; examinations; eligibility; duration of eligible lists; certification of eligibles; appointments; promotions, transfers: resignations; lay-offs or reduction in force, both permanent and temporary; due to lack of work or funds, re-employment or completion of work, the filling of positions, temporary, seasonal and permanent; classification; approval of payrolls; and such other matters as are not in conflict with this charter. The commission may, upon one week's notice, make changes in the rules, which changes shall thereupon be printed and be in force, provided that no such changes in rules shall affect a case pending before the commission. The secretary may certify eligibles and payrolls and conduct examinations under the rules of the commission.

The commissioner shall have power to institute and prosecute legal proceedings for violations of any of the civil service provisions of this charter.

(b) The civil service commission shall establish an inspection service for the purpose of investigating the conduct of and action of appointees in all positions and of securing records of service for promotion and other purposes. All departments shall cooperate with the commission in making its investigations and any person refusing to cooperate with the commission or its agents shall be subject to suspension.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the civil service commission shall by rule establish procedures to review and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, citizenship, age, physical handicap, color, economic status, sex orientation, sexual identity, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. The determination reached under civil service commission procedures shall be final and shall be enforced by every employee and officer.

3.663 General Powers and Duties

(a) The civil service commission shall have the power to inquire into the operation of the personnel system of the city and county to ensure compliance with the principles set forth in section 8.310. After such inquiry, the commission may recommend to the personnel director, as established pursuant to section 3.663, that a hearing be held or to any other officer of the city and county such action as the commission believes necessary to carry out the civil service provisions of this charter. In any hearing conducted by the civil service commission or by any hearing officer it appoints, the commission or the hearing officer shall have the power to subpoena and require the attendance of witnesses and the production of records as provided in section 3.701.

(b) The civil service commission may require periodic reports from the personnel director in a manner and form which it shall prescribe.

(c) The civil service commission may hear appeals from an action of the personnel director with respect to any personnel employee.

1. Allegations of discrimination. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the civil service commission regarding allegations of discrimination shall be final and enforceable by every employee and officer.

2. Allegations of fraud; and

3. Allegations of conflict of interest, pursuant to section 8.105.

(d) No action by the personnel director which is the subject of any appeal shall be stayed during the appeal process except by the unanimous vote of the civil service commission.

(e) The commission shall be notified of the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal of personnel regulations and may comment on such proposals. The adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing fraud or allegations of discrimination shall be subject to ratification by the commission. In addition, the adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfers, resignations and terminations shall be subject to ratification by the commission. The commission shall ratify or reject any such regulation within 60 days of receipt. The commission's failure to act shall be deemed approval.

3.662 Department of Personnel Administration

There is hereby established a department of personnel administration which shall consist of a personnel director and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the duties of that department. Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the civil service commission and whose job function is placed under the department of personnel administration shall be continued without loss in the same civil service rights as through said job function had not, by amendment to this charter, been placed under the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration.

The department of personnel administration shall be the personnel department for the city and county and shall provide a means to recruit, select, train, evaluate, promote career development, classify positions, administer salaries, administer employee discipline, discharge and related personnel activities in order to maintain an effective and responsive work force.

3.663 Personnel Director

(a) A personnel director shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the mayor; provided, however, that the personnel director shall be selected from candidates nominated by any civil service commissioner and confirmed by vote of the board of supervisors. The nominee of the mayor may be appointed acting personnel director pending confirmation. The person so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of personnel director in the spirit of this declaration."

(b) The personnel director shall conduct appropriate examinations for employment, establish eligible lists based on their results and provide for certification of eligibles. The action of the personnel director on examination matters including,
but not limited to, announcements, minimum qualifications, classes of applicants, components, construction, weighting, content, type, list length, duration and certification shall be final.

(c) The personnel director shall adopt personnel regulations which, except as otherwise provided in this charter, shall govern both the administrative and other personnel issues, including but not limited to, recruitment; applications; examinations; eligibility; duration of eligible lists; certification of eligibles; permanent, temporary, and probationary positions; regular and promotional employee evaluations; promotions; transfers; resignations; layoffs or reduction in force due to lack of work or lack of funds, reorganization, retraining or completion of work; and classification. No personnel regulations shall be adopted, amended or repealed without a prior public hearing upon at least two weeks public notice by the personnel director and after meeting and confer sessions with recognized employee organizations as required by state law.

All civil service commission rules relevant to the foregoing as well as the provisions of former sections 8.322, 8.323, 8.324, 8.325, 8.329, 8.330, and 8.331 of this chapter shall become personnel regulations on the effective date of this charter amendment.

(d) The personnel director shall conduct the salary surveys for the civil service commission as set forth elsewhere in this charter.

(e) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall establish procedures to review and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the personnel director shall forthwith be enforced by every employee and officer, unless the decision is appealed to the civil service commission in accordance with personnel regulations.

(f) The personnel director shall investigate all complaints of personnel related conduct of City and County employees and shall promptly report to the source of the complaint.

(g) The personnel director by personnel regulations shall promote efficient and effective management through personnel programs that encourage high productivity and exemplary performance.

(h) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall provide a procedure for resolution of employee disputes which shall be consistent with other provisions of this charter and shall be utilized by all department heads and appointing officers upon the expiration of the term of any otherwise binding agreements.

(i) Consistent with the foregoing and other applicable provisions of this charter, the personnel director shall delegate to the various appointing officers appropriate personnel responsibilities, including but not limited to appropriate disciplinary procedures, and consult with appointing officers with respect to personnel matters affecting their operations.

(j) Personal services contracts shall be reviewed and approved by the personnel director in accordance with the provisions of appropriate personnel regulations. Personal services contracts representing amounts in excess of the payroll of the departments and county of more than twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000) shall also be reviewed and approved by the Commission. Failure of the Commission to act within thirty days of submission of the contract by the personnel director shall be deemed expeditous so that final adoption of the eligible list is not delayed beyond sixty (60) days after the date of posting. Eligibles who, as a result of their ranking, would receive a notice of appointment regardless of the outcome of the protest(s) may be offered employment from the adopted list pending the resolution of any protest(s) and amendment to the adopted eligible list.

Except as specifically provided for in section 8.327, the Civil Service Commission shall provide for examinations on an entrance, promotional, or combination entrance and promotional basis. Consideration shall be given to permanent employees in separate promotional examinations and in promotional examinations for city and county service. The passing mark has been attained and may include evaluation of work performance and other credits. When an examination announcement is issued for a class on both a promotional and entrance basis, there shall be one resulting list of eligibles which shall include all successful candidates - both promotional and entrance - in order of relative performance.

Nothing in this section shall prohibit the appointment to a position in any other public service or employment by reason of the successful candidate's prior public service or employment.

8.328 Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave

Employees under permanent civil service appointment who, because of absence on duty authorized military leave after June 27, 1956, did not participate in a promotional examination held after June 27, 1950, and during time of war as defined in section 8.324 of this charter, and in which examination the employee would have been otherwise eligible to compete had the war not intervened, and which examination was held prior to the adoption of the civil service examination commission, shall, after expiration of military leave, have the right to participate in a similar promotional examination. Provided, that persons and employees who were on entrance or promotional eligible lists, shall, for the purpose of this amendment, be deemed to be appointees in their classification from the time their names were removed for permanent certification while in the military service.

In order to qualify for participation in a similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section, such employee who desires to participate, must make application in writing to the civil service examination commission within thirty days after the expiration of his military leave, or within thirty days after the effective date of this amendment. Failure to file such written request to participate in a similar promotional examination as herein provided shall be deemed a waiver of all rights of the employee to participate in such similar promotional examination.

The civil service examination commission shall have the power to conduct such similar promotional examination within a reasonable time after employees eligible to request participation in any similar promotional examination under the provisions of this section have indicated their desire to so participate, or have waived their right to participate, as herein provided.

The civil service examination commission shall be the sole judge of the adequacy of such similar promotional examination. If the employee obtains in such similar promotional examination a score rating equal to or
more than the minimum passing mark established by the civil service commission for inclusion on the list of eligibles resulting from the original promotional examination, his name shall thereafter be entered on the eligible list resulting from the original promotional examination in accordance with the relative examination and standing obtained by him in the original and similar promotional examinations. Such employees shall be eligible for appointment from such list of eligibles in accordance with civil service rules to any vacancy thereat occurring, and subject to satisfactory completion of a probationary period as provided in Sections 3420, 3424 and 3430 of this chapter for a period of four years after the date on which their name is entered on the eligible list and before eligibles procuring standing through examinations held subsequent to the original promotional examination.

If it is determined by the civil service commission that the name of such person would have been reached for permanent appointment from the list of eligibles established as a result of the original promotional examination during his term of military service had the name of such person appeared thereon, then such employee, upon appointment to a permanent position as herein provided, shall be granted seniority in such appointment for the full period of time he was in the armed forces, and his name shall be placed in the eligible list as if his name had appeared thereon, but such seniority shall be used only for the purpose of determining salary increments and calculating city and county service credits in other promotional examinations held subsequent to the similar promotional examination herein authorized. For all other purposes, seniority of service shall date from the date of appointment as a result of qualifying in the similar promotional examination as herein authorized.

Such employees who qualify for appointment as a result of a similar promotional examination as herein provided, and who are appointed to permanent positions, as herein provided, shall be permitted to participate in other promotional examinations for which they are otherwise eligible, while serving under probationary appointment in the position to which they were appointed as a result of the similar promotional examination, provided that certification from lists of eligibles established from such other examinations shall not be made until the employee has satisfactorily completed the aforesaid probationary appointment.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules to govern the administration of similar promotional examinations for such appointments and other matters arising therefrom.

§ 329 Certification of Eligibles; Rule of Three

Whenever a position controlled by the civil service provisions of this chapter is to be filled, the appointing officer shall make a requisition to the civil service commission for a person to fill it. Thereupon, the commission shall certify to the appointing officer the names and addresses of the three persons standing highest on the list of eligibles for such position. In case the position is promotional, the commission shall certify the names of the three persons standing highest on such list. If there are fewer than three names on the list from which certification is to be made, then only those names shall be certified. The appointing officer shall fill the position by the appointment of one of the persons certified. The provisions of this section as herein amended at the election of November 2, 1976, shall be applicable only to lists of eligibles finally adopted by the civil service commission in accordance with the provisions of Sections 8322 and 8323 of this charter on or after the effective date of this amendment. In making such certification, sex shall be disregarded except when a statute, rule of the commission or the appointing officer specifies otherwise.

From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the commission shall determine whether the position is in, in character, temporary, seasonal or permanent, and shall notify the candidate in accordance therewith to the end that the candidate may have knowledge of the probable duration of employment. The commission shall provide for such waiver of temporary or seasonal employment as it may deem just to candidates.

The civil service commission shall have the power to make all necessary rules, regulations and conditions to maintain adequate registers of eligibles established through the regular examination and procedure provided in Sections 8320, 8324 and 8330 hereof.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules to carry out the provisions of this section and to govern the administration of limited tenure appointments.

In time of national emergency declared by the President of the United States or by the Congress or while any act authorizing compulsory military service or training is in effect, the provisions of this section may also be made operative under recommendation of the civil service commission and approval of the board of supervisors by ordinance enacted by the board.

§ 330 Temporary and Emergency Appointments

When no list of eligibles exists or no eligible is available on an existing list for a position in the class required by the appointing officer, and immediate service in the position is required by the appointing officer and another list exists which is deemed by the civil service commission to be suitable to provide temporarily the service desired, the commission shall certify for civil service temporary appointment an eligible from such list; if no such other list deemed by the commission to be suitable exists, the commission pursuant to its rules, procedures and upon the request of the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment thereto for a period not exceeding one hundred and thirty working days. Non-civil service or emergency appointments extended beyond ninety days must be approved by the civil service commission. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such one hundred and thirty working days at the time civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in section 8329 of the charter.

If a list of eligibles exists for the position required by the appointing officer, and another list exists which is deemed by the appointing officer pending the time an eligible from such list is certified and reports for duty as provided in section 8329 of the charter, the commission may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment thereto for a period not exceeding thirty working days. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such thirty working days at the time civil service eligible reports for duty as provided in section 8329 of this chapter.

No person shall be compensated under any non-civil service or emergency appointment or appointments we authorized under the provisions of the foregoing paragraphs of this section for a period exceeding one hundred and thirty working days in any fiscal or calendar year, and no claim or warrant therefor shall be approved, allowed or paid. If the compensation in excess of such one hundred and thirty working days in any fiscal or calendar year.

If no eligibles are available for appointment to a permanent position in the class required by the appointing officer, the commission shall immediately provide for a temporary appointment under the provisions of this section for such position. If its annual appropriation is insufficient to meet the cost of said examination, it shall report to the mayor the estimated cost thereof, and the
mayor shall request and the supervisors shall make supplemental appropriation therefore in the manner provided herein for supplemental appropriations.

8.340 Dismission During Probation Period

Any person appointed to a permanent position shall serve a probationary period. The civil-service commission personnel director shall by rule establish a probationary period of not less than six months' service for each twelve months' service for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed ranks of the police department, fire department, sheriff's department and San Francisco International Airport police force shall be for twelve months except that, with respect to members of the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve months' service from the day following completion of the prescribed department field training officer program, but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment; provided further that probationary members of the uniformed ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in section 8.343 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four months may be established for executive and management classifications. At any time during the probationary period or subsequent thereto, the civil-service commission may terminate the appointment upon giving written notice of such termination to the employee, and to the civil-service commission specifying the reasons for such termination. Except in the case of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments the civil-service commission shall review the termination. The civil-service commission shall by rule establish the procedures for such review. If the appointment results from an entrance examination the commission may declare the person disqualified or may return the name to the list of eligibles under such conditions for further appointment as the commission may deem just. If the appointment resulted from a promotional examination the employee shall have the right of appeal and hearing before the civil-service commission. The commission shall render a decision within thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person disqualified; or (b) order such person reinstated to the position with entry date the same as the entry date of the decision order that the employee be paid salary from the time of the termination of the appointment; or (c) order the return of such person to a position in the classification from which that person was promoted and may restore the employee's eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same or a similar classification under such conditions as the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall be final. Immediately prior to the expiration of the probationary period the appointed officer shall report to the civil-service commission as to the competence of the probationer for the position, and if competent, shall recommend permanent appointment. Nothing in this section shall preclude the civil-service commission from reviewing terminations for the purpose of future employability including terminations in the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments.

8.407 Definition of Generally Prevailing Rates of Wages

Notwithstanding any provision of section 8.401 or any provision of any other section of this chapter to the contrary, generally prevailing rates of salaries and wages for those employees covered by section 8.401 of this chapter shall be determined by the civil service commission as set forth below.

The civil-service commission personnel director shall conduct a comprehensive investigation and survey of basic pay rates and wages and salaries in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment for like work and like service, based upon job classifications as provided in section 3661.3662 of this chapter and shall make its findings, based on facts and data collected, as to what are the generally prevailing basic pay rates for each benchmark class of employment solely in the county and shall provide for each. A benchmark class is defined as a "key class" within an occupational grouping selected as the class for which a representative sample of data will be collected.

Basic pay rate data for public and private employment shall be collected solely from the Bay Area counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, San Francisco and Santa Clara; provided, however, that for any benchmark class of employment for which the civil-service commission personnel director determines there is insufficient data from Bay Area public jurisdictions the commission personnel director shall survey major public agencies in the state employing such class, major public agencies to be defined as those employing more than 3,000 persons.

The commission personnel director shall collect basic pay rate data for like work and like service from Bay Area public jurisdictions as follows:

(a) The counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, San Francisco and Santa Clara;
(b) The ten most populous cities in these five Bay Area counties based on the latest federal decennial census.
(c) Agencies of the state and federal governments and from school districts and other special districts in the six Bay Area counties as determined by the civil-service commission personnel director. The commission personnel director shall collect private basic pay rate data from recognized governmental Bay Area salary and wage surveys of private employers in the city and county of San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. The data collected shall be limited to basic rates of pay and salaries actually being paid by public and private employers for like work and like service.

The term "prevailing rates of wages" for employers governed by chapter section 8.401 and this section shall be defined as the rate ranges developed from the weighted average of the midpoint of the basic pay rates, excluding fringe benefits, for surveyed public employments and the median of the pay rates for private employment to be determined as follows:

1. Multiply the medians from the private and public midpoint from public employment data base by the number of employees in the given classification from each data base.
2. Add the products of (1);
3. Divide the sums in (2) by the total number of employees surveyed for that classification;
4. Extend this figure by 10 percent to establish the maximum of the range and reduce this figure by 10 percent to establish the minimum.

When fixing rates of compensation the board of supervisors shall fix basic pay rates as close as reasonably possible to prevailing rates, provided, however, that the board of supervisors shall not set the maximum rate of pay for any class in excess of the maximum prevailing rate for that class; provided, further, however, that no employee shall have his basic pay rate reduced to conform to prevailing rates except as provided for in section 8.406. For those classifications of employment in which the practice is customary, the schedules of compensation shall provide for minimum, not less than three intermediate, and maximum salaries for a method of advancing the salaries of employees from minimum to intermediate to maximum with due regard for seniority of service.

The term "basic pay rate" as used in this section is hereby defined as applying only to the basic rate of wages, with included range scales, and does not include any other benefits of employment or working condition benefits.

It is the declared intent of the qualified electors of the city and county that neither the board of supervisors nor the mayor have any base to provide any benefits of employment except those enumerated already provided for in the charter and. Any addition, deletion or modification of benefits of employment enumerated in the charter shall be submitted, as a charter amendment, to the qualified electors of the city and county. The qualified electors expressly state that they understand that benefits of employment are sometimes referred to as "fringe benefits" of employment and the qualified electors expressly reserve the right to either grant or deny such benefits except those conditions of employment commonly referred to as "working conditions". Any reference to working conditions shall mean those compensations which must necessarily be provided in order for the employee to perform his job description duties efficiently and safely, and shall include but not be limited to such working conditions and benefits as are typically included in the administrative provisions of the salary standardization order and the salary ordinance.

The said salary and wage ordinance, as it is at his or her discretion, may provide working condition benefits for employees covered under this section and section 8.401 of this charter only in accordance with the following provisions:

(a) The civil-service commission personnel director shall determine, certify and recommend to the board of supervisors the benefits and conditions of employment which in the opinion of the personnel director benefit is equitable or necessary for the efficient and safe performance of the employee's duties as enumerated in his job description.
(b) The working condition benefit, as recommended by the civil-service commission personnel director, may include such benefits as are usually comparable for like work and like service to that provided for the job classification and is provided to not less than 50 percent of the employees in the class in the jurisdiction covered by the salary survey.

9.108 Initiative, Referendum, and Recall

(a) The registered voters shall have power to propose by petition, and to adopt or to reject at the polls, any ordinance, act or other measure which is within the jurisdiction conferred by the laws of the state and which may be enacted, or any legislative act which is within the power conferred upon any other board, commission or officer to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinance, act, charter amendment or other measure may be so proposed by filing with the registrar a petition setting forth said measure in full, signed by registered voters of the city and county as many in number as the percentages hereinafter required of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election.

Any declaration of policy may be submitted to the electorate in the manner provided for the submission of ordinances, acts and any other measure which may be enacted, or any legislative act which is within the power conferred upon any other board, commission or officer to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinance, act, charter amendment or other measure may be so proposed by filing with the registrar a petition setting forth said measure in full, signed by registered voters of the city and county as many in number and as percentages hereinafter required of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election.

Any declaration of policy may be submitted to the electorate in the manner provided for the submission of ordinances, acts and any other measure which may be enacted, or any legislative act which is within the power conferred upon any other board, commission or officer to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinance, act, charter amendment or other measure may be so proposed by filing with the registrar a petition setting forth said measure in full, signed by registered voters of the city and county as many in number and as percentages hereinafter required of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election.

9.108 Initiative, Referendum, and Recall (a) The registered voters shall have power to propose by petition, and to adopt or to reject at the polls, any ordinance, act or other measure which is within the jurisdiction conferred by the laws of the state and which may be enacted, or any legislative act which is within the power conferred upon any other board, commission or officer to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinance, act, charter amendment or other measure may be so proposed by filing with the registrar a petition setting forth said measure in full, signed by registered voters of the city and county as many in number and as percentages hereinafter required of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election.

Any declaration of policy may be submitted to the electorate in the manner provided for the submission of ordinances, acts and any other measure which may be enacted, or any legislative act which is within the power conferred upon any other board, commission or officer to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinance, act, charter amendment or other measure may be so proposed by filing with the registrar a petition setting forth said measure in full, signed by registered voters of the city and county as many in number as the percentages hereinafter required of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election.

Any declaration of policy may be submitted to the electorate in the manner provided for the submission of ordinances, acts and any other measure which may be enacted, or any legislative act which is within the power conferred upon any other board, commission or officer to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinance, act, charter amendment or other measure may be so proposed by filing with the registrar a petition setting forth said measure in full, signed by registered voters of the city and county as many in number as the percentages hereinafter required of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election.

Any declaration of policy may be submitted to the electorate in the manner provided for the submission of ordinances, acts and any other measure which may be enacted, or any legislative act which is within the power conferred upon any other board, commission or officer to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinance, act, charter amendment or other measure may be so proposed by filing with the registrar a petition setting forth said measure in full, signed by registered voters of the city and county as many in number as the percentages hereinafter required of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election.

Any declaration of policy may be submitted to the electorate in the manner provided for the submission of ordinances, acts and any other measure which may be enacted, or any legislative act which is within the power conferred upon any other board, commission or officer to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinance, act, charter amendment or other measure may be so proposed by filing with the registrar a petition setting forth said measure in full, signed by registered voters of the city and county as many in number as the percentages hereinafter required of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election.
or privilege, shall go into effect until the expiration of sixty days from the date it becomes final. At the end of such sixty days such ordinance shall be in force and effect, unless within such period there shall be filed with the registrar a petition signed by registered voters equal in number to five percent of the entire vote cast for mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election, requesting that such ordinance be submitted to the electors. In case such petition is filed, such ordinance shall not go into effect until approved by a majority of the voters voting thereon at a general or special election.

If, before the time any other ordinance involving legislative matters becomes effective, there shall be filed with the board of supervisors a petition signed by qualified electors of the city and county equal in number to at least ten centum of the entire vote cast for all candidates for mayor at the last preceding general municipal election, at which a mayor was elected, protesting against the passage of such ordinance the same shall be suspended from going into operation, and it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to reconsider such ordinance, and if the same be not entirely repealed, said board shall submit the ordinance to the voters of said electors either at the next general municipal election or at a special election to be called for that purpose, and such ordinance shall not go into effect or become operative unless and until a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon shall vote in favor thereof. The provisions of section 9.109 and 9.10.1 of the charter shall apply to and govern the verification and certification of such petition.

Annual budget and appropriation ordinances, supplemental appropriation ordinances, the annual salary ordinance, or ordinances amending the same, the ordinances levying taxes, any ordinance appropriating money from the emergency reserve fund, ordinances authorizing the city attorney to promulgate regulations, and other ordinances necessary to enable the mayor to carry out any of the powers vested in him in the case of public emergency as defined in section 3.100 of the charter, ordinances enacted pursuant to section 8.410 of the charter, as well as ordinances relative to purely administrative matters, shall not be subject to referendum.

Any executive official, the chief administrative officer, the controller or any member of the board of education or public utilities commission may be recalled by the electors. The procedure to effect such recall shall be as follows: A petition demanding the recall from office of the person sought to be recalled shall be filed with the registrar. Said petition shall contain a statement of the grounds on which the recall is sought. Any insufficiency of form or substance in such statement shall in no way affect the validity of the election and proceedings held thereunder. No recall petition shall be filed against any officer until he has held his office for at least six months.

(ii) In the event the representative of the board of supervisors (or the representatives of recognized employee organizations do not reach an agreement through the meet-and-confer process on matters contained in the annual salary standardization ordinance by March 15 of any year, the mayor shall recommend and the board shall adopt or approve or reject a schedule of compensation which reflects the compensation rates for the classifications covered by Section 8.410 of this Charter the last good faith offer presented by the mayor or his or her representative.

In any year when an agreement on matters contained in the salary standardization ordinance has not been achieved, the civil service commission in consultation with the mayor and the personnel director shall, prior to April 1, develop a schedule of compensation and administrative provisions which reflect additional rates that would be payable, and working conditions, based upon the last demands made by the recognized employee organization(s) which participated in the meet-and-confer process.

A schedule shall be transmitted to the registrar of voters for submission to the electors of the city and county at a general election or a special election called for the purpose, and said special election shall be held not less than sixty (60) days from the date of the call. No such schedule shall be voted on which has not been received by the registrar of voters. At said election, the ballot shall contain the following two alternatives:

(ii) Approval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

(iii) Disapproval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

If a majority of the valid votes cast in the election favor paying the additional rates set forth in the schedule of compensation based upon the last demands of the recognized employee organizations which engaged in the meet-and-confer process, it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to amend the salary standardization ordinance to reflect said increased rates.

continued on page 7b
rates and the same shall be in lieu of said annual compensation, and notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, said rates shall become effective and be payable as if adopted prior to April 1, of any year.

The provisions of sections 3.100 and 3.100-1, relating to the emergency powers of the mayor, shall not be applicable to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

11.105 Effective Date of Amendments
The effective date of the amendments, additions and deletions to the civil service provisions of the charter shall be ninety (90) days after the acceptance and filing thereof with the Secretary of State.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION G

We the people of San Francisco declare this to be our policy:
1) IT IS IMPROPER TO PROFIT FROM OR PROVIDE SUPPORT TO THE RACIST POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SYSTEM IN SOUTH AFRICA, KNOWN AS APARTHEID.
2) COMPANIES HAVING SUBSTANTIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH APARTHEID MUST BE CONSIDERED IRRESponsible.
(a) The Board of Supervisors must determine which companies doing or seeking business with the City have the greatest ties to Apartheid. Companies that have a significant involvement in profiting from or maintaining the Apartheid system, may, on that basis, be deemed "irresponsible bidders."
In purchasing goods and services and awarding other contracts, the City must give priority to avoiding such companies; the degree of the preference must be in proportion to the company's complicity with Apartheid, according to the following criteria:
— how much business the company does in or with South Africa;
— how much the company profits from that business;
— how much support the company provides the Apartheid government in taxes, loans, payments or other funding;
— the nature of the company's South Africa business;
— the degree of the company's cooperation with South African political censorship or secrecy agreements;
— the degree to which the company provides the South African government with the technology, materials and other means to maintain and enforce Apartheid.
(b) City funds must not be deposited or invested with any bank or other company which does business in or with, or makes loans to, South Africa.
(c) If any exception to the above policies is found to be necessary or appropriate, the responsible official must promptly and publicly report it to the Board of Supervisors, clearly describing the exception and the reasons for it.
(d) The term "city" includes all agencies, departments, officials, employees, units and subunits of the city and county of San Francisco, and all funds administered by or on behalf of the city or county.
(3) WE CALL ON ALL OTHER PUBLIC BODIES AND PRIVATE OR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS TO ADOPT SIMILAR POLICIES.
(4) WE CALL A GENERAL PUBLIC BOYCOTT FOCUSING ON THOSE COMPANIES HAVING THE GREATEST TIES TO APARTHEID.
The Board of Supervisors must determine and announce which company or companies are the worst offenders within each major industry, so that the public can focus its boycott on those companies.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION H

SUMMARY: THIS INITIATIVE STATES THAT THE AIDS EPIDEMIC IS A MAJOR PUBLIC HEALTH PROBLEM OF CONCERN TO EVERYONE, REQUIRING INCREASED SUPPORT FOR RELATED MEDICAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION. IT CALLS FOR A COUNCIL FOR AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION OR SIMILAR UNITED EFFORT TO STOP AIDS.

We the people of San Francisco hereby adopt the following policy:
1. The AIDS epidemic has become a major public health problem, costly both in human lives and in general community resources;
2. The first steps in dealing with such a crisis are: the scientific research needed to discover and understand the nature, causes, co-factors, prevention, diagnosis and treatment of the disease, and the education of the public about the lessons of that research;
3. A proper program of research and education pays for itself in the long run;
4. Prompt action is urgent, because of the rapidly growing number of persons affected, increasing not only the suffering but also the difficulty of eradicating the disease;
5. The leadership and support of such an effort is everyone's responsibility;
6. While San Francisco's role in the overall effort against AIDS has been viewed as a positive example to other areas, the continued rapid increase in the spread of the disease means that we cannot afford to rest on our laurels or leave further responsibility to others.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:
1. We call on all appropriate government bodies as well as medical, professional, charitable and community organizations and concerned individuals to join together in an all-out effort to stop AIDS;
2. We call for support to an organized united effort along the lines of an AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION COUNCIL, including, in some form:
— A COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, to provide informed evaluations as to priorities among research projects and proposals, recommending those which are most cost-effective and most likely to produce early results useful in the prevention or treatment of the disease, to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts or neglect of promising approaches, and to provide the council with complete and up-to-date information regarding comparative results of experimental treatments, prevention programs and other existing research;
— A COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, to inform the public regarding prevention and other research findings, and to inform relevant government officials and the general public, concerning the factual basis for a re-ordering of current public funding priorities toward an increased war against disease, including research and education against AIDS and related conditions;
— A FUND-RAISING COMMITTEE, to solicit donations, lobby for grants, organize benefits and other fund-raising projects spreading the financial burden by appealing to many sources;
3. We ask the council and committees to be responsive and accessible to public input, to include representation of all interested groups, to consider all viewpoints, and to be capable of prompt action;
4. We ask appropriate city officials to determine whether a suitable form of such a council already exists; if it does, we wish the city to support it actively; if not, we wish the city to seek to encourage its formation by such means as may appear proper.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION I

SUMMARY: This initiative asks "Shall we tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?" The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated portion of Route 480 known as the Embarcadero Freeway. This initiative declaration of policy will give the voters the opportunity to establish the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco regarding the proposed teardown of the Embarcadero Freeway.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION J

Shall the City replace a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if such replacement would open up the Waterfront to its citizens, improve the tax base, and create a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic?
FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER
JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: The Bill of Rights guarantees that every person accused of a crime shall have the effective assistance of counsel. Whether an individual is rich or poor, that person is entitled to a competent and dedicated attorney.
In San Francisco it is the duty of the Public Defender to uphold this sacred right. In every case, we provide the client with the best defense under the law.
In the last 7 years, my outstanding staff has done this work with the highest degree of professionalism. In the next 4 years, that same strong, professional, independent and ethical representation will continue.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John D. Burdis, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Sale Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative In Congress, 5th District
Manuel Cedillo, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
George Christensen, 1710 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Clerk
Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Artist/Community Organizer
Brian Getz, 55 22nd Ave., Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson, Sheriff of San Francisco
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., International Vice President, ILGWU
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for Children & Youth
Susan Kelly Jacobs, 3070 26th Ave., Executive Assistant to Sula Burton M.C.
Ephraim Margolius, 50 Scenic Way, Attorney
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Community Health Director
Linda Ann Post, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative
Jim Rivaldo, 430 Steiner St., Political Consultant
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Member, SF Community College District
Governing Board
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel W. Walker, 562 Campbell Ave., President — Local 250-A Transport
*Workers Union of America
A. Ceci Williams, 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor
C. R. Zanca, 1966 Pacific Ave., Auto Repair Proprietor

FOR ASSESSOR
SAM DUCA

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I was elected your Assessor in 1978 and re-elected in 1982. My years in the Assessor's Office were spent in a professional appraisal capacity personnel and administration. I have two university degrees, the coveted M.A. designation, and am the recipient of a special Congressional Advisory Board award from the United States Congress. I have served in an advisory capacity, both nationally and internationally, in property tax administration and will continue to serve the taxpayers of the City and County of San Francisco in dealing with Article XIII of the State Constitution. My community involvement includes participation in cultural, civic business organizations.

Sam Duca

The sponsors for Sam Duca are:
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
Eugene L. Friend, 2910 Lake St., Investor
Nancy Pelosi, 40 Presidio Ter., Housewife and volunteer in politics
Walter H. Shorestein, 740 El Camino del Mar., Chairman, Milton Meyer & Co.
Stanley Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Emma W. Louis, 1257 Jackson St., Housewife
Alfred S. Wilkes, 2590 Jackson St., Chr. of Exec. Comm. of Diversified Holding Co.
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hinckley Walk, Physician
Gerson Bakar, 2310 Hyde St., Investor
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management
Jane McKaske Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired
Joseph C. Orega, Sr., 866 Faxon Ave., Publicity Dept. — S.F. Giants
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher
Frances May Mccatee, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Recreation & Park Commissioner
Frederick F. Campagnoli, 2609 Larkin St., Attorney
Betty Brooks, 1728 26th St., Field Representative
Jess Teruel Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Businessman
Cyril L. Magini, 994 California St., Merchant
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John H. Swanson, 145 Lake Merced Hill South, Bowling Alley Owner
Frances G. Goldman, 745 El Camino Del Mar, Child Guidance
Irma M. Bemardo, 2182 34th Ave., Housewife
Leo J. Murphy, 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Charles M. Cunningham, 475 Connecticut St., Self Employed
Lawrence V. Eppinette, 815 Fell St., Conf. Secretary
Mary M. O'Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Volunteer & Homemaker
Elizabeth R. Duca, 16 Wawona St., Homemaker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Application for Absentee Ballot
is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

Name
________________________________________
Residence Address________________________________________
Mailing Address________________________________________
Signature________________________________________

If the person to whom this pamphlet is addressed no longer resides at this address, please draw a diagonal slash (/) through the address label and drop the pamphlet in the mailbox.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:
The “yes” or “no” on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.
This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
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YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A — You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 5, 1986.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A — You can register to vote if you:
• are a U.S. Citizen,
• are at least 18 years of age on election day,
• are a resident of California, and
• are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A — Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A — Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A — At a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, such as this one, you can only choose among the candidates of your party.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A — Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A — Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A — Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Senator, State Assembly member, County Central Committee, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A — Your polling place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A — The election will be Tuesday, June 3, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A — Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A — Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes. This is called a “write-in”. If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A — Ask the workers and they will help you.

Q—Can a worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A — No.

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A — Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (l) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A — Yes. You can vote early by:
• Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
• mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A — An application form is not necessary. You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A — You must write:
• your home address,
• the address where you want the ballot mailed,
• then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail by absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A — You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 3, 1986.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS CONCERNING VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

NOTE: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Vomatic."

A 第一步
请双手法票向自动机将整张选票插入。

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.
Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

C 第二步
请切记将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.
Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfíre con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

D 第三步
請把帶錨之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

D 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空白信封袋內，票尾凸出在外。在封袋上，有空白格供選票人應用。
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO ÚNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perforé la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perforé la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perforé la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra “SÍ” o después de la palabra “NO”.

Todas las marcas o borraduras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuelvala al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

請附在投票紀錄簿上之打孔針在選票上打孔；千萬不要用鋼筆或鉛筆。

選民須知：

投票時所選擇的任何候選人。請在選票上箭頭所指之候選人名打孔。如果候選人數超過一職位，請在選票上箭頭所指之所有候選人中，選擇你要投選的候選人打孔，但不要超過選舉的規定人數。

選選合憲的非候選人，請在非候選選票人選票信封所提供之選定空位上寫下次候選人所選選的職位和候選人的姓名。

投票任何提案，請在選票上箭頭所指 "YES" 或 "NO" 字樣打孔。

選票上若寫著無效或被撕破，選票作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔錯誤，應致歉或補救；無補救，而選票人選票信封之選票信封，應把該選票遞交給選舉員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

 PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROxima PAGINA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>GEORGE &quot;DUKE&quot; DEUKMEJIAN</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILLIAM H.R. &quot;BILL&quot; CLARK</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>H.L. &quot;BILL&quot; RICHARDSON</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIKE CURB</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>BRUCE NESTANDE</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RALPH E. WINKLER</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MICHAEL CYRUS</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>DAN STANFORD</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate Controller/Attorney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controller Corporativo/Abogado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DON A. SEBASTIANI</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California Legislator/Winemaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legislador de California/Vinculador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARZ GARCIA</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tax/Business Controller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contralor de Impuestos y Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILLIAM CAMPBELL</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California State Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senador del Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>No Candidate has filed</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No se ha presentado ningún candidato</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>DUNCAN M. JAMES</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney at Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abogado</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRUCE GLEASON</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney at Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abogado</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAWRENCE J. STRAW, JR.</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney at Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abogado</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td>CLAUDE W. PARRISH</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Executive/Controller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ejecutivo de Negocios/Contralor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. JOHN SHIMMON</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Equalization Auditor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auditor del Consejo de Igualamiento</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_WRITE-IN: To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BILL ALLEN</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM H. PEMBERTON</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH WILLIAM KNOWLAND</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTHUR B. “ART” LAFFER</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE C. MONTGOMERY</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELDREDGE CLEAVER</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN W. SPRING</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOBBI FIEDLER</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED DAVIS</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE HERSCHENSOHN</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT W. NAYLOR</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED ZSCHAU</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please vote for one candidate.*

(WRITE-IN): To vote for a candidate not on the ballot, write the name and office title on the long side of your ballot.
### United States Representative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Garza</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Write-in) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 161

(There is no contest for state senator in this district)
(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal)

本區沒有州參議員選舉。

### Member of the State Assembly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Rocco Corporate Manager</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence Faulkner Party Central Committeeman</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Write-in) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 181
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT R. BACCI</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA KLOBUCAR</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT LAURSEN</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRI</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPHINE SILVESTRI</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN JOHN SULLIVAN</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERENCE FAULKNER</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>Bill Honig</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Nusbaum</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeanne Baird</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>Sam Duca</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>Jeff Brown</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
<td>STATE PROPOSITIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 5, 1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSITION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $850,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>COMMUNITY PARKLANDS ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for acquiring, developing, improving, rehabilitating, or restoring urgently needed local and regional parks, beaches, recreational areas and facilities, and historical resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>WATER CONSERVATION AND WATER QUALITY BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $150,000,000 to provide funds for water conservation, groundwater recharge and drainage water management, and clarifies language in the Clean Water Bond Law of 1984.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>DEPOSIT OF PUBLIC MONEYS IN CREDIT UNIONS. Authorizes Legislature to provide for deposit of public moneys in any credit union. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect. Legislation already approved implementing measure could result in greater interest income to state and local governments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. Provides exception to property tax limit when acquisition or improvement of real property approved by two-thirds of voters. Fiscal Impact: By itself, measure has no fiscal effect. No increase can occur in local property tax rate unless bond issue is approved by two-thirds vote. State costs for tax relief programs could increase. State income tax revenues could decline as taxpayers deduct greater amounts for property tax payments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>ALLOCATION OF VEHICLE LICENSE FEE TAXES TO COUNTRIES AND CITIES. Requires allocation of Vehicle License Fee taxes to local governments. Fiscal Impact: Measure would have no direct fiscal effect. Prevents Legislature from changing the law to take vehicle license fees away from counties and cities. Measure would not prevent state reducing other forms of aid to local governments or changing existing formula for dividing vehicle license fee revenues between counties and cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPÓSITOS ESTATALES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>236 SI</strong></td>
<td><strong>237 NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1988. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $600,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en la compra de granjas y casas para los veteranos de California.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>239 SI</strong></td>
<td><strong>240 NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTA DE TERRENO DE PARQUES DE LA COMUNIDAD DE 1988. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $700,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición, desarrollo, mantenimiento, rehabilitación o la restauración de parques, playas, áreas de recreación, y los recursos históricos locales y regionales.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>242 SI</strong></td>
<td><strong>243 NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEY DE BONOS PARA LA CONSERVACIÓN DE AGUA Y CONTROL DE LA CALIDAD DEL AGUA DE 1988. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $500,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la conservación del agua.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>246 SI</strong></td>
<td><strong>247 NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPÓSITO DE FONDOS PÚBLICOS EN COOPERATIVAS DE CRÉDITO. Autoriza a la Legislatura para que disponga el depósito de fondos públicos en cualquier cooperativa de crédito. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. La legislación ya ha aprobado que pone en efecto la medida podría resultar en mayor ingreso de intereses para los gobiernos locales y estatales.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>249 SI</strong></td>
<td><strong>250 NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD: Dispone exenciones de los límites de impuestos a la propiedad en el caso de adquisición o mejoramiento de la propiedad inmobiliaria que se ha aprobado por los taxpayers de la comunidad. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. La legislatura ya ha aprobado que pone en efecto la medida podría resultar en mayor ingreso de intereses para los gobiernos locales y estatales.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>254 SI</strong></td>
<td><strong>255 NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIGNACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS POR PAGOS DE LICENCIA DE VEHÍCULOS A LOS CONDADOS Y CIUDADES. Se requiere la asignación de los impuestos recaudados en pagos por licencia de vehículos. Impacto Fiscal: La medida no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo. Impide que la Legislatura pueda cambiar la ley para fumar los fondos provenientes de licencias de vehículos para financiar otros gastos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>258 SI</strong></td>
<td><strong>259 NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SISTEMAS DE JUBILACIÓN DE LOS LEGISLADORES Y JUICOS. Limita las pensiones de jubilación para aquellos partidos que no otorguen el Sistema de Jubilación de los Legisladores y Jueces después del 1 de enero de 1987. Impacto Fiscal: Algunos menores para el estado en años futuros.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The text is in Spanish and includes various propositions submitted for voting in California. The text describes the details of each proposition and its potential fiscal impact.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE PROPOSITIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>49</strong> NONPARTISAN OFFICES. Prohibits a political party or party central committee from endorsing, supporting, or opposing a candidate for nonpartisan office. Fiscal Impact: No direct state or local government fiscal impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50</strong> PROPERTY TAXATION. DISASTERS. Base-year value of property damaged or destroyed by disaster transferable to comparable replacement property in same county. Fiscal Impact: Local property tax revenues would decrease by an unknown amount. County assessor and tax collectors would have nonsignificant higher administrative costs. State would replace revenues lost by school and community college districts. State income tax revenues could increase due to lower property tax deductions on replacement properties. These state costs and revenues cannot be estimated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>51</strong> MULTIPLE DEFENDANTS TORT DAMAGE LIABILITY. Plaintiff's non-economic damage recovery limited to defendant's liability based on defendant's percentage of fault. Fiscal Impact: Substantial savings to state and local governments. Savings could be several millions of dollars in a year, varying significantly from year to year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>52</strong> COUNTY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county correctional facilities and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of four hundred ninety-five million dollars ($495,000,000).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CITY &amp; COUNTY PROPOSITIONS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgments against the City?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> PROPOSITION C HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THE BALLOT BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

### CARGOS NO PARTIDARIOS

Prohibe a un partido político o a un comité central de un partido político patrocinar, apoyar u operar a un candidato a un cargo no partidario. Impacto Fiscal: Ninguno. Impacto fiscal directo a los gobiernos estatal o locales.

---

### IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE DESASTROSA

El valor en un año base de propiedad inmueble destruida o dañada por un desastre puede ser transferible a propiedad inmueble de reemplazo comparada en el mismo condado. Impacto Fiscal: Los reídos provienen de impuestos locales a la propiedad disminuirán en una cantidad despreciable. Los tesoreros y recaudadores de impuestos del condado tendrían insigificantes cuestiones administrativas más altas. El estado reemplazará los reídos que los distintos escuelas y de colegios de educación superior dejaran de percibir. Los reídos del impuesto estatal a la renta podría aumentar debido a menores deducciones en el impuesto a la propiedad en las propiedades de reemplazo. Esto podría y reídos estatales no podrían ser calculados.

---

### RESPONSABILIDAD CIVIL DE MÚLTIPLES PARTES DEMANDADAS EN JUICIOS DE AGRAVIOS INDEMNIZABLES

Limita la indemnización que puede recibir el demandante por daños no económicos a la responsabilidad del demandado basándose en el porcentaje de la culpabilidad del demandado. Impacto Fiscal: Ahorros sustanciales para los gobiernos estatal y locales. Los ahorros podrían ser algunos millones de dólares al año, que variarían significativamente de año en año.

---

### ACTA DE SONDOS PARA DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA INSTALACIONES CORRECCIONALES DE CONDADOS DE 1996

Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelación, y reemplazo de instalaciones correccionales de los condados y la ejecución del mantenimiento diferido en las mismas en conformidad con una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos noventa y cinco millones de dólares ($495,000,000).

## PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONTADO

### "¿Desea la Ciudad establecer una oficina de administración del riesgo, un centro de investigación, un centro de demanda, para estudiar y reducir el riesgo de pleitos y sentencias contra la Ciudad?"

- **SI**: 278  
- **NO**: 279

---

### "¿Desea la Autoridad de la Comprador a firmar contratos por más de $50,000 sin la aprobación del Jefe Administrativo y a permitir que sus agentes firmen contratos en su lugar?"

- **SI**: 281  
- **NO**: 282

---

**OFICIALMENTE ELIMINADA**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Propositions of the City and County

#### Proposition 288
"A Deberá la Ciudad transferir la administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil a un departamento de administración de personal que tenga poder para cambiar las normas del servicio civil que al presente constan en la Constitución?"

#### Proposition 289
"A Deberá la Ciudad amparar a cualquier persona que se encuentre en condenación para edificar en la Reprisa Salinas en las Avenidas..."

#### Proposition 292
"A Deberá la Ciudad negar o revocar cualquier permiso de con-..."

#### Proposition 293
"A Deberá la Ciudad..."

---

### Voter Selection Card

**Primary Election**
June 3, 1986

**Polls are Open From**
7 A.M. to 8 P.M.

Fill out this card and take it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

#### State Propositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### City Propositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See reverse side for candidate selection.
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

D
Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?

YES 288
NO 289

E
Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?

YES 292
NO 293

F
Shall the City prohibit campaigns for any candidate for municipal office before any city commission, board or other governmental body that has jurisdiction over such candidate's future actions?

G
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to develop and maintain the nation's greatest ties with South Africa?

H
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to require that all city, county and private organizations to which the city contributes funds be non-sectarian and non-political in their policies and operations?

I
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to construct a new section of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?

NO 311

VOTER SELECTION CARD

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

CANDIDATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governor</th>
<th>Lt. Governor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>Controller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Attorney General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>State Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td>Supt. Public Inst.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CANDIDATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Central Committee*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to your sample ballot for the number of County Central Committee members to be elected. The number varies with each district.

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR PROPOSITIONS.
PROPOSITIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

288 SI 贊成
289 NO 反對

“¿Debería la Ciudad transferir la administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil a un departamento de administración de personal que tenga poder para cambiar las normas del servicio civil que al presente constan en la Carta Constitucional?”

292 SI 贊成
293 NO 反對

“¿Debería la Ciudad negar o restringir cualquier permiso de construcción para edificar en la Represa Balboa en las Avenidas Ocean y Phalen en los próximos tres años?”

296 SI 贊成
297 NO 反對

“¿Debería la Ciudad prohibir la defensa remuneradora efectuada por oficiales de la Ciudad y legisladores estatales ante cualquier comisión de la Ciudad, y limitar la cantidad con la que una persona pueda contribuir para un candidato a una oficina municipal en $500?”

300 SI 贊成
301 NO 反對

“¿Debería ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el boicotear las empresas que tengan mayor vinculación con la segregación racial subterfugiendo?”

303 SI 贊成
304 NO 反對

“¿Debería ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el apelar a todas las organizaciones apropiadas, públicas y privadas, para establecer y mantener un Consejo para la Investigación y Educación sobre G.I.R.G.A. (G.I.R.G.A.)?”

307 SI 贊成
308 NO 反對

“¿Debería ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el demoler el Autopista Embajador?”

310 SI 贊成
311 NO 反對

“¿Debería ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el replicar parte de la Autopista Embajadora, si esto aumentara el acceso del público a la zona de los muelles y mejorara el tráfico?”
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW  
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

**BALLOT** — An official list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT** — If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL** — See Absentee Ballot, above.

**POLLLING PLACE** — The place where you go to vote.

**PROPOSITION** — This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

**MEASURE** — Another name for proposition.

**CHALLENGE** — Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

**SUPERVISORS** — Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

**CHARTER AMENDMENT** — The charter is the basic set of laws for the city government. A charter amendment changes one of those basic laws. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

**ORDINANCE** — A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

**DECLARATION OF POLICY** — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, the supervisors must carry out the policy, to the extent legally possible.

**INITIATIVE** — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

**PETITION** — A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

**PERMIT (noun)** — A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building. Proposition E concerns the issuance of a permit.

**COMPENSATED ADVOCACY** — Compensated means being paid for doing something; Advocacy means speaking or writing on behalf of someone else. Proposition F concerns the issue of compensated advocacy.

**RISK MANAGEMENT** — This field covers two areas: (1) deciding on when it is better to buy insurance and when it is better to be self insured or uninsured, then shopping for the insurance; (2) identifying hazardous conditions on one's property and seeing that they are corrected so that liability and damage claims will be avoided. Proposition A concerns risk management.

---

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.
Risk Manager; Claims Investigation

PROPOSITION A

Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgements against the City?

YES 278
NO 279

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Consultants hired by the Chief Administrative Officer are available to City departments that have questions about “risk management”, such as how to keep damage claims to a minimum and how to find the best insurance rates. In some cases, the departments use these consultants. In other cases, the departments make their own decisions. When damage claims are filed, some are handled by the City Attorney’s Office and some are handled by City departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would amend the City Charter to create an Office of Risk Management, under the Chief Administrative Officer. The office would set risk management guidelines for all City departments, boards and commissions. Proposition A would also establish a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration in the City Attorney’s Office. The bureau would be responsible for investigating, evaluating and processing all damage claims made against the City, except those claims made against the Public Utilities Commission and the Police Department. The bureau would also have the power to investigate potential suits against the City and to make settlements within dollar limits to be set by ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer and a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want damage claims and risk management decisions to continue to be handled the way they are now.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

“Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not affect the cost of government. However as a result of its potential future application and the exemption of certain employees from the civil service provisions of the Charter, costs may be affected in an amount presently indeterminate.”

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 10 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 71
VOTE YES ON A

Last fiscal year, over 6,400 claims and law suits were filed against the City, costing us more than $10 million in settlements. I believe that it is time to change the way we handle our claims, secure insurance, prevent risks and settle legitimate claims against the City.

Last summer, we appointed a task force of citizens, under San Francisco Bar President Jerry Falk, to make recommendations on how to streamline our procedures and save money at the same time. The present system is very slow, costly, and inefficient.

Currently, all claims are investigated by the department involved. The City-Attorney cannot act on any claim until the department is ready. This results in delay and duplication of effort and increased costs. A centralized and accountable Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney would be more efficient, cost-effective, and professional. It would enable the City to settle many claims quickly, before litigation is begun, saving the City the costs of defending itself in court and lowering the average cost of settling a case.

This can be accomplished without creating new jobs by simply moving into one office the city positions presently scattered throughout the government.

Vote "Yes" on A. Reduce the cost of City government.

Adoption of this measure would also formally establish responsibility for Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer, where it has been unofficially since 1978. With this strengthened authority, the Risk Management Office would be responsible for the gathering of claims data on a City-wide basis, the creation of incentives for both reducing the possibility for injuries and damage and the number of claims for each department, the coordination of insurance purchasing and specific suggestions to avoid and reduce risk.

This amendment is presented with the recommendation of the Mayor's Task Force on Claims and Judgments, the Chief Administrative Officer, City Attorney, the President of the San Francisco Bar Association, and the President of the Lawyers' Club of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF proposition A

Each year the City spends almost $10 million to settle damage claims. It is estimated that the overall costs to the City for all risk-related activities exceeds $125 million a year. It is time for action to be taken to reduce these huge expenditures. This charter amendment is designed to do just that.

Claims Investigation and Adjustment

Right now, the City claims investigation process is decentralized and largely unorganized. Each department investigates its own claims. Investigators may or may not be specially trained for their duties. There is no uniformity of investigation procedure or claims reporting. In only a few departments do investigators contact injured parties within days of an accident in order to settle the claim quickly and economically.

This amendment will create a claims investigation and adjustment bureau in the Office of the City Attorney. Claims investigation and adjustment activities will be centralized, economized and made much more efficient. The new bureau will be able to respond immediately to accidents and claims, providing quick compensation to deserving persons while at the same time producing a prompt, professional investigation. This reform is greatly needed.

Risk Management

Presently, there is no overall plan for the management of the City's risk exposure: insurance purchasing, avoidance of industrial accidents, gathering data on accident patterns, etc. Again, risk management as a function is fragmented among the various City departments. As a consequence, departments cannot develop the necessary expertise to manage themselves to reduce risk-related costs.

This measure will establish a risk manager under the Chief Administrative Officer. For the first time, overall City planning will be possible in order to control risk. Departments will be told what activities are producing injuries or damage and advised on corrective measures. Private industry has been utilizing risk managers of this type for years. It is time that the City did the same.

This amendment will reduce the cost of government and insure a more efficient delivery of City services to all San Franciscans. We urge you to give it your unqualified support.

Board of Supervisors

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This charter amendment was proposed by a citizens’ task force appointed by Mayor Feinstein. Its mission was to propose ways of reducing the number and financial costs of claims and lawsuits against the City.

The amendment has two principal features. The first is to centralize within the City Attorney’s office the investigation of claims filed against city departments. This will allow for improved training and supervision of the investigators, who presently are scattered throughout city government. The result will be more efficient, cost-effective and professional investigation of claims. By improving the quality of claims investigation, the City can identify those claims which have merit and attempt to reach early—and less costly—settlements. Meritless claims will be denied with greater confidence that if suit is filed it can be defended successfully.

The second major feature of the amendment will establish a Risk Management office under the Chief Administrative Officer. Risk management is a concept widely used in private business. Risk managers are professionals skilled in reducing the overall cost of claims. The Risk Manager would be responsible for coordinating the City’s insurance program, data collection, and correcting problems within the City which lead to claims. The Risk Manager would review those claims which have been filed against the City. Where it appears that an unsafe condition or practice has led to a claim, the Risk Manager would suggest to the affected department that corrective measures be taken. Reports to the Mayor and to the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors of the recommended corrections and the actions taken would ensure that the various departments will be responsive.

The City cannot eliminate claims and lawsuits against it. But it can limit its exposure by managing the claims process more effectively. This measure will reduce injuries and reduce claims, and that is good for everyone.

Jerome B. Falk, Jr.
Chair, Mayor’s Task Force on Claims and Judgments Against the City

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, May 31, 1986

12 Noon  State Senate, Assembly, Congress and State Propositions
1:00     Proposition A—Risk Management & Claims
1:15     Proposition B—Purchaser & Contracts
1:30     Proposition D—Civil Service
2:15     Proposition E—Balboa Reservoir
2:30     Proposition F—Compensated Advocacy
3:00     Proposition G—Apartheid
3:20     Proposition H—AIDS
3:30     Propositions I, J—Embarcadero Freeway
3:50     Statewide Candidates

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Purchaser & Contracts

PROPOSITION B

Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchaser must get the approval of the Chief Administrative Officer before signing certain contracts for more than $15,000. Only the voters may change that dollar limit. The Purchaser must personally sign every contract that comes through his office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would raise the limit on contracts requiring the Chief Administrative Officer's approval to $50,000. It would also allow the Board of Supervisors to change that limit by ordinance. Proposition B would also permit the Purchaser to name certain people in his office to sign contracts on his behalf.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer's approval only on contracts for more than $50,000. You also want the Purchaser to be able to name certain people in his office to be able to sign contracts on his behalf.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to require the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer’s approval on contracts for more than $15,000. You also want him to sign all contracts himself.

Controller’s Statement on “B”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

“Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”
On March 3 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 71
Purchaser & Contracts

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON B!

The City's Charter requires that a permanent, non-elected City official, the Chief Administrative Officer, review all purchases and contracts above $15,000. Of course, CAO approval of major contracts is very important. But, due to inflation, the number of contracts that have to go to the CAO for approval is always increasing. Today there are too many documents requiring CAO approval. This slows down the purchasing process, occupies staff time—and ultimately costs the City money. Proposition B will raise the CAO approval level to $50,000, and help the City to improve the efficiency of its purchasing operations.

The City's budget includes more than $250 million for purchases on tens of thousands of contracts. At the current $15,000 review limit, the CAO must approve thousands of documents every year—a costly, time-consuming process. In the long run the City loses money because of the inordinate length of time required to complete all the paperwork.

An adjustment must be made to remove the smaller contracts from this cumbersome process. Review and approval of contracts under $50,000 should be under the responsibility of the City Purchaser, a highly trained and experienced professional, who reports directly to the CAO. By changing the present $15,000 to $50,000, it will be possible for the CAO to give each document that comes to him the attention it requires. And, by placing its orders and paying its bills faster, both the City and businesses will benefit—especially small business and those owned by minorities and women.

Proposition B will allow future adjustments to the limit to be made by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility will ensure the City's ability to adjust to inflation and changes in the market.

This amendment comes to you with the recommendation of auditors, controllers, bankers, and others who exercise top fiduciary responsibility within their own organizations.

VOTE YES ON B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will make essential changes to update the purchasing and payment procedures under the Chief Administrative Officer. These measures are necessary and desirable because they will save the City money by significantly increasing our management efficiency.

Right now, the City loses because it takes too long for contracts to be reviewed and payments okayed, which means that early payment incentives go unutilized. The CAO has to approve every contract greater than $15,000—and with City purchases last year over $250 million, the paperwork logjam is vast and overwhelming.

An increase in the review limit from $15,000 to $50,000 will make an adequate adjustment for inflation—$50,000 now is only about $15,000 in 1967 dollars. Proposition B will also enable the City Purchaser, who reports to the CAO, to maximize potential savings through early payments by designating appropriate personnel to approve contracts up to $50,000. These “Good Business” amendments are consistent with private sector practices and should be incorporated by the CAO in the City’s best interests.

Finally, Proposition B will give the City the ability to respond quickly to changes in the market place by allowing changes in the CAO review limit by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility is necessary to ensure that in the future we will not lose money because of institutional rigidity. Control is maintained with the necessity of Board action and Mayoral approval to adjust the review limit, and this same feature will allow for change when desired.

Vote yes on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DONT' LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civil Service

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City transfer the general administration of
the civil service system from the Civil Service Com-
misson to a Department of Personnel Administra-
tion that has power to change civil service rules
now written into the Charter?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs
the civil service system of the City of San Francisco. The
structure of the civil service system and certain rules govern-
ing its operation are written into the Charter and can only be
changed by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would make major changes.
A Department of Personnel Administration would run the
Civil Service system and would be able to change rules with
Commission approval. Major features of Proposition D are
described below. The complete charter amendment is printed
in this voters' handbook.

Department of Personnel Administration

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Certain civil service rules governing
the general operation of the system, including the examina-
tion, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs,
are written into the Charter and carried out by the Civil Ser-
vice Commission. Only the voters can change these rules.

THE PROPOSAL: A department of Personnel Administration
would be responsible for the general operation of the civil
service system. A Personnel Director appointed by the
Mayor would run the Department. Certain rules governing
examination, selection and appointment would be taken out
of the Charter. The Personnel Director would be able to
change these rules with the approval of the Civil Service
Commission.

Civil Service Commission

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs
the general operation of the civil service system, including
the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for
City jobs. The Commission also hears and decides appeals
on civil service matters.

THE PROPOSAL: The Civil Service Commission would no
longer be responsible for the general operation of the civil
service system. The Commission could investigate the opera-
tion of the system, approve rule changes proposed by the Per-
sonnel Director, and hear and decide appeals only on claims
of job discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest.

Employee Relations

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors appoints an
Employee Relations Director to negotiate contracts with City
employees; the Board approves all contracts.

THE PROPOSAL: The Mayor or his or her agent would negoti-
ate with City employees; the Board of Supervisors would still
approve all contracts.

What your vote means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these
changes in the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the ex-
isting civil service system.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE
Controller's Statement on "D"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not directly affect the cost of government, as it removes many civil service policy setting functions from the Charter and an independent Civil Service Commission and transfers responsibility for personnel matters, including labor negotiations, to the Mayor.

"As a product of its inherent flexibility and possible future application, costs could be affected or savings realized in amounts presently indeterminate but probably substantial."

How "D" Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative Charter amendment rewriting the civil service provisions of the Charter had qualified for the June ballot.

Robert Bradford, Jonathan Buckley, Lee Munsen and Mary Hilton, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 36,049 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 25,027 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

POLS CLOSE AT 8:00 p.m.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by boldface type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisanship, political, social or other considerations. Consistent with the City's and County's affirmative action goals, no applicant or employee shall be selected, appointed, reduced in rank, removed or in any way favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicaps, union activities, political affiliation or sexual orientation.

(b) The purpose of the civil service system is to obtain for the city and county the best qualified persons to fill city and county positions in a timely and economical manner, using professional, fair and equitable personnel selection and personnel management practices with consideration of the following merit principles:

1. Recruiting, selecting and advancing employees on the basis of their ability, knowledge, skills and performance relative to the work to be performed.

2. Establishing equitable and adequate compensation, as provided elsewhere in this chapter.

3. Training employees, as needed, to promote productivity and high quality performance and to facilitate career development.

4. Retaining employees during good service and separating employees for good cause.

5. Assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration, with proper regard for their privacy and constitutional rights; and assuring equal employment opportunity, based on the person's ability to do the job.

6. Assuring that employees are protected against coercion for political purposes and are prohibited from using their official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the outcome of an election or a nomination for office.

(c) This charter does not limit the power of departments, agencies, or other subdivisions of the city and county in their exercise of management prerogatives including but not limited to:

1. Directing employees in the performance of their duties;

2. Hiring, promoting, transferring and assigning employees from those qualified;

3. Classifying positions in accordance with Section 3663 (g);

4. Disciplining employees;

5. Laying off employees because of lack of work, lack of funds or other reasonable cause; and

6. Determining the mission of its departments and divisions, and its budget, organization, the number of its employees, and the numbers, types, classifications and grades of positions or employees assigned to an organizational unit, work project, shift or tour of duty, and the methods and technology of performing its work.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisanship, political, social or other considerations. No person shall in any way be favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, age, religion, national origin or other non-merit factors.

(b) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in subsection (a) or any other provisions of this charter, it shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, consistent with a policy of acquiring qualified personnel for the service of the city and county, to encourage the hiring of blind persons. It shall further be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that no otherwise qualified blind person shall be discriminated against in examination, re-examination, appointment, re-appointment, waiver or eligibility for appointment or re-appointment, promotion or demotion in any class, subclass, or position in the civil service unless it is indispensable for the performance of the duties and responsibilities of the class, subclass or position. It shall be the duty of the commission to classify, and from time to time it may reclassify, places of employment in the civil service, the duties of which may be efficiently performed by qualified-blind-persons-and-to-conduct-appropriate-examinations-which-will-fairly-test-the-capacity-of-blind-persons-as-well-as-eighted-persons-to-perform-such-duty.

2.203-2 Employee Relations Director

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3.500 of this charter, the employee relations director shall be appointed by the board of supervisors and shall hold office at the pleasure of said board.

3.802 Employee Relations

It shall be the duty of the mayor to meet and confer with employee representatives on behalf of the city and county and all its constituent boards, commissions, departments and agencies as required by applicable law. These duties may be performed by a designee of the mayor who shall serve at the pleasure of the mayor. Nothing herein shall prevent the mayor from contacting for the performance of these duties.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the mayor shall submit all memoranda of understanding or ordinances to be enacted pursuant to Article VIII of this charter herein to the Board of Supervisors for its approval or rejection.

There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county shall have the general powers and duties set forth in section 3661.

The civil service commission shall consist of five members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and this charter section as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of five years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by this amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981 and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by this amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Vote YES and join 34,000 San Franciscans who signed petitions to get this crucial reform on the ballot. "D" clears the way to modernize Civil Service so that it is fair and efficient. The present system is a 50-year conglomerate of rules that tie the City's hands—
— A protest by one applicant can hold up hiring for an entire job classification for months—even years.
— Often tests cannot be given frequently enough to maintain current tests of qualified employees. This leads to delays and temporary appointments that make hiring top candidates all but impossible.
— Appointments to jobs are restricted to the top three names on a list even though more than three people have the same score.
— Many provisions are out of date. Some deal with hiring during the Korean War. Others limit our ability to carry out affirmative action.

"D" would remove archaic rules from the Charter so they could be changed as the times require—subject to meet and confer and public hearings. Job tests could be expedited; hiring and promotions speeded up; opportunities opened to women and minorities.

Specifically, Proposition D:
1) Creates a Department of Personnel Administration at no additional cost. Like other U.S. cities, day-to-day administration would be the responsibility of a director, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Supervisors.
2) Makes the Civil Service Commission the oversight body to set policy and hear appeals. Rulings would have to be within 60 days, eliminating endless delays.
3) Moves the office of labor relations from the Supervisors to the Mayor, who must make the tough-minded decisions to balance the budget. Never again could the Board give labor $27 million for "comparable worth."

This reform is the product of years of work with SPUR, League of Women Voters, Chamber of Commerce. Members of the Board of Supervisors could have put the reform on the ballot last year but bowed to some labor leaders, and 34,000 San Franciscans had to do the job for them.

Proposition D will enable City government to work better for you. Vote YES.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON 'D'

Proposition D is a complex proposition with a simple goal: remove the archaic restrictions on the hiring, promotion, or firing of city employees and bring San Francisco’s personnel system into the modern age.

Archaic is the only way to describe a system that keeps equally qualified people from competing for a job, and that takes months—sometimes years—to fill vacancies.

For example, if 50 people score equally high on a competitive examination, shouldn’t they all have a chance for any job for which they are eligible? Not under the current system, which requires complicated tie-breaking rules not at all related to a person’s qualifications or abilities.

Or what about being able to hire the best person available for a given job? Currently, eligibility lists are frozen for two years and every person on each list, including the lowest-scoring, must be offered a job before the highest-scoring person on a more recent list. Private businesses couldn’t function saddled with such absurdities.

Proposition D cuts through the red tape. It creates a modern personnel department, with a director responsible for carrying out rules to ensure fairness and efficiency. Accountable to the Mayor, the director would be selected from a list provided by the Civil Service Commission, and subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.

The Civil Service Commission remains an independent body, with the right to approve new personnel rules and hold hearings on abuses. Also under “D”, negotiations with employee unions would be under the Mayor, subject to approval by the Supervisors, providing checks and balances in balancing our budget.

With greater accountability and continued checks and balances, Proposition D will open the way to more efficient government in our City.

Bill Maher, Supervisor
Louise Renne, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON 'D'

Proposition D is a necessary reform to the City’s Civil System. As the City's Chief Administrative Officer for almost ten years, I have found that quality employee hiring is difficult and the process causes long delays.

The current system is:
• inflexible. The City cannot hire and promote the most qualified persons.
• inefficiently administered by a commission. Other large

(continued)
Civil Service

cities do not have such a bureaucratic process.
• antiquated. Civil service rules represent practices of the 1950s rather than the 1980s.

The new system:
• allows the Mayor to appoint an effective personnel director, who controls administration and procedures.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

It's 1986 and we're still trying to manage City business as if it were 1932. As heads of City departments, charged with the daily responsibility of putting out fires, fighting crime, maintaining hospitals, parks, libraries and providing other essential services, we know from bitter experience about shortcomings of the existing Civil Service System.

Enacted with the City Charter in 1932, the system is foundering in red tape. Outdated rules are the subject of endless challenges. Tests are put off; vacancies go unfilled; promotions delayed; any appeal, however groundless, stops the process in its tracks.

Proposition D would take old procedures out of the Charter so they could be changed in an orderly process by the Civil Service Commission, which also would hear appeals.

Day-to-day administration of the tests—the content, scoring, all the myriad details of managing a complex system, would be put into a modern, highly professional personnel office. Tests would be speeded up. Hiring would keep pace with need. Promotions would be on the basis of competence. High performance would be the standard. Discipline could be imposed with working rights fully protected, and women and minorities would be assured equal opportunity.

Proposition D will help improve management and the quality of City services. Vote Yes on D.

Frank Jordan, Chief of Police
Emmet Condon, Fire Chief
Don Birrer, Director, Public Works
Mary Burns, General Manager, Recreation & Park
John Frantz, City Librarian
Eugene Garland, Director, Port
Marvin Geistlinger, Purchaser
Wilbur Hamilton, Executive Director, Redevelopment Agency
Claire Isaacs, Director, Arts Commission
Ray King, Director, Parking Authority
Dean Macris, Director, City Planning
Grant Mickins, Director, Human Rights Commission
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, PUC
Joyce Ream, Director, Aging
Ed Sarsfield, General Manager, Social Services
Thelma Shelley, Managing Director, War Memorial
Moira Sô, Executive Director, Community Development
Louis Turpen, Director of Airport
Dr. David Werdegar, Director, Health Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The hiring practices outlined in San Francisco City Charter have been virtually unchanged since 1931, a severe handicap in running a modern city. Proposition D is designed to streamline the charter and ensure that the rights of present city employees and candidates for city jobs are protected, while improving the hiring process itself. The initiative also builds management accountability in the city system.

Proposition D Is More Fair, More Efficient, More Economical

The day-to-day personnel functions, including hiring, will be consolidated under a Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. Decisions of the Director of Personnel on examination content and administration are final, unless a decision is stayed during the appeal process by a unanimous vote of the Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D will make it easier to modernize the many archaic Civil Service rules and procedures now included in the Charter, while maintaining a strong and independent Civil Service Commission to safeguard the merit system and protect the rights of city employees. Many detailed rules will come out of the Charter and will become personnel regulations. These regulations can then be modernized, but only through a process which includes public hearings and meet and confer sessions with the union involved. In addition, the Civil Service Commission must approve any changes or new regulations governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfer, resignation and terminations.

Proposition D Will Improve Performance And Public Confidence

The openness and fairness of the proposition will benefit everyone. Well-qualified job candidates will have a better chance of being hired, and well-qualified job holders will have a better chance of being promoted. This means generally better job performance in all departments, resulting in higher employee morale and more public confidence in city government.

Submitted by
Louis Hop Lee, President
Civil Service Commission
Lee Munson, Member Civil Service Commission and Treasurer, San Franciscans for Fair and Efficient Government
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Cities can survive only with strong management. The greatest budgetary restraint must be exercised to assure that full value is received for each tax dollar spent.

With firm limits on what it can spend and faced with a possible loss of Federal funds next year, the City must be managed with the greatest possible efficiency.

Essential to greater efficiency is the need for Civil Service reform. As members of City Commissions, we constantly confront the torturous delays and confused rules that gridlock the present system. The present system simply can’t respond to the City’s personnel needs.

Qualified applicants become frustrated and seek employment elsewhere. Promotions are blocked. Morale suffers. Temporaries fill in; overtime mounts. The ability to plan is crippled; management is weakened.

Proposition D would put the system on a business-like basis. A personnel department would handle day-to-day administration. The Civil Service Commission would be the watchdog to assure the integrity of the merit system.

This streamlined system would replace what is now inflexible and cumbersome. Testing could be accelerated; hiring made more efficient and promotions made on time. The result would be greater efficiency and elimination of costly waste.

Vote Yes on D.

Jerry E. Berg, President, Board of Permit Appeals
Henry Berman, President, Fire Commission
Mo Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Hector Cincinillo, Rent Board
Rev. Harry Chuck, Housing Authority
Dr. Arthur Coleman, President, Port Commission
Owen Davis, Police Commission
J. Edward Fleishh, Airports Commission
H. Welton Flynn, President, Public Utilities Commission
James Foster, Health Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation & Park Commission
James Fussell, President, Housing Authority
Anne Halsted, Port Commission
Tommy Harris, Recreation & Park Commission
Tom Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Walter Jebe, Public Library Commission
Jeffrey Lee, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Philip Lee, President, Health Commission
Bruce W. Lilienthal, Small Business Advisory Commission
Jacqueline Nemirovski, President, Arts Commission
Toby Rosenblatt, President, Planning Commission
Dr. David Sanchez, President, Police Commission
Jean San Jule, Housing Authority
John Patrick Shortt, President, Parking Authority
Marjorie G. Stern, President, Public Library Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D contains civil service reform measures urged by the League of Women Voters since 1969.

Proposition D will:
—Modernize the City’s outdated personnel system by creating a Director of Personnel, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors
—Preserve the principles of merit through policies set by the Civil Service Commission
—Create a more responsive Civil Service system at no additional cost to the taxpayer

EFFICIENCY AND FLEXIBILITY

Proposition D transfers authority for day-to-day management of the City’s personnel system from the Civil Service Commission to the Director of Personnel. This will:
—Prevent hiring delays
—Ensure only the most qualified individuals are hired and promoted
—Provide City managers with more administrative flexibility

FAIRNESS FOR EMPLOYEES

Proposition D will:
—Safeguard the rights of City workers
—Protect gains made in hiring women and minorities
—Retain the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit appeals board
—Retain the ability of the City’s unions to negotiate working conditions
—Create a system that can respond quickly and fairly to the needs of City workers

Proposition D will bring the Civil Service system into the 20th century by making the Mayor accountable for the management of a system employing more than 25,000 people. Hiring by merit is still guaranteed by the Charter. Please join us in voting for this Reform!

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
Esther Marks, Past President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote Yes on Proposition D the Civil Service Modernization Initiative.

Prevent abuse of a system that was intended to serve the public and protect against favoritism. Prevent situations like this: an employee failed to report to work for a week without explanation; he was telephoned, notified by certified mail and a message left under his door; he was terminated 13 days later; he did not appeal the termination and the civil service commission up-

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
held the termination. Two months later, the employee petitioned the commission for reinstatement. The employee got his job back, not because the process of termination was wrong but because the commission had a long standing objection to using "absent without leave" as a reason for firing.

The quality of public services is dependent upon the effectiveness of the staff who deliver them. The primary role of the civil service commission should be to facilitate recruitment and retention of the best available personnel. It must protect against favoritism and must assure that everyone has an equal and fair chance at employment.

The present system does not do that. We feel this initiative will make the system work better, for the managers, for the employees and for the public.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco government is huge, with a budget of more than $1 billion per year and 25,000 employees. It is expected to solve serious problems. This requires that the City have the ability to hire and promote talented people to do the job.

The present civil service system is so tied up in red tape that jobs remain vacant for six months to a year, and all too often someone who is not capable of doing a good job is hired. Your tax dollars are being wasted, and you are not receiving the quality of services you need and deserve.

Proposition D will modernize San Francisco's civil service system. It separates the personnel department from the Civil Service Commission, and puts the department under the Mayor where it belongs. The Mayor is responsible for balancing the budget and delivering city services as efficiently as possible. She cannot do this unless she can find capable people to do the job. That is the task of the personnel department in any organization.

Proposition D will also assure that the independent Civil Service Commission has sufficient authority to require the personnel system to be fair in its treatment of City employees. The Commission will be able to issue subpoenas and require testimony of witnesses on investigations it conducts. Should it find that discrimination has occurred, it can issue orders that must be obeyed.

Most major American cities, and virtually all cities and counties in California, have the kind of civil service system that will be established by Proposition D. San Francisco's present system is still mired in the past. It hobbles the ability of the City to deliver services and spend your tax dollars as efficiently as possible.

SPUR has not placed a statement in the Voter's Handbook for any other issue over the past 15 years. We feel that Proposition D is so vital for San Francisco's future that we are making this appeal for your support.

Vote "YES" on Proposition D.

SPUR—The San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Reform Initiative, will give San Francisco citizens the HIGH PERFORMANCE GOVERNMENT necessary to meet the many challenges of the future. Proposition D corrects the outdated and inflexible requirements originally written in San Francisco's City Charter in 1931. It will eliminate the problems which prevent San Francisco's personnel system from operating with efficiency the City's voters and taxpayers deserve:

Proposition D insures City jobs will be filled from current lists of the most qualified employees.

Proposition D prevents ungrounded appeals from delaying for years the appointment or promotion of qualified employees.

Proposition D eliminates the repetitive tasks currently monopolizing the Civil Service Commission meetings and directs the Commission to serve as an appellate body to protect the City's good employees.

Proposition D centralizes the day-to-day operation of the civil service system and makes the Director of Personnel responsible to the Mayor.

Proposition D simplifies the budgetary process by making the Mayor the City's chief labor negotiator, responsible for setting working conditions within the City's financial capacity.

Proposition D is the result of years of painstaking review by the most experienced, able and respected management experts in San Francisco. It is a plan intended to move City government out of the 1930s and equip San Francisco to enter the twenty-first century without being burdened by the red tape of the past.

After ten years of commitment to improving our City, the Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee is convinced adoption of Proposition D is one of the most important issues facing the voters. CHANGE IS LONG OVERDUE. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by,
The Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee

David Anacker
Jerome Anderson
Richard Blum
Charles Chapman
Arthur Cooke, Jr.
Benton Dial
James Edgar
Ruben Garcia

Robert Hayden
Walter Hoodley
John Jacobs
Michael McGill
Ellen Newman
Roy Nordman
Frank Tatum
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PERSONNEL MANAGERS SAY YES ON PROPOSITION D

As the personnel managers for City Departments, we are charged with the responsibility of managing the City's personnel system. The activities include examinations, hiring, training, discipline, union-management relations, affirmative action and compensation. No one knows better than we the frustrations experienced in attempting to monitor an unbelievable sequence of overlapping bureaucratic activities in attempting to get the job done.

Proposition D will bring our personnel system into line with most other public personnel systems. The improved system will create the potential for being more responsive to the needs of operating departments. It will improve labor relations by transferring this function to the executive branch of government where it belongs.

Proposition D will streamline certain routine procedures resulting in a reduction of cost and time. Under the current system delays are experienced due to lengthy appeals during which time the departments' objectives are delayed.

Proposition D will create an atmosphere of increased accountability for department managers in the areas of affirmative action, discipline and job performance.

Proposition D has been endorsed by the San Francisco Council of Human Resource Managers, the association of over one hundred personnel managers in City government.

Proposition D strengthens merit system principles. Civil Service commissioners will have more time to enforce and protect these principles rather than being bogged down in the day-to-day activities of administration.

Proposition D will help bring about improved methods and practices in personnel administration and should result in a more competent and effective workforce which the citizens of San Francisco have a right to expect.

Alvin W. Schaaf
Personnel Director
Recreation and Park Department

Marsha Ramirez
Personnel Officer
San Francisco Port

Edward M. Gazzano
Personnel Director
Department of Health

James Horan
Senior Personnel Officer
Department of Social Services

James Ilnicki
Personnel Director
San Francisco International Airport

Andrea R. Gourdine
Manager, Bureau of Personnel & Training
Public Utilities Commission
Mori Naguchi
Senior Department Personnel Officer
Mary Smith
Senior Personnel Officer

Laguna Honda Hospital
Thelma Poteet
Senior Personnel Officer
San Francisco General Hospital
John Burke
Personnel Director
Controller's Office

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will assist the Department of Public Works by streamlining the Civil Service process.

• Under the current system, the duration of eligible lists from 2 to 4 years hampers the Department from hiring graduates of colleges and universities on an annual basis. Consequently, many excellent candidates are not entered into the Civil Service System. Passage of the proposition will improve the quality of the pool of applicants and thereby the quality of public service given by the Department.

• The establishment of a Personnel Director to administer the day-to-day tasks of the system will speed up the decision making process to the advantage of employees and management alike.

• The proposition still calls for checks and balances in that the Commission will continue to hear appeals on discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest. The Commission will act as a watchdog while leaving the general administration to the Personnel Director.

The initiative will make for an improved system for employees, management and the citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Donald Birrer
Director of Public Works

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Passage of this amendment will update our civil service system. These changes will make it comparable to other merit system agencies. Some of these changes are:

(A) removal of administrative details from the charter which inhibit timely and effective personnel actions.

The following subjects will be placed in personnel regulations:

• Protests of written questions and answers
• Protests of tentative employment lists
• Promotional examinations

Examinations for employees on military leave
Certification of eligibles—Rule of three
Duration of employment lists
Temporary employee appointments

(B) allows continuous up-dating of employment lists.
(C) allows equitable treatment of job candidates with same test score.

(D) realigns responsibilities: the Civil Service Commission dealing primarily with compliance and adjudication activities (continued)
while the Personnel Department administers the day-to-day operation of the merit system.

Equally important the amendment retains important merit system provisions dealing with:

- Employee salary setting procedures
- Positions subject to merit system examinations
- Public hearing and meet and confer requirements
- Penalties for examination fraud
- Seniority, meritorious service and applicable educational credits for promotional examinations in the Police/Fire De-

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Initiative, is a long-overdue reform to streamline antiquated hiring practices in San Francisco's fifty-year-old charter. Proposition D will ensure that the best and brightest job candidates are chosen to serve our city, thus promoting excellence in job performance and helping to eliminate incompetence. This initiative builds management accountability in the city system, while giving the Civil Service Commission the independence to protect the rights of women and minorities.

A Better, More Efficient System at Less Cost

Proposition D consolidates personnel functions, including hiring, under a new Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. The Director has final authority over content of examinations given city job applicants, so more flexibility is possible in finding truly qualified candidates.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service System, as presently constituted, (vintage 1932), is uncivil, and there is nothing "systematic" about it! It's pure, unadulterated municipal lunacy and chaos! Remarkably, BOTH Management and Labor despise it. It certainly is NOT producing the best qualified persons to fill City jobs!

Let's follow Mayor Feinstein's recommendations. If this operation doesn't dramatically improve, there are always FUTURE ELECTIONS where additional, more Draconian changes can be considered by the voters.

As matters now stand, it is far better to light a candle than just sit and curse the darkness! Any changes will be an improve-

SAL FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

For more than a half-century, San Francisco Mayors have abided by the employee examination, hiring and promotion poli-
cies administered by a strong and independent Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D is a deceptive and dangerous scheme that would give future Mayors and top-level bureaucrats the power to ignore competence and reward political loyalty.

Proposition D would take key Civil Service employment rules out of the City Charter and make them subject to wheeling and dealing by City Hall politicians.

There's an old saying — "if it ain't broke, don't fix it."
Civil Service has worked well for more than 50 years. Proposition D is unnecessary, ineffective and even counter-productive. It's not just deceptive, it's dangerous.

Joseph L. Alioto
Former Mayor of San Francisco
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Time and time again, different groups have put various propositions on the ballot to weaken our Civil Service System and reintroduce political patronage into City employment practices. And every time the voters have wisely rejected these schemes, no matter how cleverly they have been disguised.

Proposition D is just another power grab by bureaucrats at the top in City Hall.

We've said NO! loud and clear in the past. Let's say NO one more time.

Submitted by:
TAXPAYERS FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT
Thomas Scanlon
City Treasurer, Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "D"!!!!

During the eight years while a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I fought hard to reform the Civil Service Commission and to bring working conditions and city workers' pay equitable to both workers and taxpayers. I fought to insure an independent Civil Service Commission that would remain just that—indepen- dendent and free from political influence and political patronage of particularly the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

I am truly saddened by the Mayor's insistence in bringing this disastrous Proposition "D" before the voters. Some of the Supervisors rejected this misguided measure for what it is; an unwise consolidation of authority to hire, fire and promote city workers by the Mayor and newly created personnel officer.

My efforts to bring pay equity to both taxpayers and city workers were continually squashed by then Supervisor Feinstein and Supervisor Molinari. Finally, in 1975, shortly after a disastrous city strike, I was able to place on the ballot, for voter approval, a measure that almost eliminates the power of the Mayor and Supervisors to manipulate the pay of city workers. This measure was overwhelmingly passed by the voters that year and we have not had any labor unrest since that date.

Vote No on "D"!
"D" stands for disaster. It will undo many of these reforms. Also, right now, the city is almost broke, thanks to the manipulation of Mayor Feinstein and her chief ally Supervisor Molinari.

If "D" passes the cost of operating our city government will increase in the next 24 months by not less than $60,000,000. Contrary to the provisions of Proposition 13, property taxes would be increased, thus forcing up rents.

Vote No on "D".
Don't weaken our Civil Service Commission, whereby least deserving city employees could be promoted because of connection or clout.

Vote No on "D".
We now almost have more problems than we can handle. We don't want our city turned into another Chicago, wherefor for nearly half a century a corrupt political system flourished under Mayor Richard Daley.

John Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We join San Franciscans for Fair Employment in opposing the Civil Service Initiative, Proposition D.

This measure will severely hamper the well-being of the San Francisco Fire and Police Departments. These departments are two of the finest in the Country and have consistently protected life and property in a professional manner. They must continue that tradition with a civil service system based on MERIT and not political patronage.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.
Andrew C. Casper
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Keith P. Calden
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

William F. Murray
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Donald M. Scott
Chief, San Francisco Police Dept.
Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Our present Civil Service system was designed to keep corruption out of government. It has generally served that purpose well. This proposition would dismantle that system and in my opinion open the doors to nepotism, favoritism, patronage and corruption. Better a city government that is bureaucratic than one that is corrupt. Vote NO on D.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is an attack on the merit system and an attempt to return patronage to the Mayor's office by eliminating the authority of the Civil Service Commission and its built-in checks and balances.

The present Civil Service system is not perfect, but corrections can be made within the Charter without destroying a system that has worked for over 50 years and has been free from fraud and corruption.

This proposition will do nothing to improve the caliber of police performance and could have the opposite effect. I urge you to vote NO on PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by
The San Francisco Police Supervisors and Investigators Association

Don Goad, Captain SFPD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D could be a dangerous first step toward weakening the independent, impartial administration of our City government.

Proposition D would transfer power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor. The Director's decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline and certification would be final. The Commission would have no right to hear examinations or disciplinary appeals.

With the transfer of duties and responsibilities from the Commission to the Mayor's appointed Personnel Director, the Mayor would have control over personnel functions. Currently, commissioners have independent status and can be dismissed for cause. The Personnel Director could be dismissed at will.

The Merit System could be replaced by a patronage system. Proposition D could open the door to rules permitting the Personnel Director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his or her position on the list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Proposition D is NOT a reform package. The checks and balances for efficient City government would be lopsided, with too much power in the hands of unknown future Mayors.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
John L. Molinari, President
Harry G. Britt
Richard Hongisto
Wille B. Kennedy
Wendy Nelder
Nancy Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Beware of PROPOSITION D!

Powerful special interest groups are attempting to remove key City employees from the independent and impartial Civil Service system in the name of "reform".

They want instead to make these employees answerable directly to future Mayors and politically-appointed Personnel Directors and department heads.

PROPOSITION D got on the ballot because the Chamber of Commerce and such companies as Pacific Bell and PG&E paid a professional southern California campaign firm, $70,000 to collect signatures.

They're trying to destroy the merit system and replace it with an old-fashioned patronage system.

Department heads will be able to ignore examination scores and reward loyalty rather than competence in promotions and hiring.

Don't let the Chamber of Commerce, big business and their allies in the City bureaucracy dictate who's hired, fired and promoted among public employees.

PROPOSITION D is not just deceptive, it's dangerous! Vote NO on PROPOSITION D!

Libby Doneheim
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Ron Huberman
Vice-Chairman, Democratic Central Committee
Jim Hicob
Democratic Central Committee
Roberto Esteves
President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Rick Pacurur
President, Harvey Milk Lesbian Gay Democratic Club
Walter L. Johnson
Exec. Secty., S. F. Labor Council
Michael Bernick
Linda Past
Sal Roselli
Deborah Stein
John Mehrig
Pat Norman
Nancy Walker
Owen Craig
Harry Britt
Louise Mimmick
Carole Migden
Agar Jaicks
Jack Morrison
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D places too much power in the hands of ONE. Proposition D will provide for a personnel director to be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. The Mayor now appoints five members of the Civil Service Commission who also serve at her pleasure.

You work for years to climb the civil service ladder and then somebody comes along with an idea to cut you off at the pockets.

Proposition D will lock in all the employees employed in the Mayor's office and will control the appointments of any new staff by the next Mayor elect in 1987 and years thereafter.

Like controlling your estate from the grave.

Vote NO on D.

Marguerite Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service Merit System has served our City well, giving San Franciscans an equal opportunity. It has helped us obtain employment and earn promotions based on objective examinations.

The Civil Service Merit system replaced the old patronage system that rewarded political loyalty more than competence.

Now the supporters of PROPOSITION D want to create a new Personnel Director, accountable only to the Mayor, and give department heads the absolute power to decide who works for the City and who gets promoted.

If PROPOSITION D passes, equal opportunity would give way to opportunity based on membership in the bureaucratic "establishment".

Keep our Civil Service Merit System strong and free from the political abuses of the past.

Vote NO on D!

Wille L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly
Ben Tan
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
JoAnne Miller
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
A. Richard Cerbatis
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Sadanio Wilson
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, President
S. F. Community College Governing Board
Julie Tang
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Alan S. Wong
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Henry Der
Albert Chang
Rudy Meraz
Robert "Bob" Morales
Yuri Wadi

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Can you imagine studying for a civil service examination, being rated at the top of the eligible list and never receiving the promotion? That's exactly what Proposition "D" will do should the electorate adopt this amendment.

The civil service merit system has defects, but to totally eliminate the system and replace it with a patronage system where promotions are based on who you know, rather than what you know is scandalous.

Civil service was put into place to prevent scandal and the "favor seeking" individual from getting a paid position because he/she happened to support the right elected official.

Proposition "D" will allow one person, chosen by the Mayor, to decide who will be promoted, hired and fired. This is awesome power for one single individual to have at any level of government.

Our current Mayor may choose a fair person for this position, but will future Mayors be as careful? As each new Mayor assumes office, the civil service system will again change. The potential to favor one individual or group over others is great.

Proposition "D" has a great potential to diminish the quality of services we now provide to our citizens, as the future of how people are hired and promoted in the San Francisco Police Department is completely unknown.

It's true our promotional system is fraught with delays and delays frustrate us all, but Proposition "D" is not the answer. Proposition "D" will only add to our existing problems. Several years ago, our citizens elected a Charter Commission to streamline city government and make civil service work more efficiently. The voters eventually rejected those proposals. The checks and balances that make our government stable were no longer present. It simply went too far.

Proposition "D" goes even further. It brings about a system of patronage and should be defeated lest we want to engage in "free-wheeling and dealing" of civil service jobs and promotions.

We urge a strong No vote against Proposition "D"!

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry, President
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The purpose of the Civil Service Commission is to ensure that the merit system would be the only criteria in any examination process.

If Proposition D passes, all authority concerning examinations would be taken from the Civil Service Commission and given to a Personnel Director, who is appointed by the Mayor. This Personnel Director would have the authority to hire and fire at his discretion, with no appeal available. This proposition is contrary to everything the Fire Department and all City employees have strived for over the years.

The Civil Service Commission in its present form was instituted to prevent any possibility of a patronage system, where one person has complete control.

This proposition would do nothing to improve your Fire Department. If you are satisfied with the work and make up of the San Francisco Fire Department in its present form, “Vote No On Proposition D”. You will be doing a service for the San Francisco Fire Department, and the people of San Francisco.

Submitted by the San Francisco Fire Chiefs’ Association
John Flaherty, Battalion Chief SFFD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is bad government and bad politics, changing our independent civil service system into a system dominated by the Mayor:

. . By shortening the six year terms of Civil Service Commission to conform to the Mayor’s four year term of office.
. . By transferring most of the Commission’s powers to a Personnel Director who serves solely at the Mayor’s pleasure.

Keep politics out of employment services. Vote NO on Proposition D!

Alice B. Toklas, Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Roberto Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D fails to offer enough new and improved procedures to cure the current defects in the civil service system. Charter sections and civil service rules are repealed without specific known replacements.

Proposition D transfers power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created personnel director appointed by, and to serve at the pleasure of, the Mayor. The director’s decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline, and certification would be final. The commission would have no right to hear examination or disciplinary appeals.

There are hidden costs with Proposition D because the new Personnel Administration Department will employ a personnel director, and other employees “as may be necessary to carry out (its) functions and duties.”

The Merit System could be replaced by an old style Patronage System. Proposition D could open the door to rules which permit the personnel director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his/her position on the civil service testing list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Police and Fire Commissions would lose functions as a result of the personnel director’s new power. The director’s unlawful employment discrimination policy would be binding upon department administrators. The director’s procedure for employee dispute resolution must be used by all department heads and appointing officers.

Proposition D is not the answer. The checks and balances for efficient city government would be lopsided.
I urge a no vote on Proposition D.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, 17th Assembly District
Sala Burton
Congresswoman
Art Agnos
16th Assembly District
Milton Marks
State Senator

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Balboa Reservoir Development Ban

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission declared Balboa Reservoir South (located across Phelan Avenue from San Francisco City College) surplus in 1984 and made the site available for low, moderate and market rate housing. In July 1985, a City-community advisory committee chose a developer to build 203 single-family homes on the 13 acre site. Construction has not yet begun.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would prohibit granting new building permits and would revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site (Assessor’s Block 3180, Lot 1) between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit granting any new building permits and you want to revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to allow building permits to be granted for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

How “E” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for a three-year ban on development of the Balboa Reservoir site had qualified for the June ballot.

Sidney Kass and Jesse David Wall, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 12,430 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 10,012 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 77
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Having been responsible for providing leadership at City College from 1947 to 1977, we cannot stand by and see this site converted to housing. We must speak up. Such a move would preclude forever the logical and much needed campus expansion to what was once our West Campus. We left that site reluctantly to make way for water storage. If it is no longer required for that purpose, let us return it to City College.

Thousands of San Franciscans—high school graduates, dropouts, veterans, re-entering women—representing all of the city's diverse ethnic groups, have been prepared for transfer to four-year colleges, profitable careers, and have had their lives enriched at the City College of San Francisco. Without City College's open door and easy access, many would have been deprived of these opportunities.

We question:
1. Why no EIR was required when the proposed development could have a substantial impact.
2. Whether the future needs of City College for classrooms, housing, and parking have been considered.
3. What the impact on taxpayers is with below market land sale and construction financing by bonds.

This moratorium will permit adequate study of these issues. Vote YES on Proposition 'E'.

Bruce Bonacker, President
Board of Directors, Glen Park Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let a developer make a mint on land across from the most overcrowded college in the Bay Area! Parking is already an impossibility for residents near City College...adding 200 homes to this land would make the situation much worse.

It's simple: a college which can't find room for more students at a time when more people are returning to education doesn't serve the community.

This land is being sold at much less than its true value. The development wouldn't do much to ease the City's housing crunch, but it would undercut the future of City College and the peace of mind of the neighborhood.

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot.

The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

You'd probably be upset. We certainly are. Please help us protect our neighborhood. Please vote YES on proposition E.

Westwood Park Residents:
Edna Tooker
Mitiee Derwin
Eugene Eden
Donna Nicoletti
Robert Armstrong
Pauline Armstrong
Joel Martinez
Richard & Lisa Patterson
David Bean
H. Beozzo
William Burke
Richard Robel
Clyde Theriot
Danae Manus
Esmay Manus

Sunnyside Residents:
Ellen Wall
Melissa Volmack
David Wall

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let the greedy developers take this potentially picturesque open space.
A yes vote means you want more time to consider its future use. All we ask is time to think and plan.

John Barbagelata
Former member, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Suppose there was a publicly owned open space across the street from the main U.C. Berkeley Campus.
Can you imagine for one moment that it would be passed into private ownership?
Vote Yes on E for Equality and Excellence in Education

City College Students:
William Lew, Student
Tim McGuire, Student Council Member
Joseph Goldstein, Student Council Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

In 1952, the “Experts” said we needed reservoirs. They felt so strongly that they condemned the City College West Campus, destroyed the buildings, and constructed the reservoirs—all at taxpayer’s expense.

Now, in 1986 with more demand for water, the “Experts” say the reservoir is no longer needed. What is the concerned taxpayer to believe?
When in doubt, the city should hold on to the expensive things already paid for.

Stop the reservoir giveaway. Vote YES on E.

Taxpayers for Preserving the Reservoir.
Richard Patterson
Dorice Murphy
Lucille Carson
Daniel Gutierrez
Franz Wite
Bernhard Scholand
Ruth Hanson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This is a Planning Issue
We have been accused of trying to stop housing for poor people. Not true. In the first place, the price levels are certainly middle income and above, but our main objection is that this badly done plan is damaging to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as to the over-crowded community college across the street.

WHAT WE WANT

Even our critics point out that we originally SUGGESTED housing for that site, but they don't talk about what else we suggested. We want two levels of parking under a City College Library, Bookstore, and Auditorium, with housing on top. Furthermore, let the housing be TRULY affordable—for students and seniors. We are trying to stop the bureaucrats' subsidized middle income housing project because it makes our dream impossible.
We ask for three years to give the neighborhood and the college a chance to produce a better plan.

SNaP (Sensible Neighborhood Planning Committee)

Helen Critzer, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council, representing 17 neighborhood associations in the area of the surplus reservoir property in question has voted to endorse the three-year stop of private construction on the old West Campus of City College.

Dr. Louis Batmale, Chancellor of City College from 1970-1977 has persuaded us that City College needs the lands.

Juanita Raven, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Be a sport.
Give City College a vote of support.
City has 23,000 students and badly needs a library. The only place to put it is in the reservoir site. City College has walked closely with San Francisco for five decades. The reservoir site has always been understood to be reserved for City College.
Until now when someone wants it for housing. Housing is important, but it can be anywhere in town. But a City College library can only be located at the College.
Vote yes to support a book—and a reader.
Reading, studying, writing and research make up our town also.
It is hard to understand criticism of City for wanting to keep this area for a library. Sure, housing sites are at a premium—but even more so a library site for City which is one of the largest schools in the Nation.
Some people blast City for wanting a library because of the need for housing. Housing is needed. But some of those very same people want a big battleship stationed here that will bring in 15,000 new family members.
The Educational and cultural growth of San Francisco mandates living space for the City College library.
If this measure gets a no vote, it means there will be no site for a Library. This is the last chance. Vote YES to help out a book—and a reader.
State financing, when approved, will construct this building.
It is the top building priority at City College.
A YES vote here means there will be time to think about the use of the site. During that three year period, cooler heads may realize this is the only site for a Library. If the housing goes in there will be no library there.
Vote yes for a book, for a good school and a better City.

John Riordan, Board of Governors
San Francisco Community College District.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Sunnyside Neighborhood Association is not against housing, but we are trying to stop a hasty and short-sighted plan. We are asking for this moratorium to get time for a better plan that will answer a variety of needs and benefit the entire city as well as our community.

This is a planning issue.
The release of the reservoir property as surplus by the water department came as a surprise to our neighborhood. The June 1984 “Residence Element” of the city’s Master Plan did not even list the land as surplus. By 1985 major decisions were being made for use of the land without adequate neighborhood input.

There were some meetings attended by a few people carefully selected for their zealous pro-housing views or potential financial gain. The resulting plan has gone out of control. Now it benefits only the developer and the lucky few who will get houses on free land.

Proposition E is not an attack on housing.
Please help us save our neighborhood against poor planning by voting YES on Proposition E.

Joe Mahoney, President
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Miraloma Improvement Club urges a YES vote on Proposition E.

Frank Mastro, President
Arnell Rodrigues
Maggie Kroll
Dorothy Evers

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION E

All the talk in the world can’t change the fact that City College has fewer acres of land relative to its student population than any college in the Bay Area.
Enrollment at City College is INCREASING, as is the enrollment of the San Francisco public schools from which City College draws most of its students. It is obvious that City College needs and deserves the reservoir land. The three year moratorium will give time to produce a better plan which will have input by faculty, students and alumni who know the college’s needs and want to support it.

Sid Kass
Susie Langdon Kass
Phil Kass
City College Student
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The homeowners of Westwood Park, a neighborhood adjacent to the Balboa Reservoir, support the ballot initiative calling for a 3 year development moratorium. We believe that the City and City College should take additional time to determine their needs and how they might be met by using the Reservoir. In event that City College does not need this property, we support its development as open space or as single family detached housing.

Westwood Park Association
Don C. Swander
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Let's not aggravate the traffic problem around City College before we first develop solutions for the existing problems.
A three-year moratorium only buys our neighborhood and elected officials time to find solutions; it doesn't say no to housing. A YES vote is a vote for prudent development. A YES vote helps to preserve the family character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ken Hoegger
Realtor and community Activist

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As representatives of the students of City College, we understand first-hand, the intense need to reserve a site for future school expansion.
Preservation of the Balboa Reservoir, a site directly adjacent to the campus, is particularly crucial. The facilities that CCSF requires, such as a library and an auditorium, are essential to the main structure of the campus. Unlike classrooms, it would be unreasonable to build an auditorium or a library on an off-campus site, since these facilities are integral to the main function of the school.

In short, opposition to the moratorium based on the notion that alternate sites could be secured, is misleading. Once a site near the college is taken, any hope of expansion would be eliminated.

Associated Student Council of City College
Jack Lee, Vice President of Associated Counsel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Local 2121 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFLCIO, representing City College faculty, urges a yes vote on Proposition E.

While this project provides short-term employment for a few, we are more concerned about the thousands of students who would benefit from planning and development that would better serve the community and the college.

Yes on E for continued excellence in community college education.

Anita Martinez, President
San Francisco Community College District
American Federation of Teachers

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is twice as crowded as any community college in northern California. It needs a much larger library, bookstore and auditorium, and more parking.
The college has always expected to use the empty SOUTH reservoir for educational needs. That land is finally surplus. Neither the college Governing Board nor the Chancellor attended the Mayor's planning sessions for the property and the faculty was not informed. When the 12.3 acre site was offered to a developer for $36,900 for subsidized housing, the Chancellor said, "We are at a crossroad and the correct path is for the Board of Supervisors, with the Mayor's support, to deed this surplus land to City College so that the college may continue to serve the city effectively for the next 50 years as it has for the past half-century." The Mayor refused. Now only Board member John Riordan supports the correct path.
The Water Department says it may need the NORTH reservoir now used for student parking. If that crisis occurs, the Chancellor says, "We'll deal with the situation then." How, if the south reservoir is gone?

(continued)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College needs land now for desperately needed facilities, one of which is a library. City College has an enrollment of 23,000 students but our library has seating for 450. There are other possible locations for new housing, but City College can’t be moved. Give us an opportunity to plan a development for the community and the college.

Annie M. Young
City College Library Faculty and Staff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty and staff members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco’s community college for our students’ needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Darlene Allato
Mary Allen
Mary Anslor
Tom Angeloff
Robert Balesleri
Don Bateli
Diana Bernstein
Joe Barry
Anna Bratton
Thomas Brendel
James Bristol
Richard Brongle
Laurent Broussal
Philip Brown
Barbara Cabral
John Callen
John Cartis
Frank Cervato
Rosemary Clark
Perry Close
Kurt Common
Walter Chobris
George Crippen
Patricia Davis
Guy DePrino
Edward Dierau
Sharon Edwards
Larry Ernst
Mary Ervite
Kwei Fong
William Funke
Terry Greenfield
Robert Griffin
Michael Gulri
Mary Hanna
YenKuang Ho
Peter Hock
Ronald Hochadem
Myrna Holden
Katherine Hondiemon
Michael Hulbert
Edward Hunt
Frank Ingersoll
Elaine Johnson
Wendy Kaufman
Jo Kennedy
Mercedes Kov
Rosalind Kwok
Don Lafferty
James Lathas
Steve Levinison
Sue Lith
Gary Ling
Amelia Lippi
Dave Lubbert
Leon Lucy
Damante Macalou
Marion McManus
Patricia Madigan
Michael Malachowski
Mary Mari
Maria Marioni
Sylvia Marshall
Valerie Meehan
Jose Mejia
Margie Michelmaier
Deanne Milan
Cindy Moody
Thomas Munro
David Myre
Deborah Nagle
Glenn Nance
Herbert Nagler
William Neff
Dennis Piotkowsk
Francine Podenski
Theresa Poydostus
Solomon Rajiu
Mary Rowton
Firthrome Sanee
Marvin Schinnerer
Fred Schneider
Earl Schriner
Andy Seal
Ken Shen
Robert Struckman
Moshuet Tam
Edward Taylor
Piere Thiry
Barbara Thomas
Clare Thompson
Wille Thompson
Mary Thorber
Robert Tricero
James Trimmer
Joanne Tumminia
George VonBooszy
Cherie Wettol
Austin White
Joan Wilson
Rosalie Wolf
Christina Yee

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Water Department has begun a resource study of water use, due for completion in two or three years. The study may well indicate that one or both reservoirs will be needed. The American Water Works Association states that reservoirs should be used in pairs. This is particularly important because it is the only reservoir at an elevation of 305 feet.

The Mayor twisted the arm of the Water Department to declare one of these reservoirs surplus before the water resource study is completed. Don't let her get away with this kind of polit-
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

A YES vote on Proposition E helps STOP a scheme to GIVE AWAY $12,300,000 worth of City land for $1,800,000 (or less) to a Redwood City real estate developer.

A YES vote will SAVE taxpayers $550,000 per year. The housing project will produce $240,000 in taxes, but supplying City services will cost $790,000 per year.

The Controller's cost estimate does NOT account for the $12,300,000 land value, since land sale below value is NOT technically a cost of government. The Controller also is NOT permitted to assume that the housing project will be constructed, since construction has NOT yet been ordered by the Board of Supervisors.

The plan does NOT restrict housing sales to moderate-income first-time buyers. The plan only restricts use of tax-subsidized funds. Any person favored by the developer or politicians can buy these dwellings and get the benefits of the public land giveaway.

The houses are made "affordable" by giving away the land far below market value, by City-backed low interest, and by cutting construction corners.

The real beneficiaries of the subsidized housing project are the financiers (NOT the project dwellers). Bondholders receive 9.6% average tax-free interest, which is equivalent to 24.6% taxable interest at 61% maximum tax. The developer and bond establishment receive $5,340,000; this is $26,300 (or 22.40%) for each $177,400 unit.

The City loses $51,700 worth of land GIVEN AWAY for each unit.

Vote YES on Proposition E for good fiscal management.

William Marquardt
Financial Analyst, SNaP
Helen Crizer, Treasurer, SNaP

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is by far the most crowded community college in the Bay Area. With 22,600 students on a 56 acre campus, it is more than twice as crowded as any of the others.

Name of College | Number of students | Campus (acres) | Area/1000 students
---|---|---|---
City College of SF | 22,624 | 56 | 2.47
Laney College, Oakland | 9,805 | 59 | 6.02
Chabot College, Hayward | 18,000 | 147 | 8.17
Contra Costa College | 8,500 | 83 | 9.76
College of San Mateo | 13,820 | 153 | 11.07
College of Marin | 6,663 | 77 | 11.56

Given these facts, why does the Governing Board not try to get the old West Campus back? Why don't they support this moratorium to delay the land grab?

The Governing Board is under political pressure from City Hall. They have been threatened with the loss of the north reservoir parking lot and funding for special projects. Forgive them.

Vote Yes on E.

Friends of City College
David Newton
Glen Simpson
Jack Baker
Thomas Velasquez
Tillie McCullough

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The student population at City College is increasing. This semester's enrollment is up 1,265 students over last semester.

The enrollment in the San Francisco public schools has been increasing by 1,218 per year for the last three years. City College draws most of its enrollment from public schools in San Francisco.

Obviously, City College will have a larger enrollment in the future years, and will be in desperate need of space if we do not give it back its old West Campus.

Please reserve this public land for the college.

Please vote YES on E.

Barbara Holman

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON E

In 1981, I launched a six-point program to expand San Francisco's housing supply and the voters had approved a City policy to add 20,000 new housing units within five years. This Proposition would destroy a major portion of the effort to build affordable, single-family housing in our city.

The Balboa Reservoir Site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now a site for development of 203 new single-family homes, most with three bedrooms and two baths. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed as other homes built under the City's program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom could not afford homeownership. It is believed that these new homes will sell rapidly.

The Balboa Reservoir site is one of the few sites large enough to accommodate a substantial number of new homes. Please do not let a few people stop a major opportunity for new housing. Vote no on Prop E.

Not only would Proposition E halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site, but the 9.8% fixed-rate, 30-year mortgage money set aside for the housing would also be lost.

Nothing constructive is accomplished by this measure—it does not provide additional land or facilities for City College. As a matter of fact, City College has neither plans nor money to use the property. Further, the Community College Board of Directors, the governing body for City College, has voted overwhelmingly to oppose the initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No on E.”

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the site of the unused Balboa Reservoir and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost.

These homes are desperately needed for San Franciscans who can't afford to buy in the city where the average house is selling for over $160,000. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

The homes would be built on land that belongs to the City. Over two years ago, it was declared surplus and available for housing. It is not part of City College, and City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

We urge you to vote no on Proposition E if you want more affordable housing for San Franciscans.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Submitted by:  
Nancy G. Walker  
John L. Molinari  
Louise H. Renne  
Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

In 1980 San Franciscans voted overwhelmingly (63% yes to 37% no) to construct 20,000 housing units. Good progress is underway towards achieving the voter goal. A 1986 report by Mayor Dianne Feinstein states, "In the last five years 3,559 new housing units completed with another 3,000 by 1988 and 20,000 more in 10 to 15 years". Most of this housing will be built in underutilized commercial districts; not in existing residential neighborhoods.

The 203 affordable owner occupied single family units slated for the southern portion of Balboa Reservoir are part of the 1988 total. Our progress in addressing the City's housing shortage will be curtailed if this ill-advised initiative is approved. SUPPORT OWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Housing production is essential to check rising prices and to maintain our social, economic, and ethnic population diversity. AS A SAN FRANCISCO VOTER, YOU CAN BE PART OF OUR HOUSING PROGRESS BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Do not be misled. The Community College Governing Board opposes this initiative. The district does not have any future building plans for this housing site.

WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT THE CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY HOUSING BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director  
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt construction of affordable housing at Balboa Reservoir site. This surplus public property empty for 30 years was declared surplus by the City in 1984. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders. The housing is desperately needed. San Franciscans need affordable housing.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

A critical issue facing San Francisco today is the lack of housing middle class San Franciscans can afford.

That is why I have joined these neighborhood associations to support the Balboa Reservoir neighborhood housing proposal. Those participating in the development of the proposal includes:

- O.M.I. Community Association
- Dorado Terrace Association
- Outer Mission-Ingleside
- Political Action Committee
- Greater Ingleside Community
- Mount Davidson Manor
- Ocean Avenue Merchants Association
- Ingleside Terrace Association
- The San Francisco Open Space Committee
- City College of San Francisco

From early in 1985 I worked closely with these neighborhood groups in the discussions between city government and community leaders concerning the development plans for this desperately needed new housing at the unused Balboa reservoir site.

These are the reasons you should vote no on proposition E.

1. The neighborhood housing proposal that this initiative seeks to stop is the result of months of hard work by the largest coalition of neighborhood associations ever to join together to plan a housing development in San Francisco.

2. The housing at the Balboa Reservoir site was designed with the involvement of the coalition of neighborhood associations to enhance the surrounding community.

3. The governing Board of the Community College District has made clear that they have no plans for the site and no ownership rights to it. City College does not oppose the construction of this development and opposes this initiative.

4. Self-proclaimed “Friends” of City College want to stop the proposal in order to preserve the site for future faculty parking. A clique of City College staffers involved in a neighborhood association pose as community opposition to this development even though a representative from this organization, the Sunny-side Neighborhood Association, had helped plan and support the proposal.

5. By masquerading as concerned neighbors these self-appointed “friends” of City College hope to prevent the construction of 204 critically needed units of housing and pull off one of the biggest land grabs in San Francisco’s history.

Don’t be fooled, vote no on proposition E.

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Residence Element of the Comprehensive Plan of the City and County of San Francisco assesses the City’s housing needs and lays out specific steps to meet those needs. This document was adopted by the City Planning Commission in 1984 after extensive public review at neighborhood meetings and public hearings, and consideration of the detailed Environmental Impact Report.

The first objective of the Housing Element is “to provide new housing for all income groups” in locations appropriate for residential development. To meet this goal, development of housing is to be aggressively pursued and encouraged on surplus, underused and vacant public land.

Proposition E would halt construction of affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site. This public property, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City in 1984. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

If you want more affordable housing in San Francisco vote no on Proposition E.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Susan J. Bierman, City Planning Commissioner
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on E.

Proposition E deprives San Franciscans of one of their last real chances to become homeowners at an affordable price. At the South Balboa Reservoir, we have City-owned land on which 203 units of three-bedroom, two-bath homes can be built at low prices which average San Franciscans can afford to pay. These homes need to be built now, not in three years. In three years the low interest rates on mortgages and the bond financing will be gone. Two hundred families will have lost the opportunity to become homeowners, and the City will have lost the opportunity to ease the tight market in rental housing.

Nor does this ill-conceived initiative help City College in any way. City College does not need this land. Speculation that the College may at some future date find a use for the land is not founded on fact. The College may never be able to build on the reservoir. Their enrollment has dropped by over 4000 students in the last few years.

This initiative is designed to confuse you. It will make our housing shortage worse for three long years. If you support affordable housing in our City, Vote NO on Proposition E.

Bill Maher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Balboa Reservoir site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now planned for development of 203 new single family homes. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed—other homes built under this program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom would not otherwise be able to afford home ownership.

San Francisco has the most expensive housing in the nation where last year the average home sold for over $160,000. Housing is difficult to produce because the obstacles are great—little land on which to build, high construction costs and uncertain interest rates.

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost. The initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional land or facilities for City College. The Community College Board, the governing body of City College, in fact recently voted to oppose this initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No” on Proposition E.

John L. Molinari

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

In 1980, the voters of the City and County of San Francisco approved a measure making it City policy to add 20,000 new units of housing within five years. In 1984 in an effort to satisfy this objective, the Board of Supervisors adopted a policy encouraging the expansion of the City’s housing supply. Making surplus City-owned land, such as the site at Balboa Reservoir, available for affordable housing was an important part of that policy. A proposal to build 203 homes on the unused Balboa Reservoir site was advanced to help implement the pro-housing policy.

Approval of Proposition E would HALT construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.

The Balboa Reservoir homes would be built on land currently belonging to the City and County of San Francisco. The property IS NOT part of the City College, and City College has neither plans or money to buy the property and convert it for City College use.

The only debatable issue is the future of affordable housing on the Balboa Reservoir site.

As we are all aware, San Francisco has the most expensive homes in the United States. The average cost of a home is $152,000. Not many can afford such prices. However, the housing proposed for the Balboa Reservoir will give many more citizens the opportunity to become homeowners. The homes to be built will be sold to first-time buyers at prices ranging from $83,000 to $145,000.

Other homes built in San Francisco under the direction of similar affordable housing programs have been snapped up quickly by San Franciscans. Without the program, most would not have been able to purchase the home and become homeowners.

Again, if you desire to preserve the construction of more affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site, vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Willie B. Kennedy
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Additional single family housing is undeniably San Francisco's most acute social need.
When some vacant surplus City land (12 acres) finally becomes available for 203 additional new private homes there will always be some selfish individuals who are in favor of new housing "just so long as it is not built across the street from me!"
This unused, vacant City reservoir land hasn't generated a dime of taxes for over thirty years! Let's add 203 NEW homeowner taxpayers to the City's rolls as quickly as possible.
Stop these self-serving no-growth obstructionists! Please vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Prop E would halt affordable housing construction at the Balboa Reservoir site. Many gay people need affordable housing, too, and we join with other community groups urging you to vote NO on Prop E.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Robert Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E, if approved, would block the construction of 203 badly needed single-family homes on the south portion of the Balboa Reservoir in San Francisco. Sixty percent of these homes would be available for purchase by moderate and middle income families at purchase prices between $80,000 and $120,000. They would be constructed on surplus public land and financed by the sale of mortgage revenue bonds to enable the developer to sell the homes at below market prices.
A neighborhood group headed by two city college faculty members is responsible for placing Proposition E on the ballot. The group contends that the land which is intended to be used for the project should be made available instead to City College for the construction of new teaching facilities even though enrollment at City College is declining and the City College Board has voted 6 to 1 to oppose the initiative.

Like many other areas of the country, San Francisco suffers from a shortage of housing. Purchase prices here are among the highest in the nation. The use of surplus public lands and revenue bond financing provide a means for making single family homes available to a broad spectrum of families at affordable prices.
The Balboa Reservoir project is supported by the leaders of 8 neighborhood groups in the area surrounding the location of the proposed project and by a majority of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, as well as by Mayor Dianne Feinstein. We urge you to encourage the construction of this type of housing in San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition E.

San Francisco Board of Realtors
William L. Jansen, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

SAVE OUR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS!
BERNAL HEIGHTS SAYS, "VOTE NO ON PROP E!"
We are residents of Bernal Heights in San Francisco. We've worked hard to build affordable family and senior citizen homes in our neighborhood.
We need more affordable housing in our City to survive. The real issue in Prop E is affordable family housing — a "yes" vote prevents the construction of 203 family homes. That's crazy! Join us in preserving what's best in our City. Vote "no" on Prop E!

Sylvia M. Yee, Bernal Heights Community Foundation Board of Directors***
Frank Hutchins, BHC Foundation*
Mary Lou Bertolotti, BHC Foundation*
Leila Havner, BHC Foundation*
Elizabeth Egger, BHC Foundation*
Sister Janet Simons, BHC Foundation*
Stephen Antonaras, BHC Foundation*
Loreto R. Dill, BHC Foundation*
Barbara Bagot, BHC Foundation*
Margaret C. Randolph, Northwest Bernal Block Club*
Maureen Lawth, NWBCC*
Tim Molinari, BHC Foundation & Dev't Committee*
Black Bagot, BHC Foundation & Dev't Committee*
***Organization for identification purposes only.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco Needs Affordable Housing—Vote No on Proposition E

Everyone agrees that San Francisco needs affordable housing. The questions are how and where that affordable housing can be built.

The Balboa Reservoir housing development, to be built on the site of a reservoir built thirty years ago and unused since that time, answers those important questions for more than 200 San Francisco first-time homebuying families by providing:

- 203 new affordable three-bedroom, single-family homes
- 9.8% fixed-rate financing
- A mix of 30% low-income, 30% moderate-income and 40% market-rate first-time buyers
- A convenient site that has been declared “surplus” by the City and “available for development of affordable housing”

The Balboa Reservoir housing development is a small but significant step in the effort to generate affordable housing in our City.

Thousands of San Franciscans from every community, neighborhood group and viewpoint agree that the Balboa Reservoir development is good for San Francisco. Virtually every elected official, including the Governing Board of City College also agree.

All these San Franciscans ask you to say “yes” to affordable housing and “NO” to Proposition E.

San Francisco Coalition for Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar, Executive Director

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The viable plan for affordable single family housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site is being threatened by Proposition E. If Proposition E passes, 203 single family homes will be lost to the citizenry of San Francisco at a time when they are greatly needed.

The facts about the proposed housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site argue strongly against Proposition E. All 203 homes will be for first time home buyers. One-third of the homes will be available to households earning $27,000. Another third of the homes will be available to households earning $36,000. Adequate parking will be provided within the development itself, thus answering any concerns that traffic in the area will be congested.

City College has no need or plan to use South Balboa Reservoir for its facilities. City College’s priority is to develop its existing campus. South Balboa Reservoir should therefore be used for one of the City’s greatest needs: increased and affordable housing which is available to lower and middle income families.

As homeowners who live in the vicinity of South Balboa Reservoir, we welcome its planned use for single family housing and feel it will become an integral and contributing part of the community. We therefore urge you to vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Submitted by:
Stephen Graham, Chairman of the Housing Sub-committee of the Citizen’s Committee for Community Development
Roderick A. McLeod, Vice-Chairman of the Citizen’s Committee on Community Development

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing is a group of neighbors which consists of many of the renters of Westwood Park and Sunnyside neighborhoods as well as owners and renters of Ingleside which are the closest neighbors to the Balboa Reservoir along with some of the students and teachers of City College.

We strongly support the Balboa Reservoir for housing. We believe that the Balboa Reservoir is an ideal spot for housing.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

As Merchants as well as residents of Ocean Avenue, Greater Ingleside and San Francisco, we support the Development of the Balboa Reservoir as housing.

A Traffic Survey has stated that there will be minimal impact on the existing patterns of traffic by this development.

Our neighborhood wants homes in the South Balboa Reservoir.

Vote No On Prop. E. *

Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughney
Submitted by Patricia Vaughney

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Additional City College Parking is being considered on another location off I-280 to keep the college congestion away from the neighborhood’s streets.

City College has 44 more acres in which to expand and existing buildings at City College have viable means to expand.
We believe that housing on the Balboa Reservoir is the most viable solution to develop a vacant piece of property that is directly adjacent to our stores on a Transpreferential Street.

Affordable housing is in great need in San Francisco and as much needed here as anywhere. We want to help provide this need. Vote No on Prop. E.

Ocean Avenue Merchants Assoc.
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughan
Submitted by Patricia Vaughan

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction on much-needed affordable, single-family housing at the long vacant south Balboa Reservoir site. This proposition would also block a major housing development that would bring jobs into an area of the city that has little industry or private business.

Sale prices for these units are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the San Francisco housing market, where the average home is selling for $160,000. Construction of these homes will help all young, first-time home buyers and will require only 5% down, instead of the 20% down payment on houses bought with conventional home mortgages.

This plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by nine nearby neighborhood organizations. If Proposition E is approved and this project is blocked, more young adults will purchase their first home in Vallejo or some other outlying area, further draining San Francisco of the young families that every growing community needs.

San Francisco residents will gain apprenticeships, jobs, contracts and subcontracts from this development.

This plan calls for 2 and 3 bedroom, family-sized houses, with space for another bedroom which can be finished when needed.

Each house will have 2½ parking spaces in front and would not cause parking problems in the area. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

City College of San Francisco has no plans to buy the property, has no money for institutional expansion, nor any mention of this land in any master plan. Some supporters of this proposition are motivated by racist notions and have said they fear that this development will become another “Geneva Towers.” This type of thinking is similar to support for apartheid practiced in South Africa and must be defeated by progressive San Francisco voters. Property values will increase, instead of a decrease as a result of this project.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition E.

Larry Ukar Johnson-Reed — President, O.M.I. Pilgrim Community Center Inc.
Maria Campbell-Casey — Program Director, Bay Area Engineering Societies Committee for Manpower Training, Inc.
Claire Mills-Bradford — Program Director, O.M.I. Senior Center
John C. Jackson
Linda Rose-Gipson
Jon Still — Secretary, Young Adult Committee
Kenneth Butler

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided — 2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Affordable Housing Alliance — Mitchell Omerberg, Director
Bay Area Urban League — Gregory Best, Field Representative
Bernal Heights Community Foundation — Andre Lennell Day
Community Educational Services — Dorothy Chen, Executive Director
Japanese Community Youth Council St. Francis Square Apartments, Inc. — Sandra Mayor-Jenkins, Secretary
Minority Contractors Association of Northern California — James Hangabook, Secretary, Board of Directors
National Community Congress — Dr. Eddie C. Welban
Parkmerced Residents Organization, Inc. — Ricardo A. Callejo, Esq.
Patriot Hill Neighborhood House — Enola Maxwell
San Francisco Building Trades Council — Stan Smith
San Francisco Housing & Tenants Council — Joseph Lacey
San Francisco Tenants Union — Jim Raye
Rev. Amos C. Brown — Local Pastor & Community Servant
Greg Day — Chairman, Citizens Committee on Community Development
Polly V. Marshall — Commissioner, San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
Regina A. Sneid
Jim Wachob — San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Michael E. Willis, AIA — Fleming Corporation

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000, and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided—2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote "No" on Proposition E.

Greater Ingleside Political Club — Frank Noto, Treasurer
Housing Conservation and Development Corporation — Lonnie Lawson,
Board of Directors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000, and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided—2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote "No" on Proposition E.

Bayview Baptist Minister Fellowship — Rev. N. B. Mills, President
Bread of Life Missionary Baptist Church — Rev. S. A. Bailey
Cosmopolitan Baptist Church — Rev. A. Ray Genie
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Raymond M. Howard Sr.
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Carole Nelson
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Cornelia R. O'Reilly
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Paul G. Theiss
Old St. Mary's Housing Committee — Charles Gule, Chairman
St. Peters Housing Committee — Tessa Rouverol

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE... DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?  

YES 296  NO 297

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: With certain exceptions, City officers, including elected officials and commission members, may represent clients before City boards and commissions other than their own, and be paid for their services. State legislators may represent clients before City boards and commissions, and be paid for their services. Any person may contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would prohibit City officers from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay. This proposition would prohibit State legislators from appearing before City boards, commissions and departments on behalf of clients for pay. City officers would be prohibited from discussing with these officers and legislators matters that the City is deciding. Proposition F would also prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit City officers and State legislators from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to allow City officers and State legislators to represent clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to allow any person to contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

Controller's Statement on “F”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 77

How “F” Got on Ballot

On February 26 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for limitations on compensated advocacy and campaign contributions had qualified for the June ballot.

Quentin Kopp, Martha Gillham and Cheryl Arenson, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 9,400 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,986 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.
 ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

In all our years of observing San Francisco City government, we have found one maxim to be true time after time: a good idea gets copied, especially among politicians.

For no sooner did Quentin Kopp promise to bring Proposition F to the voters than did Mayor Feinstein come up with an informal, administrative version of her own. Fine, you say (and the Mayor says), then why vote Yes on Proposition F?

(1) The Mayor's remedy of asking City Commissioners who also act as lobbyists before City agencies to resign is nothing more than a hand slap, and is good only as long as she is mayor. It's not binding on future mayors and could be changed without any vote of the Board of Supervisors, let alone the people of San Francisco. Proposition F prohibits this kind of conflict-of-interest, and it will be the law, no matter who is mayor.

(2) The Mayor's action did nothing to state legislators who can also act as lobbyists before City Boards and Commissions, nor did her action stop the law or business partners of City Commissioners from picking up the slack in big-money lobbying. Proposition F will stop these practices in their tracks.

(3) What about the other half of Proposition F, which reduced the campaign contribution limit to $500 so that all San Franciscans can enjoy equal access to City officials, not just the ones with the big bucks? The Mayor can't do anything about this, and she hasn't. Only a Yes vote on Proposition F will reduce the weight of big money and ensure our full voice in City elections and City government.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. If it's important enough for the Mayor to copy part of it administratively, it's important enough to do the job right and make it a law.

John J. Barbagelata
Harry Aleo
June Cahn
Dorothy Partridge

Robert Arenson
Rudolph Lohnes
Janet Wentworth

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The worst and most persistent problem in American politics is that politicians and political races can be "bought". Reducing the size of campaign contributions will be a step forward in reducing the role of money in elections. Vote yes for more honest government.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

RESTORE to the people their rightful and equal power as individual voters by reducing the monetary clout and influence of private interests who make the laws and the policies as City officials and Commissioners or State legislators.

TELL the special interests that their money and influence can no longer interfere with representative government.

TELL the special interests that the voters will no longer tolerate the influence-buying which comes with large campaign contributions.

TELL the special interests that this measure will encourage highly talented citizens to serve San Francisco honestly and responsibly.

VOTE YES ON F.

Cheryl Arenson
Anne Renfrew
David Pacheco

Tom Hayes
Dorothy Vukovich

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

"Government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

These noble words from Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, cast in bronze at the entrance to City Hall, seem to have escaped the attention of some City officials who pass by them every day. For in San Francisco City government, Lincoln's simple formula for representative government would read quite differently: "Government of the powerful, by the lobbyists, and for the wealthy."

Government of, by, and for the privileged few is bad government. Government of, by, and for all the people is good government. It's as simple as that—as simple as Lincoln first put it.

Proposition F, the Good Government Initiative, will help San Franciscans maintain control of their government and will prevent undue influence by City officeholders.

To reduce undue influence, Proposition F outlaws the practice of City Commissioners and State Legislators representing special interests for pay before City Commissions and Boards. City Commissions should render their decisions deliberately and impartially, not be swayed by the political clout of the lobbyists appearing before them, or by any political favors those lobbyist/politicians might promise. "I'll scratch your back if you scratch my back" bargains do not belong in government. And until such backroom bargains are made illegal, City government will not belong to the rest of us either.

Proposition F also reduces the maximum amount that anyone can give to a local candidate from $1,000 to $500. If large contributors and other special interests can't give as much money, they can't buy as much influence with elected officials. And the lower the contribution limit, the less campaign spending and the more City government will be responsive to all San Franciscans.

You can "buy back" City government from the privileged and powerful with the most precious of all political commodities: your vote.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Mary Lohnes
Peter Fatouh
Judith Thorson

Babette Drefke
Daniel Jordan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F, an initiative of the people, is needed to protect the voters and the integrity of the legislative process from being corrupted by the power of money and influence. It prevents City officials and State Legislators from lobbying the City on behalf of high-powered special interests. It also lowers the campaign contribution limit from $1,000 to $500, thus reducing the influence of those same special interests over our elections and elected officials.

The bogus argument that the Mayor won't be able to find qualified people to serve on City commissions if Proposition F is adopted ignores the plain fact that there are 700,000 people in San Francisco, a pool of civic-minded citizens more than large enough to accommodate the 250 commission appointments available in our City government. For example, there are plenty of architects to fill the one architectural appointment on the Art Commission, just as there are plenty of non-lobbyist business people and lawyers available to serve on other commissions.

Thousands of San Franciscans, not just the "insiders", are ready, willing, and able to serve the public.

Proposition F deserves your vote. Restore integrity to City government. Restore the confidence of the citizens of San Francisco in that government. Let's have no more Wilkes Bashford situations.

VOTE YES ON F.

Oscar Sutro
Martha Gillham
Marguerite Warren

Leonel Monterey
Tony Kilroy

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE "NO" ON F

This proposition disguises itself as "good government" but, in reality, would drive good people out of government. It is so crudely drawn — so sweeping in its implications — that it would bar from government almost anyone with even a remote business or community tie to government.

It would purge from City commissions anyone who “directly or indirectly” receives compensation from any “interests” with an issue before any City agency. Effectively, this could discriminate against employees from community and neighborhood groups, civil rights organizations, non-profit corporations, labor unions, merchant and business groups, as well as architects, lawyers and other professionals.

Actually, there currently are no commissioners who represent any clients before any City agency. All who are appointed in my administration sign a statement saying they will not advocate for any paying client before any official body of the City while they are commissioners. This proposition simply is not necessary.

Proposition F also would lower the limit for any individual campaign contribution from $1000 to $500. Although this sounds good, it would permit a wealthy person with various businesses and numerous family members to contribute many thousands of dollars through different sources. This would encourage "hidden" contributions. We must strive for disclosure of contributions, not a system which drives contributions underground. Candidates must be able to raise funds enough to put their message before the voters. Reducing the contribution limit can be a tactic to discourage persons from challenging incumbents.

Vote no on Proposition F.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition F purports to achieve a noble objective: The removal of “influence peddling” from City Hall. In fact, Proposition F is so poorly-crafted, it may have exactly the opposite effect on City government. It is not a "good government" initiative. It is bad legislation.

Proposition F provides no definitions and no standards for the public to judge whether City officials comply with its restrictions. Its uncertainties will be chaotic and lead to endless, needless lawsuits.

A measure similar to Proposition F was rejected by the Board of Supervisors because no public hearings were ever held on the legislation. If the public had had a chance to comment on this initiative, it might not have the critical shortcomings, deficiencies and uncertainties that now warrant its rejection by responsible San Franciscans.

In the coming months, the Board will review good government measures that are comprehensive, effective and, most important, certain. Proposition F is a misguided disaster.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

This should properly have been titled the "SINK WILLIE BROWN ORDINANCE"! The "meat of the coconuts" is in Section 4.

Supervisor Kopp’s intentions are good, however this sloppily drafted and incomprehensible measure succeeds in “burning down the barn” to eliminate a couple of rats!

Under this proposal, to avoid any potential INDIRECT conflict of interest, (which is undefined!), one would have to be a destitute, unemployed welfare recipient to qualify for service on any City Board or Commission! The Mayor has already solved this "hired advocacy" problem with the "conflict of interest" affidavits she demands IN ADVANCE from any prospective appointee.

Quentin’s proposed $500.00 campaign contribution limit is an "inside joke" and he, of all people, knows it! It merely obliges a heavy contributor to have his wife, children, business associates, or friends send in SEPARATE $500.00 checks if he wants to contribute more than $500.00 to a politician’s campaign.

These proposals require additional City employees for enforcement and wind up doing far more harm than good. Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Union members and labor officials have legitimate reasons for meeting with City officers. It is unfair and wrong to lump them in the same category as special interest lobbyists, yet that's exactly what Proposition F does. Working people deserve representation on City boards and commissions. VOTE NO!

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

If you want to ban business owners and executives from serving on City boards and commissions, then vote for Proposition F.

If you think board members of non-profit corporations and employees of community agencies have nothing to contribute to City government, then vote for Proposition F.

If you believe union members and labor officials should not have a voice at City Hall, then vote for Proposition F.

But if you share our belief that these individuals have legitimate concerns and expertise that is valuable in running major City departments, then join us in voting NO on Proposition F.

Proposition F is a simplistic, sloppily-drafted, meat axe approach to a problem already resolved by Mayor Feinstein's ban on commissioners lobbying on behalf of private clients.

Proposition F is not good government and it is not reform. Proposition F is bad legislation. VOTE NO.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

We're sympathetic to the need for political reform. But it's a complicated problem, and Proposition F just isn't the way to go.

Frankly, we can't tell who is and isn't affected by this measure. While a handful of people sometimes might abuse their positions, that's no reason to question the integrity of so many solid citizens who give tirelessly to public service. Proposition F is simply the wrong approach. Please join us in voting NO.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Concerned about elected officials spending $400,000 to run for supervisor and $1 million on a mayor's race? Then vote NO on Proposition F.

That's right. NO.

Proposition F isn't going to do anything about campaign spending. Prop F simply limits the size of contributions, reducing the current limit from $1,000 to $500. Supervisors can and will continue spending outrageous sums on their re-election campaigns. With Proposition F they'll just spend twice as much time raising money from twice as many sources, and that makes special interests even more powerful. They can always find ways around campaign limits.

We need campaign spending reform, but Proposition F doesn't provide it. Please join us in voting NO on F.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

When campaign contributions are limited, political freedom suffers. Your right to free speech includes not only your right to express your views, but also your right to support as much as you want, any candidate who speaks for you.

Minority viewpoints depend heavily on the contribution of a few dedicated supporters to get your message out. To limit your financial support of your beliefs is to silence your political voice.

Only incumbents, who have many opportunities for free media exposure benefit from this assault on free speech. The dangers of a campaign contribution limit far outweigh any possible benefit from this proposition. Defeat Proposition F!

San Francisco Libertarian Party
Michael R. Fowler, Secretary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

You may think Prop F only applies to big-time lawyers and a few legislators who represent developers. Think again!

Prop F would prohibit many community leaders from public service. If it passes, board members and employees of community and charitable organizations could be banned from serving on City boards and commissions.

We appreciate the public need for a government free of "influencing peddling." But restrictions on "compensated advocacy" ought to be clearly and carefully crafted to protect the voices of community leaders who argue on behalf of the public interest, not private special interests.

Vote No.

Hon. Juanita Del Carlo
Mission Hiring Hall

Bob Ross
Publisher, Bay Area Reporter

Hon. Jeffrey Ken Mori
Japanese Community Youth Council, Inc.
Bill O'Callahan
American Red Cross
Hon. George Suncin
Horizons Unlimited
Hon. Jean Rits Alviar
Mission Education Project
Hon. Greg Day
Polk Street Town Hall
Hon. Naomi Gray
Hon. James Foster
Carol Wang
Marlene Marseille
Lee Woods
Jo Daly
Dennis Collins
Hon. H. Welton Flynn
(Organizations listed only for purposes of identification.)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will have no effect on developers' lawyers. None.

It won't make any difference to state legislators either.

Don't kid yourself. This is not "reform" and it isn't "good government." Proposition F will allow the special interests and influence peddlers to continue exercising influence over our elected officials. It has so many loopholes, lobbying will actively continue, untouched, in the back rooms of City Hall.

And developers will always find ways around campaign contribution limits. As Common Cause has noted, Prop F simply makes tracing their dollars more difficult for the public.

Real reform would directly attack the source of huge contributions—the developers and other special interests that employ the lobbyists to peddle their influence.

VOTE NO.

Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
David Looman
Michael Mason

Rich Waller
Susan Klugerman
Rene Cazenave
Margie O'Drascoll

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
South Africa Boycott

PROPOSITION G

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?  

YES  300  NO  301

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has adopted an ordinance prohibiting the City, with certain exceptions, from purchasing goods or services from companies doing business with South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a declaration of policy that says the City must try to avoid doing business with companies that significantly profit from or help maintain the Apartheid system in South Africa. It calls on other public bodies and private groups to adopt similar policies. It directs the Board of Supervisors to identify the companies which have the greatest ties to Apartheid so that the public can also boycott those companies.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to avoid doing business with companies that help maintain Apartheid, and you want a public boycott of those companies.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to adopt this policy.

Controller's Statement on "G"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"The proposed Declaration of Policy be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

How "G" Got on Ballot

On November 6, 1985 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for the City to boycott businesses with significant ties to South Africa had qualified for the June ballot.

Arlo Hale Smith, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,546 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on October 11.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,941 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:
It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This measure calls for a public boycott of companies that aid apartheid.

Any claim of “conflict” between Proposition G and existing anti-apartheid legislation is imaginary: It is the legislative intent of supporters of this measure that it can be construed as a directive for making existing law tougher.

Personal attacks have no legitimate place in a ballot measure campaign. As proponent of this measure, I repudiate all such tactics.

Vote NO on apartheid. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Arlo Hale Smith

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Boycotts are grassroots politics. They’ve helped the farmworkers, they’ve helped win integration, and they can help end the legal racism called “Apartheid”.

A Gallup poll found 77% of South Africa’s black majority favoring international economic boycotts to force the Apartheid regime to accept reform peacefully.

After the Boycott Initiative made the ballot, the San Francisco Supervisors unanimously passed a similar city purchasing policy. The issue that remains is whether to call on the general public to join in, boycotting companies identified by the Supervisors as the worst offenders in each industry.

The companies that would be targeted consider profits to be the “bottom line”. Economic pressure is all they understand.

The AFL-CIO, NAACP, and NOW have called a boycott of Shell Oil because of its profiteering from South Africa’s oppressive economic conditions. Proposition G supports that and would put the same pressure on other industries as well.

This proposition is supported by the elected county central committee of the Democratic Party, the Peace-and-Freedom Party and the Humanist Party, and by leading attorneys, such as Terry Francois, Terence Hallinan, Tony Serra, Lewis Hope Lee, Marc Van Der Hout, Abby Ginsberg and Terence Redmond.

If South Africa were a democracy, its majority would long ago have voted to end Apartheid. We need to vote Yes — because they can’t.

Atty. Arlo Hale Smith, Democratic Party County Central Committee
Paul Kangas, Peace and Freedom Party
Lois Salsbury, Public Advocates*
Dr. Kevin Danaher, Food First*
Jesse James, Mission Rebels
Terry Collins, Community Activist
Stony Gebert, Election Action
Robert McCall, Hotel & Restaurant Employees
Executive Board Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Attorneys speak out against Apartheid:

South African police can arrest anyone without charge. They can hold you incommunicado — no contacts with family, lawyers or press.

They regularly censor news, books, music. They have banned Christmas caroling, funerals and other peaceful gatherings. Groups which criticize the government are forbidden to hold meetings.

Blacks are subject to legal segregation; their property and employment rights are greatly restricted; often, they are simply murdered.

As attorneys, we help people who have legal rights that are being violated. But what can we do for those who have no legal rights?

Boycotts and other economic sanctions are the only way to make the Apartheid government accept reform peacefully.

In the Court of World Public Opinion, Apartheid has been convicted of crimes against humanity. By imposing a sentence of economic isolation, we can end Apartheid.

Vote Yes — take a stand for justice.

Terence Hallinan
Arlo Hale Smith
Terry Francois
Karen Anderson Ryer
Robert R. Bryan
Ann Menasche
Rachel Ginsburg
Leo Puoli
Gabriel Gesmer
Onu Prouchovnick

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is a moderate, responsible but effective proposal to bring economic pressure on the South African government to establish constitutional rights for all of its citizens. Vote Yes.

Terence Faulkner, Republican
Mike Garza, Republican

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

All decent Americans abhor apartheid. However, boycotting U.S. investment in South Africa is counterproductive; it only penalizes the actual victims of apartheid.

U.S. international firms have acted as progressive agents for change through the Sullivan principles. Their investments have improved the social and economic condition of the labor force. It is improper to penalize their positive contributions.

—LYN NOPZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

We are individuals and organizations working actively to end the racist system of apartheid in South Africa. And we are voting NO on Proposition G.

Why?
(1) Because Proposition G will weaken San Francisco’s present divestment law. This law requires companies doing business with the city to sign affidavits that they will make no new contracts with South Africa.

Proposition G has no such provision.
(2) Proposition G provides no mechanism or funding to carry out its declared purpose of “boycotting” South Africa.

Proposition G will not stop South African products from entering the Port of San Francisco.

Vote against this useless, confusing, and deceptive initiative.

Preserve the stronger divestment law San Francisco already has. Vote NO on Proposition G!

Yvonne Golden
Geraldine Johnson
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
AFT 2121 Anti-Apartheid Committee
Artists Against Apartheid
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition of Black Trade Unionsists
Coalition of Conscience
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club Executive Committee
ILWU 10 and SEIU 250 Southern Africa Liberation Support Committees
National Conference of Black Lawyers
San Francisco Anti-Apartheid Committee
Southern Africa Freedom Committee/All Peoples Congress

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.
The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.
The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1983 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!
PROPOSITION H

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?

YES 303

NO 304

---

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Several city and private agencies conduct various programs related to AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a declaration of policy that says San Francisco should support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council, consisting of a Committee on Education and a Fund-Raising Committee. The Research Committee would make recommendations on the most useful AIDS research projects and try to prevent duplication of efforts. The Education Committee would inform the public about the latest research and about ways to prevent AIDS. The Fund-Raising Committee would seek donations and grants for AIDS research and education projects.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

---

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

“The proposed Declaration of Policy for an AIDS research and education council and the formation of advisory committees of civic leaders would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, additional expenditure of public funds for AIDS research may result, the amount of which cannot be determined.”

---

How “H” Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for AIDS research had qualified for the June ballot.

Stony Gebert, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 10,540 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on December 6, 1985.

A check of each signature on the petition showed that 7,564 of the signatures were valid. This is more than 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

---

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We need a council to expose and address major AIDS issues without the impasse of present medical/political bias.

As taxpayers, we are subsidizing a treadmill of continual AIDS casualties. There are major oversights where AIDS is concerned. Only recently was it learned that CDC statistics suggest 79% of early AIDS cases appear drug-related. We hear AIDS is 100% fatal. Perhaps that is because death may also be drug-related in the way of immuno-suppressive antibiotic and radiation overdoses to already compromised immunity systems. Prevailing medicine is both tunnel-visioned and high-profit motivated. Also well-funded. This solution may be part of the problem. Some physicians are beginning to feel where AIDS is concerned many current practices are ethically, medically bankrupt.

Remissions occur. Largely through immunity-enhancing, holistic medicine. Significantly, only 1% of AIDS cases occur among people at risk in the Asian community. Perhaps this is due to less drug abuse or use of an unfunded, ignored resource: herbology as part of diet. More options: homeopathy, acupuncture, etc.

If, as anticipated, upwards of 40% of those testing positive come down with AIDS, we may become overburdened. To ignore all of the above becomes part of the problem. Vote Yes on Proposition H.

Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Rich McKirkeby, Former Orderly,
Marketing Associate, Pacific Bell
Joseph P. Clady, AIDS Hospice, Shanti Counselor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There is great need for research and education about AIDS and related conditions.

We need to attack the disease, not its victims.

Knowledge is the only vaccine available today.

Vote Yes.

John Lorenzini, President,
People With AIDS Alliance
Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Jan Beck, Steven Russell, Eugene Ewins, ARC/AIDS Vigil

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There are many possible treatments for AIDS and related conditions which are not being examined by the federal government, especially therapies based on natural substances and processes.

Vote Yes for an AIDS Research Council open to all viewpoints.

Scott Gregory, M.D.
Paul Kangas

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A tape recording (Talking Book) of the San Francisco Voter Information pamphlet is available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name_________________________________________

Address__________________________________________Apt. #________

Telephone No. (required)________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:
I want to work in the following area(s): __________________________

Second choice locations (if any)________________________________

Signature______________________________________________
PROPOSITION I
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?

YES 307  
NO 308  

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the Freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a policy statement asking whether or not the Embarcadero Freeway should be torn down.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City’s policy to remain as it is, and you want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to change the City’s policy, and you do not want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway demolished, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by at least $10.2 million in local funds. Potential private sector financing and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “I” Got on Ballot

On March 3 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy placing the question of demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway before the voters had qualified for the June ballot.

Richard Hongisto, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 11,119 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,720 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land now under the Broadway ramps is put back on the tax rolls, with low-rise buildings limited by restrictive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when united with Proposition J, recognizes these facts:

1) The Embarcadero Freeway is what is left of a never-completed elevated freeway that would have ringed the City through North Beach and Marina neighborhoods to the Golden Gate Bridge.

2) Today this massive freeway, which separates us from our waterfront, would never be built.

3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.

4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf will be preserved.

5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked for this new system.

6) Only that portion of the Embarcadero Freeway east and north of the Main and Beale Street ramps — basically the portion directly on the waterfront — will be removed to make way for the new system. The removal cost, approximately $10 million to be paid for with privately-generated new revenues, is a relatively small part of the overall new system.

As for Proposition I, vote "YES, let's tear down the Embarcadero Freeway." Then turn to Proposition J and support the plan for a beautiful waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Removing the Embarcadero Freeway will allow San Francisco to:

• Create a six-lane, tree-lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero.

• Build new on-and-off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway.

• Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula.

• Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero.

• Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.

• Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won't benefit San Francisco. Don't let outsiders determine our future. Vote YES on I.

Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Jack Whaley
Roger Bayer
A. Lee Knight
Robert Bradford
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Donald A. Crosby, AIA
Rai Y. Okamoto
Robert Meyers
Ralph Hurtado
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Douglas G. Wright
Anita Sanchez
Chuck Forester
Fritz Arko
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Dehurt, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones
Randall Rossi
Karl Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Brontkema
Jon Twitchell
Jane Winslow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK — VOTE YES ON I

This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY — VOTE YES ON I

Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds — without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city's fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT — VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree — it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

---

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled.
Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I
In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan received orders to make way for growth, will pay for itself as land rolls, with the tax-free waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when these facts:
1) The Embarcadero! completed elevated freeway through North Beach and Gate Bridge.
2) Today this massive I

VOTE YES ON PROP
Removing the Embarcadero to:
• Create a six-lane, to
• Build new on and off
• Remove the unused
• Provide bike paths
• Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.
• Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these waterfront, would never be built.
3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.
4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman’s Wharf will be preserved.
5) $68 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked.

FROM:

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION? (¿FIRMO SU APLICACIÓN?)

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK— VOTE YES ON I
This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY— VOTE YES ON I
Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds— without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city’s fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities. DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT—VOTE YES ON 1

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on 1.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to 15.7 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown, Fisherman's Wharf and the financial district would be reduced.

Travel within the city would be slowed down at all hours. Vote no to the destruction of the freeway.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
- Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
- Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
- If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
  - By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
  - Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
  - MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
  - Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City’s plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Judith Tomese

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Tear it down? The concept is preposterous! There are 70,000 cars a day whizzing by on this high speed downtown elevated waterfront freeway! Where will they all go?

Aside from the outrageous demolition costs involved, (some engineers estimate $40,000,000 of taxpayer money!), eyeball observation, logic, and just plain “common sense” dictates that ground level “total gridlock” will result if this expensive freeway is now destroyed.

Nostalgic individuals must realize that the times have changed! We can’t bring the Bay back up to Montgomery Street! On behalf of San Francisco’s overburdened taxpayers, we urge a NO vote!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled.
Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco

to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it

would increase public access to the waterfront and

improve traffic?

YES 310
NO 311

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has
signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the
waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for
replacing the freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a policy
statement that says that the City would re-
place the Embarcadero Freeway if and only
if the replacement opens up the waterfront
to the public, improves the tax base, and
creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a
new waterfront transit route to assure the
smooth flow of traffic.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you
want to adopt a policy statement which says
that the Embarcadero Freeway would be
torn down if and only if the replacement
opens up the waterfront to the public, im-
proves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined
6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront trans-
it route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do
not want to adopt a policy statement to re-
place the Embarcadero Freeway under
these conditions.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following state-
ment on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will neither in-
crease nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the
policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway replaced
with a tree-lined six lane boulevard and other traffic and transit
improvements, in my opinion, based on published studies and
evaluations, the cost of government would increase by approxi-
mately $27.5 million. This includes a one-time freeway demol-
tion cost of $10.2 million plus $17.3 million required to match
potential federally-funded transit improvements. Potential
financing by the State and private sector and additional tax
revenues which might result from subsequent development of
the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “J” Got on Ballot

On March 5 a declaration of policy regarding the future of the
Embarcadero Freeway was delivered to the Registrar from the
Mayor and several supervisors with instructions that it be placed
on the ballot.

The City Charter allows the Mayor or four or more supervi-
sors to submit a declaration of policy to the voters without using
either the initiative or the legislative process.

In addition to Mayor Feinstein, the March 5 document was
signed by Supervisors Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker, Molinari,
Kennedy and Nelder.

POLLS ARE OPEN
FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans now have a chance to remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with an at-grade, six-lane parkway, which will open our waterfront and restore views blocked for years by this large freeway.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for traffic and transit improvements:

- New, shorter freeway ramps connecting directly with The Embarcadero;
- A tree-lined, at-grade, 6-lane Embarcadero Boulevard, with a new waterfront Muni line, a jogging and bicycle path from Fisherman's Wharf to Mission Bay;
- Extension of Muni Metro south to the Caltrain station at 4th and Townsend;
- New ramps connecting I-280 with The Embarcadero;
- Changes in traffic flow and improvements to existing freeway ramps.

Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf will be preserved and enhanced.

The Board of Supervisors has specified that the Embarcadero Freeway will be torn down only if preliminary engineering during the next two years confirms—as traffic and environmental studies already have—that removal of the freeway will not result in more problems than it solves.

San Francisco became eligible for $88 million in federal highway funds for this new system when the Supervisors approved the plan in 1980. The $10.2 million cost of freeway demolition itself can be paid from revenues from low-rise development of the parcels now under the Broadway ramps and the increased values of nearby properties. Strict waterfront zoning limits the size of any development.

Traffic and environmental studies by the California Department of Transportation since 1980 clearly indicate that the new waterfront transportation system will be vastly superior to the existing situation, and that traffic congestion levels will not be notably different with the elevated structure removed.

Vote Yes on J and let's remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with a parkway and transit system—once again let us see our waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J gives the voters a chance to be heard on an important and timely issue. This issue is the replacement of a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway as one element of a comprehensive package of transportation improvements in the Waterfront area.

Last fall, the Board of Supervisors adopted for further study a set of traffic and transit improvements for the Waterfront. These improvements include:

- a new landscaped surface-level boulevard
- replacement of the Clay/Washington and Broadway on and off ramps with new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom
- removal of the unused stub of I-280 and construction of new ramps connecting the new waterfront boulevard to Route I-280
- a new light rail transit line linking Fort Mason with the Caltrain Depot
- extension of the Muni Metro to the train depot, improving the Peninsula Commute Service

A YES vote on Proposition J does not allocate funds for these projects. It does allow for further design and engineering studies, including cost analysis, assessment of impacts on traffic, and other matters. The studies will then be presented to the Supervisors so that they can make an informed decision on the plan. If the studies prove positive, San Francisco will be able to transform its Waterfront for the benefit of all.

Proposition J will insure that the City will not proceed with the removal of any of the Freeway until all the studies are completed and all potential consequences are assessed. This is the responsible approach. Vote YES on J.

SPUR
League of Women Voters
Embarcadero Citizens Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SAN FRANCISCO'S NEIGHBORHOODS ASK YOU TO VOTE YES ON J.
REDUCE TRAFFIC CONGESTION—YES ON J!

Traffic backed up by the Embarcadero Roadway slows travel and creates congestion in North Beach and other nearby neighborhoods. J will speed traffic flow.

IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION—YES ON J!

Proposition J will provide regular streetcar service along the Embarcadero and extend Muni Metro service to the south, ultimately extending to Bayview-Hunters Point.

PROMOTE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY—YES ON J!

If Proposition J does not pass, San Francisco could lose $88 million in federal funds for traffic improvements.

(continued)
RESTORE THE WATERFRONT—YES ON J!
San Francisco's waterfront could become a focal point for the city, graced by a grand promenade, instead of the dismal, deteriorating eyesore it is now.
San Francisco's neighborhoods join together to ask your support for an improved Embarcadero. We guarantee the freeway will not be removed unless it is replaced by facilities that will assure a smoother, more efficient traffic flow. YES ON J!
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Robert Bradford
Ruth Gravani
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Anita Sanchez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SUPPORT PUBLIC TRANSIT—VOTE YES ON J.
SAVE SAN FRANCISCO FROM GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON J.
The revitalization of the Northeastern Waterfront...as included in San Francisco's Master Plan and transit plans, as overwhelmingly approved by the Board of Supervisors and as urged by Mayor Feinstein...will allow almost $90 million in unused federal highway funds to be used for vital downtown and waterfront transit and street improvements which will be a key to reducing needless auto congestion in San Francisco.

PROPOSITION J SUPPORTS IMPORTANT TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS TO THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT. It will:
—extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific/CalTrain depot
—create a new rail line (possibly using historic streetcars) to connect the entire waterfront from Mission Bay to the Ferry Building to Fisherman's Wharf and Fort Mason
—set the stage for a possible streetcar line along Third Street
Since the city of San Francisco adopted the 'Transit First' policy in the early 1970's, transit investments in the Muni Metro,

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A SOUND BUSINESS PROPOSITION—YES ON J!
Common sense and good business demand we make the most of our resources. San Francisco's waterfront is an economic and civic asset unrivaled anywhere—yet much of it is cut off by an ugly, noisy, elevated roadway. The traffic improvements called for by Proposition J will benefit workers, tourists, property owners, neighborhoods...and business.
—Traffic flow and transit will move quickly on a realigned, reorganized Embarcadero Roadway, allowing easier, more pleasant access to waterfront businesses.
—An improved and beautified Embarcadero will create new commercial opportunities and increase the value of existing property and businesses.
—New jobs and an expanded tax base will generate increased revenue for the city as several lots now covered by freeway ramps return to productive private ownership. Though limited to low rise development (40 to 65 feet), tax revenues from development will more than make up the city's share of the project.

in new electric trolley an articulated bus service, and in BART and Golden Gate Transit, have saved downtown San Francisco from gridlock!
IF you are concerned about the future of transit in San Francisco, IF you are concerned about reducing needless auto congestion, THEN we urge you to join Mayor Feinstein and the majority of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in voting Yes on Proposition J.

Norman Rolfe
San Francisco Muni Coalition
California Transit League
Jack Whaley
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Regina Sneed
Tony Kilroy
Hon. Jack Morrison
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Bay Area Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Hon. Amy Meyer, Recreation and Park Commissioner
Alan Lubliner

Robert Meyers
Dennis J. Potts
Kenneth R. Larch
M. Arthur Ganfield, Jr., AIA
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Delhant, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones

VOTE YES ON THIS CAREFULLY PLANNED PROJECT TO REVITALIZE OUR WATERFRONT!

Randall Rossi
Karol A. Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Brinckena
Jon Tsvichell
Fritz Arko
Michael J. O'Shea

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J OFFERS RESIDENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO A ONCE IN A LIFETIME OPPORTUNITY TO RECAPTURE THEIR WATERFRONT.

Coverring the Embarcadero into a tree-lined boulevard and building a new streetcar line will make the waterfront more pedestrian and transit oriented, that is, more people oriented.

A freeway structure that is a source of objectionable noise and casts a pall over a large part of the waterfront will be removed. The waterfront will be opened up to sunlight and fresh air and made more inviting and cheerful to those who wish to walk on one of the world’s outstanding waterfronts. Air pollution that is now retained by the existing elevated structure will be dissipated.

The transit orientation of the new waterfront will encourage energy conservation. Proposition J will:

— Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero
— Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway
— Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula

— Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero
— Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line
— Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won’t benefit San Francisco. Don’t let outsiders determine our future.

VOTE YES ON J FOR A BETTER SAN FRANCISCO.

Sierra Club Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage
Willinda McCrea* Bob Cramer* Rebecca Evans* Richard Livingston* Marilyn Clemens* Jennie Lew* Jeffrey Henne* Jane Winstone* Roger Boyer*

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J GIVES US A CHANCE TO CORRECT A COLOSSAL MISTAKE!

The Embarcadero Freeway should never have been built. The original plan was to build a freeway from bridge to bridge, destroying the Northern Waterfront, Fisherman’s Wharf, Fort Mason, and Marina Green in the process. When the people of San Francisco saw what was happening, they stopped it in mid-air—literally.

Walk under it. Hear the noise. Feel the gloom. See how it cuts out light.

It’s time to remove this mistake.

The new waterfront plan will give us a tree-lined boulevard, a new streetcar line, and a Muni Metro extension to the Southern Pacifc/Caltrain depot. It will give us a transit and pedestrian oriented waterfront that will give us pride and pleasure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J!

San Francisco Tomorrow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, with a membership of 1700 working architects in San Francisco, urges a “YES” vote on Proposition J. In 1968 the citizens of San Francisco stopped highway planners from ringing our waterfront with freeways. Today voters have another opportunity to return the waterfront to our citizens. Removal of the Embarcadero Freeway is one part of a carefully researched transit plan for San Francisco. This proposition supplies an unique opportunity to carry out a broad range of transportation improvements that will have many positive effects on the City of San Francisco.

Removal of the freeway will:

1. Return the waterfront to the people by removing this barrier to access and view.
2. Facilitate needed MUNI improvements.
3. Encourage development of the Embarcadero as a grand civic boulevard uniting the City of San Francisco.

The members of the American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition I and “YES” on Proposition J.

Donald Kennedy, FAIA
President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans love Their City, the ambiance, the Bay, waterfront, the views, the healthy neighborhoods.

Freeway builders did their damnest to destroy the City and divide our neighborhoods.

Now we can remove that damned spot, the concrete dinosaur, the hideous barrier that destroys our scenic views, the fence that keeps us from the Bay, the concealer of the Ferry Building.

Correct a mistake.

VOTE YES ON J.

Miriam Blaustein
Charlene Clark
Marie Cleasby
Zach Cowan
Dick Grosboll
Rick Hauptman
Tony Kilroy
Jean Kortum
Ira Kurlander
Jack Morrison
Andy Nash
Norman Rolfe

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

NO ON PROPOSITION J.

"J" is for JOKE—a cruel joke on us. What will J really do? Add traffic to every street east of Gough. Delay the construction of waterfront streetcar service. Cost millions in local dollars needed to improve MUNI. Create a ground-level freeway on the waterfront as big as Van Ness, with more cars.

I'm a private citizen who's concerned about traffic and what it's doing to our City. If you are too, vote NO on Proposition J.

Steve Colman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:

- Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
- Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
- If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
  - By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
  - Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
  - MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 63% increase in person hours of travel.
  - Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Blair C. Pascoe

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION A

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by boldface type.

3.202 Office of Risk Management
The furnishing is an elected under the chief administrative officer an office of risk management which shall review, analyze and report to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the finance committee of the board of supervisors the practices of the several departments, boards and commissions of the city and county regarding loss prevention and risk management, including the insurance requirements of the city and county. The office shall also establish and assist in the implementation of planning and operational guidelines regarding risk management and loss prevention for each department, board or commission. The chief administrative officer may appoint, at his or her pleasure, or contract with, a qualified individual or organization for the operation of the office. The qualifications of the individual or organization operating the office shall include relevant education, training and experience in insurance and risk management.

3.401 City Attorney

(a) The city attorney shall be an elective officer. He shall hold an office in the term of seven thousand dollars ($7,000), He shall appoint, and at his pleasure may remove, all assistants and employees of his office. He shall devote his entire time and attention to the duties of his office. He must, at the time of his election, be an elector of the city and county, qualified to practice in all the courts of the state, and he must have been so qualified for at least 10 years next preceding his election.

The city attorney must represent the city and county in all actions and proceedings in which it may be legally interested, or, for or against the city and county, or, any officer of the city and county in any action or proceeding, when directed so to do by the supervisors, except where a cause of action exists in favor of the city and county against said officer. Whenever any cause of action exists in favor of the city and county, the city attorney shall commence the same when within his knowledge or when directed so to do by the supervisors. He shall give his advice or opinion in writing to any officer, board or commission of the city and county when requested. Except as otherwise provided in this charter, he shall not settle or dismiss any litigation for or against the city and county, unless, upon his written recommendation, he is ordered so to do by ordinance.

The city attorney shall prepare, or approve as to form, all ordinances before they are enacted by the supervisors. He shall approve, by endorsement in writing, the form of all official or other bonds required by this charter or by ordinance before the same are submitted to the proper commission, board or office for final approval, and no such bonds shall be finally approved without such approval as to form by the city attorney. Except as otherwise in this charter provided, he shall prepare in writing the draft or form of all contracts before the same are executed on behalf of the city and county. He shall examine and approve the title of all real property to be acquired by the city and county.

He shall keep on file in his office copies of all written communications and opinions, also all papers, briefs and transcripts used in matters wherein he appears; and books of record and registers of all actions or proceedings in his charge in which the city and county or any officer or board thereof, is a party or is interested.

(b) The duties of the city attorney in connection with the bureau of delinquent revenue collection shall be transferred to and performed by the attorney for said bureau who shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

(c) There is established in the office of the city attorney a bureau of claims investigation and administration which shall have the responsibility of investigating, evaluating and proceeding for the several boards, commissions and departments all claims for money or damages made upon the city and county pursuant to section 7.703 of this charter or the general law of the State of California. Claim investigation functions of the police department in existence on June 4, 1996, shall continue as an adjunct to the bureau established under this section. Claims functions of the public utilities commission shall remain under that commission unless transferred to the bureau of claims investigation and administration by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the bureau shall also have the power to investigate events and occurrences giving rise to potential civil liability against the city and county and adjust and settle demands, within dollar limits to be established by ordinance, prior to their presentation as claims. There shall be established by ordinance a revolving fund to satisfy such demands adjusted prior to their presentation as claims. The bureau shall be responsible for the investigation of all claims and the analysis of city policies and practices upon which the bureau shall report and advise the several departments.

The city attorney shall appoint a chief of the bureau who shall serve at his or her pleasure. The chief of the bureau may appoint, subject to confirmation by the city attorney, investigators who shall serve at the pleasure of the chief; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of civil claims investigator or any equivalent classification on the date of approval of this amendment by the electorate shall continue to have civil service status to said position under the civil service provisions of this charter.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by horizontal strikethrough.

7.100 Materials, Supplies and Equipment

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreements for all contractual services required by the several departments' offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library department, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract. All purchases in excess of one thousand dollars ($1,000) shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases and a permanent record of all such quotations shall be kept. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifteen-thousand dollars ($15,000); fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) for materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifteen-thousand dollars ($15,000); fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of materials, supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two or more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned and may advertise for
bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concurs, he recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall direct the rejection of all articles which may be below standards, specifications or samples furnished. He shall not approve any bill or voucher for articles not in conformity with specifications, or which are at variance with any contract.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall also have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of county vehicles, equipment, etc. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of traffic, shall be thereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for and in use in all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and shall be held liable for loss or damage by negligence, shall report thereon to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.

7.103 Requisition, Contract and Payment

All purchase orders and contracts shall be based on written requisitions, or for materials, or supplies in common use in the various departments, on the purchaser's records of average use by all departments. Purchase orders and contracts in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000); fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) must be approved by the chief administrative officer. Beginning with fiscal year 1971-1972, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall approve all bids and vouchers for materials, supplies, equipment, and contractual services before the controller shall draw and approve warrants therefor. All contracts, for the purchase of materials, supplies and equipment shall be made after inviting sealed bids by publication. All sealed bids received shall be kept on file. When an award of contract is made, notice that the same has been made shall be given by one publication, and any interested person may examine the bids and records at the purchaser's office.

The purchaser of supplies shall by rules and regulations, approved by the chief administrative officer and the controller, designate and authorize appropriate personnel within the purchasing department to exercise the purchaser's signature powers for purchase orders and contracts ap-

proved as provided in this charter. 7.200 Public Works and Purchasing Contracts

The construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements, and the purchasing of supplies, materials and equipment, when the expenditure involved is in each instance not in excess of one thousand dollars ($1,000); fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000); fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), shall be done by contract, except as otherwise provided by this charter. It shall constitute official misconduct to split or divide any public work or improvement or purchase into two or more units for the purpose of evading the contract provisions of this section. In an emergency, provided an actual emergency be declared by the board of supervisors to exist, and when authorized by resolution of said board, any public work or improvement may be executed in the most expeditious manner. Notwithstanding any other provision in this section or this charter contained, upon the approval of the chief administrative officer to such an emergency work or improvement, and there may be expended by the department of public works the sum not to exceed five hundred dollars ($500) for new construction of any type in or upon unimproved or unaccepted streets.

Any public work or improvement estimated to cost less than fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000); fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) must be based on written estimates or on the average cost of similar work done in the past and shall be examined by the chief administrative officer or the heads of departments under the chief administrative officer.

The board of supervisors, by ordinance, shall establish procedures whereby appropriate city and county departments may file sealed bids for the execution of any work to be performed under contract. If such bid is the lowest, the contract shall be awarded to the department. Accurate units costs shall be kept and bids shall be obtained for all similar contracts in the department and all contracts or any contract, and the controller by the authorized officer to execute the contract, with the reasons for failure to accept such lowest bid.

If any provision of this section is in conflict with any provision of section 7.100 of the charter, the provision contained in section 7.100 shall govern and control.

Beginning with fiscal year 1978-79, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section. 7.201 Public Works Contract Procedure by Ordinance

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter and, in particular, the provisions of section 7.200, the board of supervisors shall by ordinance determine the monetary limits not to exceed fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) within which the construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements may be done by contract or by written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county, consistent, save as to monetary limits, with the manner provided for in section 7.200 and section 7.100.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in any provision of this section.

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D, Continued from page 25

...point two commissioners to terms of one year each, one commissioner to a term of two years, one commissioner to a term of three years, and one commissioner to a term of four years. Thereafter, the terms of the commissioners shall be for four years from the commencement thereof. Not less than one-fourth of the said commissioners shall be of the same sex, and one member shall have prior experience representing labor and one member shall have prior experience representing management.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will enforce the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of one hundred dollars ($100). The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission, after the regular day-working hours of 9am to 5pm. Such person or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

In accordance with section 3.500, the commission shall have the power and it shall be its duty to appoint an executive assistant to be the administrative head of the affairs under its control who shall serve at its pleasure; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of assistant secretary to the civil service commission on the effective date of this section as amended shall continue to have civil service status in the position of executive assistant under the civil service provisions of this charter.

3.661 General Powers and Duties

(a) The civil service commission shall be the employee-and-personnel-department of the city and county and shall determine appointments on the basis of merit and fitness, as shown by appropriate tests.

(b) The commission shall classify, and from time to time may reclassify, in accordance with duties and responsibilities of the employment, the training and experience required, all places of employment in the departments and offices of the city and county not specifically exempted by this charter from the civil service provisions thereof, or which may be created hereafter, and not specifically exempted from said civil service provisions. The commission shall likewise classify all other positions or other places of employment in the city and county service specifically exempted from the civil service provisions of this charter, but which, by the provisions of section 8.310, thereof, are made subject to civil service commission jurisdiction, in accordance with the basis of duties and responsibilities of the employment and training and experience required. The civil service commission shall be the judge of such classification.

(c) The civil service commission may hear appeals from an action of the personnel director with respect to:

1. Allegations of discrimination. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the civil service commission regarding allegations of discrimination shall be final and shall be enforced by every officer and employee; and
2. Allegations of fraud; and
3. Allegations of conflict of interest, pursuant to section 8.310.

(d) No action by the personnel director which is the subject of any appeal shall be stayed during the appeal process except by the unanimous vote of the civil service commission.

(e) The commission shall be notified of the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal of personnel regulations and may comment on such proposals. The adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing fraud or allegations of discrimination shall be subject to ratification by the commission. In addition, the adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, promotions, transfers, resignations and terminations shall be subject to ratification by the commission. The commission shall ratify or reject any such regulation within 60 days of receipt. The commission's failure to act shall be deemed approval.

3.662 Department of Personnel Administration

(a) The department of personnel administration shall be hereby established a department of personnel administration which shall consist of a personnel director and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. Any employee who was a permanent civil service employee appointed to the civil service commission and whose job function is placed under the department of personnel administration shall be continued without loss in the civil service rights as though said job function had not, by amendment to this charter, been placed under the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration.

(b) No civil service employee shall be placed in personnel administration on the basis of political patronage and shall provide a means to recruit, select, certify, appoint, train, evaluate, promote, career development, classify positions, administer salaries, administer employee discipline, discharge and other related personnel activities in order to maintain an effective and responsive work force.

3.663 Personnel Director

(a) A personnel director shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the mayor; provided, however, that the personnel director shall be selected from candidates nominated by any civil service commissioner and confirmed by vote of the board of supervisors. The nominee of the mayor may be appointed acting personnel director pending confirmation. The person so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will enforce the office of personnel director in the spirit of this declaration."

(b) The personnel director shall conduct appropriate examinations for employment, establish eligible lists based on their results and provide for certification of eligibles. The action of the personnel director on examination matters including,
but not limited to, announcements, minimum qualifications, classes of applicants, components, construction, weighting, content, type, list length, duration and certification shall be final.

(c) The personnel director shall adopt personnel regulations which, except as otherwise provided in this chapter, shall be consistent with the administrative management within the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration and the exercise of authority granted in this section, including, but not limited to, recruitment; applications; examinations; eligibility; duration of eligibility; retention of temporary and permanent appointments; regular performance evaluations; promotions; transfers; resignations; layoffs or reduction in force due to lack of work or lack of funds, reorganization, retraining, or completion of appointments; and classification. No personnel regulations shall be adopted, amended or repealed without a prior public hearing upon at least two weeks public notice by the personnel director and after confidential sessions with recognized employee organization which shall be required by statute. Civil service commission rules relevant to the foregoing as well as the provisions of former sections 8.322, 8.323, 8.325, 8.328, 8.329, 8.330, 8.331, 8.332 and 8.340 of this charter shall become personnel regulations on the effective date of this charter amendment.

(d) The personnel director shall conduct the salary surveys for the civil service commission as set forth elsewhere in this charter.

(e) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall establish procedures to review and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, sexual orientation, sexual status, color, marital condition or other non-merit factors. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this chapter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the personnel director shall forthwith be enforceable by every employee and officer, unless the decision is appealed to the civil service commission in accordance with personnel regulations.

(f) The personnel director shall investigate all employee complaints concerning job related conduct of City and County employees and shall promptly report to the source of the complaint.

(g) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall promote effective and efficient management through personnel programs that encourage high professional standards and exemplary performance.

(h) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall provide a procedure for resolution of employee disputes which shall be consistent with other provisions of this charter and shall be utilized by all department heads and appointing officers upon the expiration of the existing term of any otherwise binding agreements.

(i) Consistent with the foregoing and other applicable provisions of this charter, the personnel director shall delegate to the various officers appropriate personnel responsibilities, including but not limited to appropriate disciplinary procedures, and consult with appointing officers with respect to personnel regulations affecting their operations.

(j) Personal services contracts shall be reviewed and approved by the personnel director in accordance with the provisions of appropriate personnel regulations. Personal services contracts reasonably expected to involve payment by the city and county of more than five thousand dollars ($5,000.00) shall also be reviewed and approved by the Commission. Failure of the Commission to act within thirty days of submission of the contract by the personnel director shall be deemed to constitute approval by the commission.

(k) The personnel director shall establish a system of job classification. The provisions of section 8.200 shall govern whenever new classifications are created or existing classifications are reclassified.

(l) The personnel director shall be the judge of such classification determinations.

(m) From the solicitation of the appointing officer or otherwise, the department of personnel administration shall determine whether a position is in "character," temporary or permanent. Appointments may be made on a permanent, temporary or where confirmation is required, a provisional basis.

(n) Excepting sections 8.300, 8.360, 8.361, 8.365, 8.370, all but the second sentence of the paragraph of section 8.341 in section 8.346, the last sentence of section 8.400, all but the last three words in the first sentence of the third paragraph of section 8.401, sections 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.406, 8.407 and this section, wherever the words "city civil service commission" or "commission" appear in the personnel provisions of this charter, they shall be replaced by the words "department of personnel administration," "department," "personnel director" or "director" as the context permits, the words "rule" or "rules" shall be replaced by the words "personnel regulation" or "regulations," the words "general manager, personnel" and "secretary of the civil service commission" shall be replaced by the words "personnel director" and the words "section 8.360" shall be replaced by the words "section 8.362" or "section 8.363," as appropriate.

The clerk of the board of supervisors, after consultation with the city attorney, is hereby directed to conform the language of the charter as herein amended when next the charter is submitted for republication.

8.323 Protests, Written Questions and Answers

After the written portion of a civil service examination has been held, the questions used and the answers thereto shall be available for review by the participants. This review period shall not apply to non-competitive examinations or examinations on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written test. During the review period, participants shall have an opportunity to protest questions or answers they believe to be incorrect or improper. After all protests have been reviewed and the decision of the Personnel Director has been adopted, and the identification sheets have been opened, further changes in the rating key shall not be made.

8.324 Test of Tentative List of Eligibles

Following the completion of any examination, a tentative list of eligibles shall be posted for the inspection of the public and of candidates. The posting period shall be for a minimum of three (3) working days for the entrance examinations or five (5) working days for promotional or combined entrance and promotional examinations. During this period a fee for the inspector of the papers of each eligible shall be charged by the city. The amount of such fee shall be established by ordinance of the board of supervisors. The fee shall be waived for eligibles who wish to inspect their own papers. Inspection of papers shall include all documents supporting the eligibility of the candidate except the identity of the examiner giving any mark or grade in an oral examination nor the questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written test shall be provided. Only participants in the examination may review the questions used in the examination. If no protests are received during the posting period the eligible list is automatically adopted. If protests are received during the posting period the investigation and appeal of the general manager, personnel shall be expedited so that final adoption of the eligible list is not delayed beyond sixty (60) days after the date of posting.

8.325 Promotions in General

Except as specifically provided for in section 8.326, Promotions in General, the Personnel Services Commission shall provide for examinations on an entrance, promotion or combination entrance-and-promotion basis. Considerations shall be given to permanent employees in separate promotional examinations and in promotional examinations which are competitive, non-competitive or examinations for city-and-county service when the passing mark has been attained and may include evaluation of work performance and other credits. When an examination announcement is issued for a class on a promotion-or-entrance basis, there shall be one resulting list of eligibles which shall include all successful candidates who are permanent and entrance-in-order-of-relative-performance.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this or any other provision of the charter, an employee who has been certified for employment to a non-permanent position in a civil service classification shall be permitted to participate in promotional examinations on the same terms and conditions as a person holding a permanent appointment to a position in that same classification subject to a demonstration of satisfactory performance in a permanent position for a period of one year.

The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to promotional examinations announced after its effective date.

8.326 Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave

Employees under permanent civil service appointment who, because of absence on duly authorized military leave after June 27, 1950, did not participate in a promotional examination held after June 27, 1950, and during the period of time and in the manner provided for by rule of the civil service commission.

The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to promotional examinations announced after its effective date.

8.327 Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave

Employees under permanent civil service appointment who, because of absence on duly authorized military leave after June 27, 1950, did not participate in a promotional examination held after June 27, 1950, and during the period of time and in the manner provided for by rule of the civil service commission, shall be eligible for employment in a promotional examination when the examination is hereinafter referred to as the original promotional examination, shall after abrogation of the original entrance and promotion examination, shall be eligible for employment in a promotional examination when the examination is hereinafter referred to as the original promotional examination.

Provided: that persons and employees who were on entrance or permanent eligible lists shall, for the purpose of this amendment, be deemed to be appointees in the classifications from the time thereof the result of the original examination.

In order to qualify for participation in a subsequent promotional examination under the provisions of this section, such employees who desire to participate therein shall make application to the service commission within thirty days after the expiration of the period of time and in the manner provided for by rule of the civil service commission.

In order to qualify for participation in a subsequent promotional examination under the provisions of this section, such employees who desire to participate therein shall make application to the service commission within thirty days after the expiration of the period of time and in the manner provided for by rule of the civil service commission.

In order to qualify for participation in a subsequent promotional examination under the provisions of this section, such employees who desire to participate therein shall make application to the service commission within thirty days after the expiration of the period of time and in the manner provided for by rule of the civil service commission.

In order to qualify for participation in a subsequent promotional examination under the provisions of this section, such employees who desire to participate therein shall make application to the service commission within thirty days after the expiration of the period of time and in the manner provided for by rule of the civil service commission.

In order to qualify for participation in a subsequent promotional examination under the provisions of this section, such employees who desire to participate therein shall make application to the service commission within thirty days after the expiration of the period of time and in the manner provided for by rule of the civil service commission.
more than the minimum passing mark established by the civil service commission for inclusion on the list of eligibles resulting from the original promotional examination, his name shall thereupon be entered on the eligible list resulting from the original promotional examination for ten years, unless he fails to comply with the conditions prescribed for the continued eligibility of the applicant, in which event his name shall be removed from the eligible list and such vacancies shall be filled by selecting other eligibles. The commission shall have the power to make such regulations not inconsistent with law as may be necessary for the proper administration of its work.

Such employees shall be eligible for appointment from such lists of eligibles in accordance with the rules of the civil service commission as are established by the commission. Such appointments may be made at any time and from such lists as may be available, and the commission shall have the power to make such rules and regulations for the appointment of eligibles as it may deem necessary, which shall include provisions for the termination of appointments upon the expiration of the period of appointment, or upon the death, resignation, retirement, or removal of the appointee.

8.331 Limited-Tenure Appointments

When, in time of war declared by Congress, the United States is engaged in foreign or military service, the civil service commission may, in its discretion, authorize limited tenure appointments, the duration of which shall not exceed one year or one term of office, whichever is the longer, and shall be renewable. The commission shall have the power to make such rules and regulations for the appointment of eligibles as it may deem necessary, which shall include provisions for the termination of appointments upon the expiration of the period of appointment, or upon the death, resignation, retirement, or removal of the appointee, and upon other legal causes.

8.329 Certification of Eligibles: Rule of Three

Whenever a position is threatened by the promotion or appointment of another person, the commission shall certify to the appointing officer the names and addresses of the three persons standing highest on the list of eligibles for such position.

8.332 Temporary and Emergency Appointments

Temporary and emergency appointments may be made in accordance with the rules of the civil service commission for a period not exceeding one year or one term of office, whichever is the longer, and shall be renewable. The commission shall have the power to make such rules and regulations for the appointment of eligibles as it may deem necessary, which shall include provisions for the termination of appointments upon the expiration of the period of appointment, or upon the death, resignation, retirement, or removal of the appointee, and upon other legal causes.
mayor shall request and the supervisors shall make supplemental appropriation therefor in the manner provided herein for supplemental appropriations.

8.340 Dismissal During Probation Period

Any person appointed to a permanent position shall serve a probationary period. The civil service commissioner or personnel director shall by rule establish a probationary period of not less than six months' service and up to a maximum of twelve months' service for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed ranks of the police department, fire department, sheriff's department and San Francisco International Airport police force shall be for twelve months except that, with respect to members of the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve months' service from the day following completion of the prescribed department field training officer program, but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment; provided further that probationary members of the uniformed ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in section 8.434 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months in excess of a maximum of twenty-four months may be established for executive and management classifications. At any time during the probationary period the appointing officer may terminate the appointment upon giving written notice of such termination to the employee, and to the civil service commission giving the reasons for such termination. Except in the case of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments the civil service commission shall review the termination. The civil service commission shall by rule establish the procedures for such review. If the appointment results from an entrance examination the commission may declare such person disqualified or may return the name to the list of eligibles under such conditions for further appointment as the commission may deem just; if the appointment resulted from a promotional examination the employee shall have the right of appeal and hearing before the civil service commission. The commission shall render a decision within thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person disqualified; or (b) order such person reinstated to the position without prejudice; and the commission may in its discretion order that the employee be paid salary from time of entrance upon such appointment or upon the return of such person to a position in the classification from which that person was promoted and may reestablish the employee's eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same promotional classification under such conditions as the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall be final. Immediately prior to the expiration of the probationary period the appointing officer shall report to the civil service commission as to the competence of the probationer for the position; and if competent, shall recommend permanent appointment. Nothing in this section shall preclude the board of supervisors voting terminations for the purpose of future employability including terminations in the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments.

8.407 Definition of Generally Prevailing Rates of Wages

In this chapter, the term "wages" means all remuneration, by whatever name called, which is paid, allowed or promised to be paid, including all remuneration paid in lieu of wages, whether in cash or in kind, to any person employed by any person for any services rendered. Any person who holds any office or position in the municipal government shall receive wages as defined by this section.

The term "prevailing rates of wages" for employees governed by chapter section 8.401 and this section shall be defined as the rate ranges developed from the weighted average of the midpoint of the basic pay rates, excluding fringe benefits, for surveyed public employees, as to what are the generally prevailing pay rates for private employment to be determined as follows:

1. multiply the medians from the private and the midpoints from public employees data base by the number of employees in the given classification from each data base;
2. add the products of (1);
3. divide the sum in (2) by the total number of employees surveyed for that classification; and
4. extend this figure by 10 percent to establish the maximum of the range and reduce this figure by 10 percent to establish the minimum.

When fixed rates of compensation the board of supervisors shall fix basic pay rates as close as reasonably possible to prevailing rates; provided, however, that the board of supervisors shall not set the maximum rate of pay for any class in excess of the maximum prevailing rate for that class; provided further, however, that no employee shall have his basic pay rate reduced to conform to prevailing rates except as provided for in section 8.406. For those classifications of employment in which the practice is customary, the schedules of compensation shall provide for minimum, not less than three intermediate, and maximum salary steps and for a method of advancing the salaries of employees from minimum to immediate to maximum with due regard for seniority of service.

The term "basic pay rate" as used in this section is hereby defined as applying only to the basic rate of wages, with included range scales, and does not include any other benefits of employment or working condition benefits.

It is the declared intent of the qualified electors of the city and county that neither the board of supervisors nor the mayor have any hue or power to provide any benefits of employment except those enumerated already provided for in this charter and. Any addition, deletion or modification of benefits of employment enumerated in the charter shall be submitted, as a charter amendment, to the qualified electors of the city and county. The qualified electors expressly state that they understand that benefits of employment are sometimes referred to as "fringe benefits" of employment and the qualified electors expressly reserve the right to either grant or deny such fringe benefits or any type of employment commonly referred to as "working conditions" shall mean those compensations which must necessarily be provided in order for the employee to perform his job description duties efficiently and safely, and shall include but not be limited to such working conditions and benefits as are typically included in the administrative provisions of the salary standardization ordinance and the salary ordinance.

The board of supervisors may, in its discretion, may provide working condition benefits for employees covered under this section and section 8.406 of this charter only in accordance with the following provisions:

(a) The civil service commissioner or personnel director must determine, certify and recommend to the board of supervisors that the working condition benefit is equitable or necessary for the efficient and safe performance of the employee's duties as enumerated in his job description.

(b) The working condition benefit, as recommended by the civil service commissioner or personnel director, is substantially comparable for like work and like service to that provided for the job classification and is provided to not less than 50% of the employees of the class in the jurisdiction covered by the salary survey.

9.108 Initiative, Referendum, and Recall

(a) The registered voters shall have power to propose by petition, and to adopt or to reject at the polls, any ordinance, act or other measure which is within the power conferred upon the board of supervisors to enact, or any legislative act which is within the power of the board of supervisors to enact upon any other act introduced by the commission or officer of the city and county to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinance, act, charter amendment or other measure may be so proposed by filing with the registrar a petition setting forth said measure in full, signed by registered voters of the city and county as in number as the percentages hereinafter required of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election.

Any declaration of policy may be submitted to the voters in the manner provided for the submission of ordinances; and when approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting on said election or at a special election called for the purpose, said election shall be held not less than thirty days from the date of the call. Any such ordinance may be proposed by one-third of the supervisors, or by the mayor, and when so proposed shall be submitted to the electors at the next succeeding general election. No ordinance passed by the supervisors granting any public utility franchise
or privilege, shall go into effect until the expiration of sixty days from the date it becomes final. At the end of such sixty days such ordinance shall be in force and effect, unless within such period there shall be filed with the registrant a petition signed by registered voters equal in number to five percent of the entire vote cast for mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election, requesting that such ordinance be submitted to the electors. In case such petition is filed, such ordinance shall not go into effect until approved by a majority of the voters voting thereon at a general or special election.

If, before the time any other ordinance involving legislative matters becomes effective, there shall be filed with the board of supervisors a petition signed by qualified electors of the city and county equal in number to at least ten percent of the entire vote cast for all candidates for mayor at the last preceding general municipal election at which a mayor was elected, protesting against the passage of such ordinance the same shall be suspended from going into operation, and it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to reconsider such ordinance, and if the same be not entirely repealed, said board shall submit the ordinance to the vote of said electors either at the next general municipal election or at a special election to be called for that purpose, and such ordinance shall not go into effect or become operative unless and until a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon shall vote in favor thereof. The provisions of section 9.109 and 9.110 of the charter shall apply to and govern the verification and certification of such petition.

Annual budget and appropriation ordinances, supplemental appropriation ordinances, the annual salary ordinance, or ordinances amending the same, the ordinances levying taxes, any ordinance appropriating money from the emergency reserve fund, ordinances authorizing the city attorney to compromise litigation, and ordinances necessary to enable the mayor to carry out any of the powers vested in him in the case of public emergency as defined in section 3.300 of the charter, ordinances enacted pursuant to section 8.410 of the charter, as well as ordinances relative to purely administrative matters, shall not be subject to referendum.

Any elective official, the chief administrative officer, the controller or any member of the board of education or public utilities commission may be recalled by the electors. The procedure to effect such recall shall be as follows: A petition demanding the recall from office of the person sought to be recalled shall be filed with the registrar. Said petition shall contain a statement of the grounds on which the recall is sought. Any insufficiency of form or substance in such statement shall in no way affect the validity of the election and proceedings held thereunder. No recall petition shall be filed against any officer until he has held his office for at least six months.

(b) In the event the representative of the board of supervisors or the representatives of recognized employee organizations do not reach an agreement through the meet-and-confer process on matters contained in the current salary standardization ordinance by March 15 of any year, the mayor shall recommend and the board shall adopt a new schedule of compensation which reflects current prevailing rates for the classifications covered by Section 8.404 of this Charter the last good faith offer presented by the mayor or his or her representative.

In any year when an agreement on matters contained in the salary standardization ordinance has not been achieved, the civil service commission personnel director, upon receipt of a written demand from a recognized employee organization made upon the mayor and the personnel director shall prepare, prior to April 1, a schedule of compensation and administrative provisions which reflect additional rates that would be payable, and working conditions, based upon the last demands made by the recognized employee organization(s) which participated in the meet-and-confer process.

The schedule shall be transmitted to the registrar of voters for submission to the voters of the city and county at a general election or a special election called for the purpose, and said special election shall be held not less than sixty (60) days from the date of the call. No such schedule shall be withdrawn after it has been received by the registrar of voters. At said election, the ballot shall contain the following two alternatives:

(1) Approval of the schedule of compensation based upon the recognized employee organizations' last demands.

(2) Disapproval of the schedule of compensation based upon the recognized employee organizations last demands.

If a majority of the valid votes cast in the election favor paying the additional rates set forth in the schedule of compensation based upon the last demands of the recognized employee organizations which engaged in the meet-and-confer process, it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to amend the salary standardization ordinance to reflect said increased compensation.

---

**TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE**

### PROPOSITION E

**NOTE:** All sections are new.

Be it ordained by the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. This ordinance may be called the "City College Public Lands Preservation Ordinance."

Section 2. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall disapprove or revoke any building permit application for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, located across Phelan Avenue from the presently occupied campus of City College and consisting of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

Section 3. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall disapprove or revoke, WITH NO EXEMPTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS, any building permit application previously granted for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, which consist of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

---

**TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE**

### PROPOSITION F

**NOTE:** All sections are new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The People of the City and County of San Francisco desire and are entitled to a local government whose officers do not engage in, assist or promote compensated advocacy on behalf of private interests before City and County commissions and boards while also serving as City and County officers.

Section 2. No officer of the City and County may, during the term of office, engage in compensated advocacy before any City and County board or commission, or any member of the board or commission or its staff, in order to represent any private interest, for which representation the officer receives, directly or indirectly, any compensation, reward or gift.

Section 3. Officers of the City and County shall not discuss matters pending before their commission or department with other City and County officers or state legislators when those other officers or state legislators are acting as compensated advocates for a private interest.

Section 4. No member of the California State Legislature shall appear before any City and County board, department or commission as a compensated advocate representing a private interest.

Section 5. In the financing of city and county campaigns: (a) No person other than a candidate shall make, and no campaign treasurer shall solicit or accept, any contribution which will cause the total amount contributed by any person with respect to a single election in support of or opposition to such candidate, including contributions to political committees supporting or opposing such candidate, to exceed $500.00. (b) If any person is found guilty of violating the terms of this section, each campaign treasurer who received part or all of the contribution or contributions which constitute the violation shall pay promptly, from available campaign funds, if any, the amount received from such person in excess of the amount permitted by this section to the City and County Treasurer for deposit in the General Fund of the City and County. (c) This section shall not apply to any in-kind contribution of television or radio time to any candidate or committee granted to said candidate or committee pursuant to the "Fairness Doctrine" articulated in Bellmawr Broadcasting, 40 FCC 576 (1963).

Section 6. Any person violating the terms of this ordinance shall be subject to the penalties set forth in San Francisco Charter Section 8.105. Such penalties shall include, but not be limited to, removal from office.

Section 7. If any provision of this ordinance, or any application to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, it is the expressed intent of the people of the City and County of San Francisco that the remainder of the ordinance, or the application of such provision, or any other provision to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected thereby.

---
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THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION G

We the people of San Francisco declare this to be our policy:

1) IT IS IMPROPER TO PROFIT FROM OR PROVIDE SUPPORT TO THE RACIST POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SYSTEM IN SOUTH AFRICA, KNOWN AS APARTHEID.

Therefore it is necessary to sever commercial ties to South Africa, until people of all races obtain equal rights in that country, including equal voting rights.

2) COMPANIES HAVING SUBSTANTIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH APARTHEID MUST BE CONSIDERED IRRESPONSIBLE.

(a) The Board of Supervisors must determine which companies doing or seeking business with the City have the greatest ties to Apartheid. Companies that have a significant involvement in profiting from or maintaining the Apartheid system, may, on that basis, be deemed “irresponsible bidders.”

In purchasing goods and services and awarding other contracts, the city must give priority to avoiding such companies; the degree of the preference must be in proportion to the company’s complicity with Apartheid, according to the following criteria:

— how much business the company does in with South Africa;
— how much the company profits from that business;
— how much support the company provides the Apartheid government in taxes, loans, payments or other funding;
— the nature of the company’s South Africa business;
— the degree of the company’s cooperation with South African political censorship or secrecy agreements;
— the degree to which the company provides the South African government with the technology, materials and other means to maintain and enforce Apartheid.

(b) City funds must not be deposited or invested with any bank or other company which does business in or with, or makes loans to, South Africa.

(c) If any exception to the above policies is found to be necessary or appropriate, the responsible official must promptly and publicly report it to the Board of Supervisors, clearly describing the exception and the reasons for it.

The term “city” includes all agencies, departments, officials, employees, units and subunits of the city and county of San Francisco, and all funds administered by or on behalf of the city or county.

(3) WE CALL ON ALL OTHER PUBLIC BODIES AND PRIVATE OR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS TO ADOPT SIMILAR POLICIES.

(4) WE CALL A GENERAL PUBLIC BOYCOTT, FOCUSING ON THOSE COMPANIES HAVING THE GREATEST TIES TO APARTHEID.

The Board of Supervisors must determine and announce which company or companies are the worst offenders within each major industry, so that the public can focus its boycott on those companies.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION H

SUMMARY: THIS INITIATIVE STATES THAT THE AIDS EPIDEMIC IS A MAJOR PUBLIC HEALTH PROBLEM OF CONCERN TO EVERYONE, REQUIRING INCREASED SUPPORT FOR RELATED MEDICAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION. IT CALLS FOR A COUNCIL FOR AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION OR SIMILAR UNITED EFFORT TO STOP AIDS.

We the people of San Francisco hereby adopt the following policy:

The AIDS epidemic has rapidly become a major public health problem, costly both in human lives and in general community resources; the first steps in dealing with such a crisis are:

— the scientific research needed to discover and understand the nature, causes, co-factors, prevention, diagnosis and treatment of the disease, and
— the education of the public about the lessons of that research;

A proper program of research and education pays for itself in the long run;

Prompt action is urgent, because of the rapidly growing number of persons affected, increasing not only the suffering but also the difficulty of eradicating the disease;

The leadership and support of such an effort is everyone’s responsibility;

While San Francisco’s role in the overall effort against AIDS has been viewed as a positive example to other areas, the continued rapid increase in the spread of the disease means that we cannot afford to rest on our laurels or leave further responsibility to others.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

We call on all appropriate government bodies as well as medical, professional, charitable and community organizations and concerned individuals to join together in an all-out effort to stop AIDS;

We call for support to an organized unified effort along the lines of an AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION COUNCIL, including, in some form:

— A COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, to provide informed evaluations as to priorities among research projects and proposals, recommending those which are most cost-effective and most likely to produce early results useful in the prevention or treatment of the disease, to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts or neglect of promising approaches, and to provide the council with complete and up-to-date information regarding comparative results of experimental treatments, prevention programs and other existing research;

— A COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, to inform the public regarding prevention and other research findings, and to inform relevant government officials and the general public, concerning the factual basis for a re-ordering of current public funding priorities toward an increased war against disease, including research and education against AIDS and related conditions;

— A FUND-RAISING COMMITTEE, to solicit donations, lobby for grants, organize benefits and other fund-raising projects spreading the financial burden by appealing to many sources;

We ask the council and committees to be responsive and accessible to public input, to include representation of all interested groups, to consider all viewpoints, and be capable of prompt action;

We ask appropriate city officials to determine whether a suitable form of such a council already exists; if it does, we wish the city to support it actively; if not, we wish the city to seek to encourage its formation by such means as may appear proper.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION I

SUMMARY: This initiative asks “Shall we tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?” The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated portion of Route 480 known as the Embarcadero Freeway. This initiative declaration of policy will give the voters the opportunity to establish the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco regarding the proposed teardown of the Embarcadero Freeway.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION J

Shall the City replace a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if such replacement would open the Waterfront to its citizens, improve the tax base, and create a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic?
Candidates

FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER
JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: The Bill of Rights guarantees that every person accused of a crime shall have the effective assistance of counsel. Whether an individual is rich or poor, that person is entitled to a competent and dedicated attorney.
In San Francisco it is the duty of the Public Defender to uphold this sacred right. In every case, we provide the client with the best defense under the law.
In the last 7 years, my outstanding staff has done this work with the highest degree of professionalism. In the next 4 years, that same strong, professional, independent and ethical representation will continue.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John D. Burdis, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wal Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Sala Burton, 8 Shatt Blvd., Representative In Congress, 5th District
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
George Christopher, 1770 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Clerk
Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Artist/Community Organizer
Brian Getz, 55 22nd Ave., Attorney
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson, Sheriff of San Francisco
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Mattie J. Jackson, 324 Belvedere St., International Vice President, ILGWU
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for Children & Youth
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070 26th Ave., Executive Assistant to Sala Burton M.C.
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Community Health Director
Linda Ann Pest, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative
Jim Rivaldo, 430 Steiner St., Political Consultant
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Member, SF Community College District
Governing Board
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel W. Walker, 562 Campbell Ave., President — Local 250-A Transport Workers Union of America
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilaritas Ave., Minister
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor
C. R. Zanca, 1966 Pacific Ave., Auto Repair Proprietor

FOR ASSESSOR
SAM DUCA

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I was elected your Assessor in 1978 and re-elected in 1982. My years in the Assessor’s Office were spent in a professional appraisal capacity personnel and administration. I have two university degrees, the coveted MAI designation, and am the recipient of a special Congressional Advisory Board award from the United States Congress. I have served in an advisory capacity, both nationally and internationally, in property tax administration and will continue to serve the taxpayers of the City and County of San Francisco in dealing with Article XIII A of the State Constitution. My community involvement includes participation in cultural, civic business organizations.

Sam Duca

The sponsors for Sam Duca are:
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
Eugene L. Friend, 2910 Lake St., Investor
Nancy Pelosi, 40 Presidio Ter., Housewife and volunteer in politics
Walter H. Shorenstein, 740 El Camino del Mar, Chairman, Milton Meyer & Co.
Stanley Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Emma W. Louie, 1257 Jackson St., Housewife
Alfred S. Wiley, 2590 Jackson St., Chr. of Exec. Comm. of Diversified Holding Co.
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hindley Walk, Physician
Gerson Bakar, 2310 Hyde St., Investor
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired
Joseph C. Orenge, Sr., 866 Faxon Ave., Publicity Dept. — S.F. Giants
James A. Scatena, 101 St. Elmo Way, Chairman of the Board, Scatena York Co.
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher
Frances May McCauley, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Recreation & Park Commissioner
Frederick F. Campagnoli, 2609 Larkin St., Attorney
Betty Brooks, 1738 26th St., Field Representative
Jess Teruel Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Businessman
Cyril I. Magnin, 994 California St., Merchant
Ernest “Chuck” Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John H. Swanson, 415 Lake Merced Hill South, Bowling Alley Owner
Frances E. Goldman, 745 El Camino Del Mar, Child Guidance
Irma M. Bernard, 2182 34th Ave., Housewife
Leo J. Murphy, 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Charles M. Cunningham, 475 Connecticut St., Self Employed
Lawrence V. Eppinette, 815 Fell St., Conf. Secretary
Mary M. O’Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Volunteer & Homemaker
Elizabeth R. Duca, 16 Wawona St., Homemaker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Application for Absentee Ballot
is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

Name ____________________________
Residence Address ____________________________
Mailing Address ____________________________
Signature ____________________________

If the person to whom this pamphlet is addressed no longer resides at this address, please draw a diagonal slash (/) through the address label and drop the pamphlet in the mailbox.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:
The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible. This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
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The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The active members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Suzanne Guyette, Mary Ann Aronson, Mary Martin and Tom Owen.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 5, 1986.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
   • are a U.S. Citizen,
   • are at least 18 years of age on election day,
   • are a resident of California, and
   • are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don't want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, such as this one, you can only choose among the candidates of your party.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Senator, State Assemblymember, County Central Committee, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your polling place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters' Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don't know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can't help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 3, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I've written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don't know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

Q—Can a worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
   • Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
   • mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—An application form is not necessary. You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
   • your home address,
   • the address where you want the ballot mailed,
   • then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail by absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 3, 1986.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS CONCERNING VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS.
**HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER**

**SPECIAL NOTE:**
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

Note: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

**STEP 1**

**USING BOTH HANDS**
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, mete la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

A 第一步
请双手将选票插入自动投票机

**STEP 2**

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

B 第二步
请确认将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，符合于二红点之上。

**STEP 3**

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfora con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

C 第三步
请将举票之选举针由小孔垂直插入打孔投票。

**STEP 4**

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

D 第四步
投票选票之后，把选票取出，放入空信封内，票尾凸起在外。
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO UNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfore la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfore la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta a los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfore la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SÍ" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borraduras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precincto y obtenga otra.

請用附在投票記録冊上之打孔針在選票上打孔；千萬不要用鋼筆或鉛筆。

選民須知:

1. 請選所選舉的任何其他候選人，請在選票上箭頭所指之候選人名打孔。如有兩個或以上
2. 候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上箭頭所指之所有候選人中，選擇你要投票的候選人打孔，但不
要超過要選舉的規定人數。

3. 請選合格的非候選人，請在非候選選民選票信封所提供的預定空白上寫下候選人
所競選的職位和候選的姓名。

4. 請選任何提案，請在選票上箭頭所指"YES"或"NO"字樣打孔。

5. 選票上若有顯著污點或破損者，選票作廢。

6. 如果你在選票上打孔過了，撕破或弄破了，或撕破了、弄破了非選舉候選人的選票信封，應
把該選票遞交給選區的選舉員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

 PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOVERNOR</strong></td>
<td>GEORGE &quot;DUKE&quot; DEUKMEJIAN</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governor, State of California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gobernador, Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILLIAM H.R. &quot;BILL&quot; CLARK</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical Engineer/Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingeniero Electrico/Contratista</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VICEGOVERNOR</strong></td>
<td>H.L. &quot;BILL&quot; RICHARDSON</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Businessman/State Senator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hombre de Negocios/Senador Estatal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIKE CURB</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECRETARIO DE ESTADO</strong></td>
<td>BRUCE NESTANDE</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orange County Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor del Condado de Orange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RALPH E. WINKLER</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retired Major, USAF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comandante Retirado, Fuerza Area Estadounidense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MICHAEL CYRUS</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market Analyst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analista de Mercados</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>DAN STANFORD</td>
<td>Republican Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DON A. SEBASTIANI</td>
<td>Republican Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARZ GARCIA</td>
<td>Republican Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILLIAM CAMPBELL</td>
<td>Republican Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>DUNCAN M. JAMES</td>
<td>Republican Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRUCE GLEASON</td>
<td>Republican Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAWRENCE J. STRAW, JR.</td>
<td>Republican Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td>CLAUDE W. PARRISH</td>
<td>Republican Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. JOHN SHIMMON</td>
<td>Republican Party</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BILL ALLEN</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM H. PEMBERTON</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH WILLIAM KNOWLAND</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTHUR B. “ART” LAFFER</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE C. MONTGOMERY</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELDRIDGE CLEAVER</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN W. SPRING</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOBBI FIEDLER</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED DAVIS</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE HERSCHENSOHN</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT W. NAYLOR</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED ZSCHAU</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate not on the ballot, write the name and office title on the long side of your ballot.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States Representative</td>
<td>MIKE GARZA</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td>RUSSELL GRAY</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRI</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the State Assembly</td>
<td>MICHAEL ROCCO</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the State Assembly</td>
<td>TERENCE FAULKNER</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN): To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT R. BACCI</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Incumbent En posesión del cargo 現任縣中央委員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA KLOBUCAR</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>Incumbent En posesión del cargo 現任縣中央委員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT LAURSEN</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>Corporation Auditor Auditor de una Corporación 大公司審計員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRI</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>Incumbent En posesión del cargo 現任縣中央委員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPHINE SILVESTRI</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>State Central Committee woman Miembro del Comité Central del Estado 女州中央委員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN JOHN SULLIVAN</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Incumbent En posesión del cargo 現任縣中央委員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERENCE FAULKNER</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>Incumbent En posesión del cargo 現任縣中央委員</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 199

Vote por no mas de 5  请选最多5人
(SUPERINTENDENTE ESTATAL DE INSTRUCCION PUBLICA) State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Vote for One

BILL HONIG
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública
211

DANIEL NUSBAUM
Teacher
Maestro
213

JEANNE BAIRD
Educational Project Advisor
Asesora para Proyectos Educativos
215

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

(ASESOR) Assessor
Vote for One

SAM DUCA
Incumbent
En posesión del Cargo
222

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

(DEFENSOR PUBLICO) Public Defender
Vote for One

JEFF BROWN
Incumbent
En posesión del Cargo
229

(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.

NONPARTISAN BALLOT

ELECCION PRIMARIA
3 DE JUNIO DE 1986

CITY & COUNTY
### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $850,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>COMMUNITY PARKLANDS ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for acquiring, developing, improving, rehabilitating, or restoring urgently needed local and regional parks, beaches, recreational areas and facilities, and historical resources.</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>WATER CONSERVATION AND WATER QUALITY BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of $150,000,000 to provide funds for water conservation, groundwater recharge and drainage water management, and clarifies language in the Clean Water Bond Law of 1984.</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>DEPOSIT OF PUBLIC MONEYS IN CREDIT UNIONS. Authorizes Legislature to provide for deposit of public moneys in any credit union. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect. Legislation already approved implementing measure could result in greater interest income to state and local governments.</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. Provides exception to property tax limit when acquisition or improvement of real property approved by two-thirds of voters. Fiscal Impact: By itself, measure has no fiscal effect. No increase can occur in local property tax rate unless bond issue is approved by two-thirds vote. State costs for tax relief programs could increase. State income tax revenues could decline as taxpayers deduct greater amounts for property tax payments.</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>ALLOCATION OF VEHICLE LICENSE FEE TAXES TO COUNTIES AND CITIES. Requires allocation of Vehicle License Fee taxes to local governments. Fiscal Impact: Measure would have no direct fiscal effect. Prevents Legislature from changing the law to take vehicle license fees away from counties and cities. Measure would not prevent state reducing other forms of aid to local governments or changing existing formula for dividing vehicle license fee revenues between counties and cities.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>LEGISLATORS' AND JUDGES' RETIREMENT SYSTEMS. Limits retirement allowances for persons entering Legislators' and Judges' Retirement Systems after January 1, 1987. Fiscal Impact: Minor savings to state in future years if rate of inflation exceeds increase in salaries paid to current officeholders.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>NONPARTISAN OFFICES. Prohibits a political party or party central committee from endorsing, supporting, or opposing a candidate for nonpartisan office. Fiscal Impact: No direct state or local government fiscal impact.</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION, DISASTERS. Base-year value of property damaged or destroyed by disaster transferable to comparable replacement property in same county. Fiscal Impact: Local property tax revenues would decrease by an unknown amount. County assessor and tax collectors would have nonsignificant higher administrative costs. State would replace revenues lost by school and community college districts. State income tax revenues could increase due to lower property tax deductions on replacement properties. These state costs and revenues cannot be estimated.</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>MULTIPLE DEFENDANTS TORT DAMAGE LIABILITY. Plaintiff's noneconomic damage recovery limited to defendant's liability based on defendant's percentage of fault. Fiscal Impact: Substantial savings to state and local governments. Savings could be several millions of dollars in a year, varying significantly from year to year.</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>COUNTY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county correctional facilities and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of four hundred ninety-five million dollars ($495,000,000).</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgements against the City?</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C PROPOSITION C HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THE BALLOT BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.
CARGOS NO PARTIDARIOS. Prohibe a un partido político o a un comité central de un partido político participar, apoyar o oponerse a un candidato a un cargo no partidario. Impacto Fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo a los gobiernos estatales o locales.

IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE DESASTRE. El valor en año base de propiedad inmueble dañada o destruida por un desastre puede ser transferible a propiedad inmune a remanentes comparables en el mismo condado. Impacto Fiscal: Los reajustes provenientes de impuestos locales a la propiedad disminuirán en una cantidad desproporcionada. Las tasaciones y recaudaciones de impuestos del condado tendrían inflación menos importante que administradores más altos. El estado reemplazaría los réditos que los distritos escolares y colegios de educación superior dejaran de percibir. Los réditos del impuesto sobre a la renta podrían aumentar debido a menores dedicaciones en el impuesto a la propiedad en las propiedades de reemplazo. Estos costos y réditos estatales no pueden ser calculados.

RESPONSABILIDAD CIVIL DE MULTIPLES PARTES DEMANDADAS EN JUICIOS DE AGRAVIOS INDEMNIZABLES. Limita la indemnización que pueda recibir el demandante por daños no económicos a la responsabilidad del demandado basándose en el porcentaje de la culpabilidad del demandado. Impacto Fiscal: Alturas sustentables para los gobiernos estatales y locales. Los alturas podrían ser algunos millones de dólares al año, que variarían significativamente de año a año.

ACTA DE BONOS PARA DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA INSTALACIONES CORRECIONALES DE CONDADO DE 1996. Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelación, y reemplazo de instalaciones correccionales de los condados y la ejecución del mantenimiento diario en las mismas en conformidad con una emisión de bonos por cuantiosos noventa y cinco millones de dólares ($949,000,000).

PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONTADO

"¿Deberá la Ciudad establecer una oficina de administración del riesgo y un despacho de investigación y administración de demandas, para estudiar y reducir el riesgo de pleitos y sentencias contra la Ciudad?"

"¿Deberá autorizarse al Comprador a firmar contratos por menos de $50,000 sin la aprobación del Jefe Administrativo y a permitir que sus agentes firmen contratos en su lugar?"

OFICIALMENTE ELIMINADA

正式撤消
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong> Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter? <strong>YES 288</strong> <strong>NO 289</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong> Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years? <strong>YES 292</strong> <strong>NO 293</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong> Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500? <strong>YES 296</strong> <strong>NO 297</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong> Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid? <strong>YES 300</strong> <strong>NO 301</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong> Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council? <strong>YES 303</strong> <strong>NO 304</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong> Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway? <strong>YES 307</strong> <strong>NO 308</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong> Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic? <strong>YES 310</strong> <strong>NO 311</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSITIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

288 SI 贜成
289 NO 反对

"¿Debería la ciudad transferir la administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil o un departamento de administración de personal que tenga poder para cambiar las normas del servicio civil que el presente consejo en la Corte Constitucional?"

292 SI 贜成
293 NO 反对

"¿Debería la ciudad negar o revocar cualquier permiso de construcción para edificar en la Represa Balsa en las Avenidas Ocean y Phelan en los próximos tres años?"

296 SI 贜成
297 NO 反对

"¿Debería la Ciudad prohibir la defensa remunerada efectuada por oficiales de la Ciudad y legisladores estatales ante cualquier comisión de la ciudad, y limitar la cantidad con la que una persona pueda contribuir para un candidato a una oficina municipal en $500?"

300 SI 贜成
301 NO 反对

"¿Debería ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el bolívarizar las empresas que tengan mayor vinculación con la segregación racial sudaficana?"

VOTER SELECTION CARD

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR CANDIDATE SELECTION

PRIMARY ELECTION
JUNE 3, 1986

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM
7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.

Fill out this card and take it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

D Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter? YES 288 NO 289

E Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years? YES 292 NO 293

F Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500? YES 296 NO 297

G Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid? YES 300 NO 301

H Shall it be the policy of the public and private organizations to endorse Council? YES NO

I Shall it be the policy of the pet Freeway? YES NO

J Shall it be the policy of the pet Freeway, if it would in traffic? YES NO

VOTER SELECTION CARD

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>County Central Committee*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>5.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. of Equalization</td>
<td>6.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>7.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Representative</td>
<td>8.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate</td>
<td>9.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Assembly</td>
<td>10.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. Public Inst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to your sample ballot for the number of County Central Committee members to be elected. The number varies with each district.

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR PROPOSITIONS.
PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

288 SI
"¿Deberá la Ciudad transferir la administración general del sistema de servicio civil de la comisión de servicio civil a un departamento de administración de personal que tenga poder para cambiar las normas del servicio civil que el presente consta en la Carta Constitucional?"

289 NO
反対

292 SI
"¿Deberá la Ciudad negar o rescindir cualquier permiso de construcción para edificar en la Regresía Balboa en las Avenidas Ocean y Pacific en las próximas tres años?"

293 NO
反対

296 SI
"¿Deberá la Ciudad prohibir la defensa remunerada efectuada por oficiales de la Ciudad y legisladores estatales ante cualquier comisión de la Ciudad, y limitar la cantidad con la que una persona puede contribuir para un candidato a una oficina municipal en $500?"

297 NO
反対

300 SI
"¿Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el bolcater las empresas que tengan mayor vinculación con la segregación racial sudáfrica?"

301 NO
反対

303 SI
"¿Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el apoyar a todas las organizaciones apropiadas, públicas y privadas, para establecer el decálogo de un consejo para la Investigación y Educación sobre S.I.D.A. (A.I.D.S.)?"

304 NO
反対

307 SI
"¿Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el desalojar el Autopista Embarcadero?"

308 NO
反対

310 SI
"¿Deberá ser un plan de acción de los habitantes de San Francisco el repartir parte de la Autopista Embarcadero, si esto aumentara el acceso del público a la zona de los muelles y mejorara el tráfico?"

311 NO
反対
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

**BALLOT** — An official list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT** — If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL** — See Absentee Ballot, above.

**POLLING PLACE** — The place where you go to vote.

**PROPOSITION** — This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition I.

**MEASURE** — Another name for proposition.

**CHALLENGE** — Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

**SUPERVISORS** — Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

**CHARTER AMENDMENT** — The charter is the basic set of laws for the city government. A charter amendment changes one of those basic laws. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

**ORDINANCE** — A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

**DECLARATION OF POLICY** — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, the supervisors must carry out the policy, to the extent legally possible.

**INITIATIVE** — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

**PETITION** — A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

**PERMIT (noun)** — A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building. Proposition E concerns the issuance of a permit.

**COMPENSATED ADVOCACY** — Compensated means being paid for doing something; Advocacy means speaking or writing on behalf of someone else. Proposition F concerns the issue of compensated advocacy.

**RISK MANAGEMENT** — This field covers two areas: (1) deciding on when it is better to buy insurance and when it is better to be self insured or uninsured, then shopping for insurance; (2) identifying hazardous conditions on one's property and seeing that they are corrected so that liability and damage claims will be avoided. Proposition A concerns risk management.

---

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.
Risk Manager; Claims Investigation

PROPOSITION A

Shall the City establish an office of risk management and a bureau of claims and investigation and administration, to study and reduce the risk of lawsuits and judgements against the City?

YES 278
NO 279

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Consultants hired by the Chief Administrative Officer are available to City departments that have questions about "risk management", such as how to keep damage claims to a minimum and how to find the best insurance rates. In some cases, the departments use these consultants. In other cases, the departments make their own decisions. When damage claims are filed, some are handled by the City Attorney's Office and some are handled by City departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would amend the City Charter to create an Office of Risk Management, under the Chief Administrative Officer. The office would set risk management guidelines for all City departments, boards and commissions. Proposition A would also establish a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration in the City Attorney's Office. The bureau would be responsible for investigating, evaluating and processing all damage claims made against the City, except those claims made against the Public Utilities Commission and the Police Department. The bureau would also have the power to investigate potential suits against the City and to make settlements within dollar limits to be set by ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer and a Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want damage claims and risk management decisions to continue to be handled the way they are now.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not affect the cost of government. However as a result of its potential future application and the exemption of certain employees from the civil service provisions of the Charter, costs may be affected in an amount presently indeterminate."

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On March 10 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors voted "No."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON A

Last fiscal year, over 6,400 claims and law suits were filed against the City, costing us more than $10 million in settlements. I believe that it is time to change the way we handle our claims, secure insurance, prevent risks and settle legitimate claims against the City.

Last summer, we appointed a task force of citizens, under San Francisco Bar President Jerry Falk, to make recommendations on how to streamline our procedures and save money at the same time. The present system is very slow, costly, and inefficient.

Currently, all claims are investigated by the department involved. The City Attorney cannot act on any claim until the department is ready. This results in delay and duplication of effort and increased costs. A centralized and accountable Bureau of Claims Investigation and Administration under the City Attorney would be more efficient, cost-effective, and professional. It would enable the City to settle many claims quickly, before litigation is begun, saving the City the costs of defending itself in court and lowering the average cost of settling a case.

This can be accomplished without creating new jobs by simply moving into one office the city positions presently scattered throughout the government.

Vote "Yes" on A. Reduce the cost of City government.

Adoption of this measure would also formally establish responsibility for Risk Management under the Chief Administrative Officer; where it been unofficially since 1978. With this strengthened authority, the Risk Management Office would be responsible for the gathering of claims data on a City-wide basis, the creation of incentives for both reducing the possibility for injuries and damage and the number of claims for each department, the coordination of insurance purchasing and specific suggestions to avoid and reduce risk.

This amendment is presented with the recommendation of the Mayor's Task Force on Claims and Judgments, the Chief Administrative Officer, City Attorney, the President of the San Francisco Bar Association, and the President of the Lawyers' Club of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Each year the City spends almost $10 million to settle damage claims. It is estimated that the overall costs to the City for all risk-related activities exceeds $25 million a year. It is time for action to be taken to reduce these huge expenditures. This charter amendment is designed to do just that.

Claims Investigation and Adjustment

Right now, the City claims investigation process is decentralized and largely unorganized. Each department investigates its own claims. Investigators may or may not be specially trained for their duties. There is no uniformity of investigation procedure or claims reporting. In only a few departments do investigators contact injured parties within days of an accident in order to settle the claim quickly and economically.

This amendment will create a claims investigation and adjustment bureau in the Office of the City Attorney. Claims investigation and adjustment activities will be centralized, economized and made much more efficient. The new bureau will be able to respond immediately to accidents and claims, providing quick compensation to deserving persons while at the same time producing a prompt, professional investigation. This reform is greatly needed.

Risk Management

Presently, there is no overall plan for the management of the City's risk exposure: insurance purchasing, avoidance of industrial accidents, gathering data on accident patterns, etc. Again, risk management as a function is fragmented among the various City departments. As a consequence, departments cannot develop the necessary expertise to manage themselves to reduce risk-related costs.

This measure will establish a risk manager under the Chief Administrative Officer. For the first time, overall City planning will be possible in order to control risk. Departments will be told what activities are producing injuries or damage and advised on corrective measures. Private industry has been utilizing risk managers of this type for years. It is time that the City did the same.

This amendment will reduce the cost of government and insure a more efficient delivery of City services to all San Franciscans. We urge you to give it your unqualified support.

Board of Supervisors

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This charter amendment was proposed by a citizens' task force appointed by Mayor Feinstein. Its mission was to propose ways of reducing the number and financial costs of claims and lawsuits against the City.

The amendment has two principal features. The first is to centralize within the City Attorney's office the investigation of claims filed against city departments. This will allow for improved training and supervision of the investigators, who presently are scattered throughout city government. The result will be more efficient, cost-effective and professional investigation of claims. By improving the quality of claims investigation, the City can identify those claims which have merit and attempt to reach early—and less costly—settlements. Meritless claims will be denied with greater confidence that if suit is filed it can be defended successfully.

The second major feature of the amendment will establish a Risk Management office under the Chief Administrative Officer. Risk management is a concept widely used in private business. Risk managers are professionals skilled in reducing the overall cost of claims. The Risk Manager would be responsible for coordinating the City's insurance program, data collection, and correcting problems within the City which lead to claims. The Risk Manager would review those claims which have been filed against the City. Where it appears that an unsafe condition or practice has led to a claim, the Risk Manager would suggest to the affected department that corrective measures be taken. Reports to the Mayor and to the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors of the recommended corrections and the actions taken would ensure that the various departments will be responsive.

The City cannot eliminate claims and lawsuits against it. But it can limit its exposure by managing the claims process more effectively. This measure will reduce injuries and reduce claims, and that is good for everyone.

Jerome B. Falk, Jr.
Chair, Mayor's Task Force on Claims and Judgments Against the City

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Hear the Candidates and Issues
CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5
Saturday, May 31, 1986

12 Noon State Senate, Assembly, Congress and State Propositions
1:00 Proposition A—Risk Management & Claims
1:15 Proposition B—Purchaser & Contracts
1:30 Proposition D—Civil Service
2:15 Proposition E—Balboa Reservoir
2:30 Proposition F—Compensated Advocacy
3:00 Proposition G—Apartheid
3:20 Proposition H—AIDS
3:30 Propositions I, J—Embarcadero Freeway
3:50 Statewide Candidates

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Purchaser & Contracts

PROPOSITION B

Shall the Purchaser be authorized to enter into contracts for up to $50,000 without the Chief Administrative Officer's approval, and to permit his agents to sign contracts for him?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchaser must get the approval of the Chief Administrative Officer before signing certain contracts for more than $15,000. Only the voters may change that dollar limit. The Purchaser must personally sign every contract that comes through his office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would raise the limit on contracts requiring the Chief Administrative Officer's approval to $50,000. It would also allow the Board of Supervisors to change that limit by ordinance. Proposition B would also permit the Purchaser to name certain people in his office to sign contracts on his behalf.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer's approval only on contracts for more than $50,000. You also want the Purchaser to be able to name certain people in his office to be able to sign contracts on his behalf.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to require the Purchaser to get the Chief Administrative Officer's approval on contracts for more than $15,000. You also want him to sign all contracts himself.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On March 3 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 71
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON B!

The City's Charter requires that a permanent, non-elected City official, the Chief Administrative Officer, review all purchases and contracts above $15,000. Of course, CAO approval of major contracts is very important. But, due to inflation, the number of contracts that have to go to the CAO for approval is always increasing. Today there are too many documents requiring CAO approval. This slows down the purchasing process, occupies staff time—and ultimately costs the City money. Proposition B will raise the CAO approval level to $50,000, and help the City to improve the efficiency of its purchasing operations.

The City's budget includes more than $250 million for purchases on tens of thousands of contracts. At the current $15,000 review limit, the CAO must approve thousands of documents every year—a costly, time-consuming process. In the long run the City loses money because of the inordinate length of time required to complete all the paperwork.

An adjustment must be made to remove the smaller contracts from this cumbersome process. Review and approval of contracts under $50,000 should be under the responsibility of the City Purchaser, a highly trained and experienced professional, who reports directly to the CAO. By changing the present $15,000 to $50,000, it will be possible for the CAO to give each document that comes to him the attention it requires. And, by placing its orders and paying its bills faster, both the City and businesses will benefit—especially small business and those owned by minorities and women.

Proposition B will allow future adjustments to the limit to be made by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility will ensure the City's ability to adjust to inflation and changes in the market.

This amendment comes to you with the recommendation of auditors, controllers, bankers, and others who exercise top fiduciary responsibility within their own organizations.

VOTE YES ON B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will make essential changes to update the purchasing and payment procedures under the Chief Administrative Officer. These measures are necessary and desirable because they will save the City money by significantly increasing our management efficiency.

Right now, the City loses because it takes too long for contracts to be reviewed and payments okayed, which means that early payment incentives go unutilized. The CAO has to approve every contract greater than $15,000—and with City purchases last year over $250 million, the paperwork logjam is vast and overwhelming.

An increase in the review limit from $15,000 to $50,000 will make an adequate adjustment for inflation—$50,000 now is only about $15,000 in 1967 dollars. Proposition B will also enable the City Purchaser, who reports to the CAO, to maximize potential savings through early payments by designating appropriate personnel to approve contracts up to $50,000. These "Good Business" amendments are consistent with private sector practices and should be incorporated by the CAO in the City's best interests.

Finally, Proposition B will give the City the ability to respond quickly to changes in the market place by allowing changes in the CAO review limit by ordinance instead of Charter amendment. This flexibility is necessary to ensure that in the future we will not lose money because of institutional rigidity. Control is maintained with the necessity of Board action and Mayoral approval to adjust the review limit, and this same feature will allow for change when desired.

Vote yes on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.
Civil Service

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City transfer the general administration of the civil service system from the Civil Service Commission to a Department of Personnel Administration that has power to change civil service rules now written into the Charter?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the civil service system of the City of San Francisco. The structure of the civil service system and certain rules governing its operation are written into the Charter and can only be changed by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would make major changes. A Department of Personnel Administration would run the Civil Service system and would be able to change rules with Commission approval. Major features of Proposition D are described below. The complete charter amendment is printed in this voters’ handbook.

Department of Personnel Administration

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Certain civil service rules governing the general operation of the system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs, are written into the Charter and carried out by the Civil Service Commission. Only the voters can change these rules.

THE PROPOSAL: A department of Personnel Administration would be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. A Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor would run the Department. Certain rules governing examination, selection and appointment would be taken out of the Charter. The Personnel Director would be able to change these rules with the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

Civil Service Commission

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civil Service Commission runs the general operation of the civil service system, including the examination, selection and appointment of applicants for City jobs. The Commission also hears and decides appeals on civil service matters.

THE PROPOSAL: The Civil Service Commission would no longer be responsible for the general operation of the civil service system. The Commission could investigate the operation of the system, approve rule changes proposed by the Personnel Director, and hear and decide appeals only on claims of job discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest.

Employee Relations

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors appoints an Employee Relations Director to negotiate contracts with City employees; the Board approves all contracts.

THE PROPOSAL: The Mayor or his or her agent would negotiate with City employees; the Board of Supervisors would still approve all contracts.

What your vote means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing civil service system.

CONTROLLER’S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE
Controller’s Statement on “D”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself it would not directly affect the cost of government, as it removes many civil service policy-setting functions from the Charter and an independent Civil Service Commission and transfers responsibility for personnel matters, including labor negotiations, to the Mayor.

"As a product of its inherent flexibility and possible future application, costs could be affected or savings realized in amounts presently indeterminate but probably substantial."

How "D" Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative Charter amendment rewriting the civil service provisions of the Charter had qualified for the June ballot.

Robert Bradford, Jonathan Bulkeley, Lee Munsen and Mary Hilton, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 36,049 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 25,027 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

POLS CLOSE AT 8:00 p.m.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by line-through type.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. Consistent with the City’s and County’s affirmative action goals, no applicant or employee shall be selected, appointed, reduced in rank, removed or in any way favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, union activities, political affiliation or sexual orientation.

(b) The purpose of the civil service system is to obtain for the city and county the best qualified persons to fill city and county positions in a timely and economical manner, using professional, fair and equitable personnel selection and personnel management practices with consideration of the following criteria:

1. Recruiting, selecting and advancing employees on the basis of their ability, knowledge, skills and performance relative to the work to be performed.

2. Establishing equitable and adequate compensation, as provided elsewhere in this charter.

3. Training employees, as needed, to promote productivity and high quality performance and to facilitate career development.

4. Retaining employees during good service and separating employees for good cause.

5. Assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration, with proper regard for their privacy and constitutional rights; and assuring equal employment opportunity, based on the person’s ability to do the job.

6. Assuring that employees are protected against coercion for political purposes and are prohibited from using their official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the outcome of an election or a nomination for office.

(c) This charter does not limit the power of departments, agencies, or other subdivisions of the city and county in their exercise of management prerogatives including but not limited to:

1. Directing employees in the performance of their duties;

2. Hiring, promoting, transferring and assigning employees from those qualified;

3. Classifying positions in accordance with Section 3663 (k);

4. Disciplining employees;

5. Laying off employees because of lack of work, lack of funds or other reasonable cause; and

6. Determining the mission of its departments and divisions, and its budget, organization, the number of its employees, and the numbers, types, classifications and grades of positions or employees assigned to an organization unit, work project, shift or tour of duty, and the methods and technology of performing its work.

8.310 Declaration of Personnel Policy

(a) All appointments in the public service shall be made for the good of the public service and solely upon merit and fitness, as established by appropriate tests, without regard to partisan, political, social or other considerations. No person shall in any way be favored or discriminated against in employment or opportunity for employment because of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, age, religion, national origin or other non-merit factors. Notwithstanding, anything to the contrary in subsection (a) or any other provisions of the charter, it shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, consistent with a policy of acquiring qualified personnel for the service of the city and county, to encourage the hiring of blind persons. It shall further be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that no otherwise qualified blind person shall be discriminated against in examination, re-examination, appointment, re-appointment, waiver of eligibility for appointment or re-appointment, promotion or demotion in any class, subclass or position in the civil service unless eyesight is indispensable for the performance of the duties and responsibilities of the class, subclass or position. It shall be the duty of the commission to classify, and from time to time it may reclassify, places of employment in the civil service the duties of which may be efficiently performed by qualified blind persons and to conduct appropriate examinations which will fairly test the capacity of blind persons as well as sighted persons to perform such duties.

2:203-2 Employee Relations Director

—Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3:510 of this charter, the employee relations director shall be appointed by the board of supervisors and shall hold office at the pleasure of said board.

3:102 Employee Relations

It shall be the duty of the mayor to meet and confer with employee representatives on behalf of the city and county and all its constituent boards, commissions, departments and agencies as required by applicable law. These duties may be performed by a designee of the mayor who shall serve at the pleasure of the mayor. Nothing herein shall limit the mayor from contracting for the performance of these duties.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the mayor shall submit all memoranda of understanding or ordinances to be enacted pursuant to Article VIII of this charter herein to the Board of Supervisors for its approval or rejection. 3:660 Commission; Composition; Meetings

There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county shall have the general powers and duties set forth in section 3:661.

The civil service commission shall consist of five members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in-office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and this charter section as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981 and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981 and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed. The respective terms of the commissioners who shall hold office on the effective date of this section as amended shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date. Thereupon, the mayor shall appoint continued on page 73
Civil Service

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D.

Vote YES and join 34,000 San Franciscans who signed petitions to get this crucial reform on the ballot. "D" clears the way to modernize Civil Service so that it is fair and efficient. The present system is a 50-year conglomerate of rules that tie the City's hands—

— A protest by one applicant can hold up hiring for an entire job classification for months—even years.
— Often tests cannot be given frequently enough to maintain current tests of qualified employees. This leads to delays and temporary appointments that make hiring top candidates all but impossible.
— Appointments to jobs are restricted to the top three names on a list even though more than three people have the same score.
— Many provisions are out of date. Some deal with hiring during the Korean War. Others limit our ability to carry out affirmative action.

"D" would remove archaic rules from the Charter so they could be changed as the times require—subject to meet and confer and public hearings. Job tests could be expedited; hiring and promotions speeded up; opportunities opened to women and minorities.

Specifically, Proposition D:
1) Creates a Department of Personnel Administration at no additional cost. Like other U.S. cities, day-to-day administration would be the responsibility of a director, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Supervisors.
2) Makes the Civil Service Commission the oversight body to set policy and hear appeals. Rulings would have to be within 60 days, eliminating endless delays.
3) Moves the office of labor relations from the Supervisors to the Mayor, who must make the tough-minded decisions to balance the budget. Never again could the Board give labor $27 million for "comparable worth."

This reform is the product of years of work with SPUR, League of Women Voters, Chamber of Commerce. Members of the Board of Supervisors could have put the reform on the ballot last year but bowed to some labor leaders, and 34,000 San Franciscans had to do the job for them.

Proposition D will enable City government to work better for you. Vote YES.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON ‘D’

Proposition D is a complex proposition with a simple goal: remove the archaic restrictions on the hiring, promotion, or firing of city employees and bring San Francisco's personnel system into the modern age.

Archaic is the only way to describe a system that keeps equally qualified people from competing for a job, and that takes months—sometimes years—to fill vacancies.

For example, if 50 people score equally high on a competitive examination, shouldn't they all have a chance for any job for which they are eligible? Not under the current system, which requires complicated tie-breaking rules not at all related to a person's qualifications or abilities.

Or what about being able to hire the best person available for a given job? Currently, eligibility lists are frozen for two years and every person on each list, including the lowest-scoring, must be offered a job before the highest-scoring person on a more recent list. Private businesses couldn't function saddled with such absurdities.

Proposition D cuts through the red tape. It creates a modern personnel department, with a director responsible for carrying out rules to ensure fairness and efficiency. Accountable to the Mayor, the director would be selected from a list provided by the Civil Service Commission, and subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.

The Civil Service Commission remains an independent body, with the right to approve new personnel rules and hold hearings on abuses. Also under 'D', negotiations with employee unions would be under the Mayor, subject to approval by the Supervisors, providing checks and balances in balancing our budget.

With greater accountability and continued checks and balances, Proposition D will open the way to more efficient government in our City.

Bill Maher, Supervisor
Louise Renne, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

YES ON ‘D’

Proposition D is a necessary reform to the City's Civil System. As the City's Chief Administrative Officer for almost ten years, I have found that quality employee hiring is difficult and the process causes long delays.

The current system is:
• inflexible. The City cannot hire and promote the most qualified persons.
• inefficiently administered by a commission. Other large

(continued)
cities do not have such a bureaucratic process.

- antiquated. Civil service rules represent practices of the 1950s rather than the 1980s.

The new system:

- allows the Mayor to appoint an effective personnel director, who controls administration and procedures.
- allows efficient procedures to be developed with review of the Civil Service Commission.
- eliminates cumbersome and dated rules and practices.
- expedites City hiring and promotion procedures.

I urge a Yes vote on Proposition D.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

It's 1986 and we're still trying to manage City business as if it were 1932. As heads of City departments, charged with the daily responsibility of putting out fires, fighting crime, maintaining hospitals, parks, libraries and providing other essential services, we know from bitter experience about shortcomings of the existing Civil Service System.

Enacted with the City Charter in 1932, the system is foundering in red tape. Outdated rules are the subject of endless challenges. Tests are put off; vacancies go unfilled; promotions delayed; any appeal, however groundless, stops the process in its tracks.

Proposition D would take old procedures out of the Charter so they could be changed in an orderly process by the Civil Service Commission, which also would hear appeals.

Day-to-day administration of the tests—the content, scoring, all the myriad details of managing a complex system, would be put into a modern, highly professional personnel office. Tests would be speeded up. Hiring would keep pace with need. Promotions would be on the basis of competence. High performance would be the standard. Discipline could be imposed with

working rights fully protected, and women and minorities would be assured equal opportunity.

Proposition D will help improve management and the quality of City services. Vote Yes on D.

Frank Jordan, Chief of Police
Emma Condon, Fire Chief
Don Birr, Director, Public Works
Mary Burns, General Manager, Recreation & Park
John Franz, City Librarian
Eugene Garland, Director, Port
Marvin Getzinger, Purchaser
Willie Hamilton, Executive Director, Redevelopment Agency
Claire Isaacs, Director, Arts Commission
Ray Keg, Director, Parking Authority
Dean Macris, Director, City Planning
Guant McKins, Director, Human Rights Commission
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, PUC
Joyce Rame, Director, Aging
Ed Sarsfield, General Manager, Social Services
Thelma Shelley, Managing Director, War Memorial
Moira So, Executive Director, Community Development
Louis Turpin, Director of Airport
Dr. David Werdegard, Director, Health Department

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The hiring practices outlined in San Francisco City Charter have been virtually unchanged since 1931, a severe handicap in running a modern city. Proposition D is designed to streamline the charter and ensure that the rights of present city employees and candidates for city jobs are protected, while improving the hiring process itself. The initiative also builds management accountability in the city system.

Proposition D Is More Fair, More Efficient, More Economical

The day-to-day personnel functions, including hiring, will be consolidated under a Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. Decisions of the Director of Personnel on examination content and administration are final, unless a decision is stayed during the appeal process by a unanimous vote of the Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D will make it easier to modernize the many archaic Civil Service rules and procedures now included in the Charter, while maintaining a strong and independent Civil Service Commission to safeguard the merit system and protect the rights of city employees. Many detailed rules will come out of the Charter and will become personnel regulations. These regulations can then be modernized, but only through a process which includes public hearings and meet and confer sessions with the union involved. In addition, the Civil Service Commission must approve any changes or new regulations governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfer, resignation and terminations.

Proposition D Will Improve Performance And Public Confidence

The openness and fairness of the proposition will benefit everyone. Well-qualified job candidates will have a better chance of being hired, and well-qualified job holders will have a better chance of being promoted. This means generally better job performance in all departments, resulting in higher employee morale and more public confidence in city government.

Submitted by
Louis Hop Lee, President
Civil Service Commission
Lee Munson, Member Civil Service Commission and Treasurer, San Franciscans for Fair and Efficient Government

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON D

Cities can survive only with strong management. The greatest budgetary restraint must be exercised to assure that full value is received for each tax dollar spent.

With firm limits on what it can spend and faced with a possible loss of Federal funds next year, the City must be managed with the greatest possible efficiency.

Essential to greater efficiency is the need for Civil Service reform. As members of City Commissions, we constantly confront the torturous delays and confused rules that gridlock the present system. The present system simply can't respond to the City's personnel needs.

Qualified applicants become frustrated and seek employment elsewhere. Promotions are blocked. Morale suffers. Temporaries fill in; overtime mounts. The ability to plan is crippled; management is weakened.

Proposition D would put the system on a business-like basis. A personnel department would handle day-to-day administration. The Civil Service Commission would be the watchdog to assure the integrity of the merit system.

This streamlined system would replace what is now inflexible and cumbersome. Testing could be accelerated; hiring made more efficient and promotions made on time. The result would be greater efficiency and elimination of costly waste.

Vote Yes on D.

Jerry E. Berg, President, Board of Permit Appeals
Henry Berman, President, Fire Commission
Ma Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Hector Chinchilla, Rent Board
Rev. Harry Chuck, Housing Authority
Dr. Arthur Coleman, President, Port Commission
Owen Davis, Police Commission
J. Edward Fleischell, Airports Commission
H. Nolton Flynn, President, Public Utilities Commission
James Foster, Health Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation & Park Commission
James Russell, President, Housing Authority
Anne Halsted, Port Commission
Tommy Harris, Recreation & Park Commission
Tom Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Walter Jebe, Public Library Commission
Jeffrey Lee, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Philip Lee, President, Health Commission
Bruce W. Lillenthal, Small Business Advisory Commission
Jacqueline Nenerevski, President, Arts Commission
Toby Rosenblatt, President, Planning Commission
Dr. David Sanchez, President, Police Commission
Joan San Jule, Housing Authority
John Patrick Short, President, Parking Authority
Marjorie G. Stern, President, Public Library Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D contains civil service reform measures urged by the League of Women Voters since 1969.

Proposition D will:
— Modernize the City’s outdated personnel system by creating a Director of Personnel, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors
— Preserve the principles of merit through policies set by the Civil Service Commission
— Create a more responsive Civil Service system at no additional cost to the taxpayer

EFFICIENCY AND FLEXIBILITY

Proposition D transfers authority for day-to-day management of the City’s personnel system from the Civil Service Commission to the Director of Personnel. This will:
— Prevent hiring delays
— Ensure only the most qualified individuals are hired and promoted
— Provide City managers with more administrative flexibility

FAIRNESS FOR EMPLOYEES

Proposition D will:
— Safeguard the rights of City workers
— Protect gains made in hiring women and minorities
— Retain the role of the Civil Service Commission as a merit appeals board
— Retain the ability of the City’s unions to negotiate working conditions
— Create a system that can respond quickly and fairly to the needs of City workers

Proposition D will bring the Civil Service system into the 20th century by making the Mayor accountable for the management of a system employing more than 25,000 people. Hiring by merit is still guaranteed by the Charter. Please join us in voting for this Reform!

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
Esther Marks, Past President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote Yes on Proposition D the Civil Service Modernization Initiative.

Prevent abuse of a system that was intended to serve the public and protect against favoritism. Prevent situations like this: an employee failed to report to work for a week without explanation; he was telephoned, notified by certified mail and a message left under his door; he was terminated 13 days later; he did not appeal the termination and the civil service commission up-
Civil Service

Two months later, the employee petitioned the commission for reinstatement. The employee got his job back, not because the process of termination was wrong but because the commission had a long standing objection to using “absent without leave” as a reason for firing.

The quality of public services is dependent upon the effectiveness of the staff who deliver them. The primary role of the civil service commission should be to facilitate recruitment and retention of the best available personnel. It must protect against favoritism and must assure that everyone has an equal and fair chance at employment.

The present system does not do that. We feel this initiative will make the system work better, for the managers, for the employees and for the public.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco government is huge, with a budget of more than $1 billion per year and 25,000 employees. It is expected to solve serious problems. This requires that the City have the ability to hire and promote talented people to do the job.

The present civil service system is so tied up in red tape that jobs remain vacant for six months to a year, and all too often someone who is not capable of doing a good job is hired. Your tax dollars are being wasted, and you are not receiving the quality of services you need and deserve.

Proposition D will modernize San Francisco’s civil service system. It separates the personnel department from the Civil Service Commission, and puts the department under the Mayor where it belongs. The Mayor is responsible for balancing the budget and delivering city services as efficiently as possible. She cannot do this unless she can find capable people to do the job. That is the task of the personnel department in any organization.

Proposition D will also insure that the independent Civil Service Commission has sufficient authority to require the personal system to be fair in its treatment of City employees. The Commission will be able to issue subpoenas and require testimony of witnesses on investigations it conducts. Should it find that discrimination has occurred, it can issue orders that must be obeyed.

Most major American cities, and virtually all cities and counties in California, have the kind of civil service system that will be established by Proposition D. San Francisco’s present system is still mired in the past. It hobbles the ability of the City to deliver services and spend your tax dollars as efficiently as possible.

SPUR has not placed a statement in the Voter’s Handbook for any other issue over the past 15 years. We feel that Proposition D is so vital for San Francisco’s future that we are making this appeal for your support.

Vote “YES” on Proposition D.

SPUR—the San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Reform Initiative, will give San Francisco citizens the HIGH PERFORMANCE GOVERNMENT necessary to meet the many challenges of the future. Proposition D corrects the outdated and inflexible requirements originally written in San Francisco’s City Charter in 1931. It will eliminate the problems which prevent San Francisco’s personnel system from operating with efficiency the City’s voters and taxpayers deserve:

- Proposition D insures City jobs will be filled from current lists of the most qualified employees.
- Proposition D prevents ungrounded appeals from delaying for years the appointment or promotion of qualified employees.
- Proposition D eliminates the repetitive tasks currently monopolizing the Civil Service Commission meetings and directs the Commission to serve as an appellate body to protect the City’s good employees.
- Proposition D centralizes the day-to-day operation of the civil service system and makes the Director of Personnel responsible to the Mayor.
- Proposition D simplifies the budgetary process by making the Mayor the City’s chief labor negotiator, responsible for setting working conditions within the City’s financial capacity.

Proposition D is the result of years of painstaking review by the most experienced, able and respected management experts in San Francisco. It is a plan intended to move City government out of the 1930s and equip San Francisco to enter the twenty-first century without being burdened by the red tape of the past.

After ten years of commitment to improving our City, the Mayor’s Fiscal Advisory Committee is convinced adoption of Proposition D is one of the most important issues facing the voters. CHANGE IS LONG OVERDUE. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by,
The Mayor’s Fiscal Advisory Committee

David Anacher
Jerome Anderson
Richard Blum
Charles Chapman
Arthur Cooke, Jr.
Benton Dulin
James Edgar
Ruben Garcia

Robert Hayden
Walter Hovland
John Jacobs
Michael McGill
Ellen Newman
Roy Northman
Frank Tanim

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PERSONNEL MANAGERS SAY YES ON
PROPOSITION D

As the personnel managers for City Departments, we are charged with the responsibility of managing the City’s personnel system. The activities include examinations, hiring, training, discipline, union-management relations, affirmative action and compensation. No one knows better than we the frustrations experienced in attempting to monitor an unbelievable sequence of overlapping bureaucratic activities in attempting to get the job done.

Proposition D will bring our personnel system into line with most other public personnel systems. The improved system will create the potential for being more responsive to the needs of operating departments. It will improve labor relations by transferring this function to the executive branch of government where it belongs.

Proposition D will streamline certain routine procedures resulting in a reduction of cost and time. Under the current system delays are experienced due to lengthy appeals during which time the departments’ objectives are delayed.

Proposition D will create an atmosphere of increased accountability for department managers in the areas of affirmative action, discipline and job performance.

Proposition D has been endorsed by the San Francisco Council of Human Resource Managers, the association of over one hundred personnel managers in City government.

Proposition D strengthens merit system principles. Civil Service commissioners will have more time to enforce and protect these principles rather than being bogged down in the day-to-day activities of administration.

Proposition D will help bring about improved methods and practices in personnel administration and should result in a more competent and effective workforce which the citizens of San Francisco have a right to expect.

Alvin W. Schaaf
Personnel Director
Recreation and Park Department
Marsha Ramirez
Personnel Officer
San Francisco Port
Edward M. Gaziano
Personnel Director
Department of Health
James Horan
Senior Personnel Officer
Department of Social Services
James Ilincic
Personnel Director
San Francisco International Airport

Andrea R. Gourdine
Manager, Bureau of Personnel & Training
Public Utilities Commission
Mori Noguchi
Senior Department Personnel Officer
Mary Smith
Senior Personnel Officer
Laguna Honda Hospital
Theilda Putet
Senior Personnel Officer
San Francisco General Hospital
John Burke
Personnel Director
Controller’s Office

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will assist the Department of Public Works by streamlining the Civil Service process.

- Under the current system, the duration of eligible lists from 2 to 4 years hampers the Department from hiring graduates of colleges and universities on an annual basis. Consequently, many excellent candidates are not entered into the Civil Service System. Passage of the proposition will improve the quality of the pool of applicants and thereby the quality of public service given by the Department.

- The establishment of a Personnel Director to administer the day-to-day tasks of the system will speed up the decision making process to the advantage of employees and management alike.

- The proposition still calls for checks and balances in that the Commission will continue to hear appeals on discrimination, fraud and conflict of interest. The Commission will act as a watchdog while leaving the general administration to the Personnel Director.

The initiative will make for an improved system for employees, management and the citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Donald Birrer
Director of Public Works

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Passage of this amendment will update our civil service system. These changes will make it comparable to other merit system agencies. Some of these changes are

(A) removal of administrative details from the charter which inhibit timely and effective personnel actions.

The following subjects will be placed in personnel regulations:

- Protests of written questions and answers
- Protests of tentative employment lists
- Promotional examinations

- Examinations for employees on military leave
- Certification of eligibles—Rule of three
- Duration of employment lists
- Temporary employee appointments
- Allows continuous up-dating of employment lists.
- Allows equitable treatment of job candidates with same test score.
- Realigns responsibilities: the Civil Service Commission dealing primarily with compliance and adjudication activities (continued)
while the Personnel Department administers the day-to-day operation of the merit system.

Equally Important the amendment retains important merit system provisions dealing with:
- Employee salary setting procedures
- Positions subject to merit system examinations
- Public hearing and meet and confer requirements
- Penalties for examination fraud
- Seniority, meritorious service and applicable educational credits for promotional examinations in the Police/Fire Dep-

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D, the Civil Service Initiative, is a long-overdue reform to streamline antiquated hiring practices in San Francisco's fifty-year-old charter. Proposition D will ensure that the best and brightest job candidates are chosen to serve our city, thus promoting excellence in job performance and helping to eliminate incompetence. This initiative builds management accountability in the city system, while giving the Civil Service Commission the independence to protect the rights of women and minorities.

A Better, More Efficient System at Less Cost

Proposition D consolidates personnel functions, including hiring, under a new Director of Personnel Administration, who is appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors. The Director has final authority over content of examinations given city job applicants, so more flexibility is possible in finding truly qualified candidates.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

For more than a half-century, San Francisco Mayors have abided by the employee examination, hiring and promotion policies administered by a strong and independent Civil Service Commission.

Proposition D is a deceptive and dangerous scheme that would give future Mayors and top-level bureaucrats the power to ignore competence and reward political loyalty.

Proposition D would take key Civil Service employment rules out of the City Charter and make them subject to wheeling and dealing by City Hall politicians.

There's an old saying — "if it ain't broke, don't fix it.

Civil Service has worked well for more than 50 years. Proposition D is unnecessary, ineffective and even counter-productive.

It's not just deceptive, it's dangerous.

Joseph L. Alioto
Former Mayor of San Francisco

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Time and time again, different groups have put various propositions on the ballot to weaken our Civil Service System and reintroduce political patronage into City employment practices. And every time the voters have wisely rejected these schemes, no matter how cleverly they have been disguised.

Proposition D is just another power grab by bureaucrats at the top in City Hall.

We've said NO! loud and clear in the past. Let's say NO one more time.

Submitted by:
TAXPAYERS FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT
Thomas Scanlon
City Treasurer, Retired

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “D”!!!

During the eight years while a member of the Board of Supervisors, I fought hard to reform the Civil Service Commission and to bring working conditions and city workers' pay equitable to both workers and taxpayers. I fought to insure an independent Civil Service Commission that would remain just that— independent and free from political influence and political patronage of particularly the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

I am truly saddened by the Mayor's insistence in bringing this disastrous Proposition “D” before the voters. Some of the Supervisors rejected this misguided measure for what it is; an unwise consolidation of authority to hire, fire and promote city workers by the Mayor and newly created personnel officer.

My efforts to bring pay equity to both taxpayers and city workers were continually squashed by then Supervisor Feinstein and Supervisor Molinari. Finally, in 1975, shortly after a disastrous city strike, I was able to place on the ballot, for voter approval, a measure that almost eliminates the power of the Mayor and Supervisors to manipulate the pay of city workers. This measure was overwhelmingly passed by the voters that year and we have not had any labor unrest since that date.

Vote No on “D”!
"D" stands for disaster. It will undo many of these reforms. Also, right now, the City is almost broke, thanks to the manipulation of Mayor Feinstein and her chief ally Supervisor Molinari.

If “D” passes the cost of operating our city government will increase in the next 24 months by not less than $60,000,000.

Contrary to the provisions of Proposition 13, property taxes would be increased, thus forcing up rents.

Vote No on “D”.
Don't weaken our Civil Service Commission, whereby least deserving city employees could be promoted because of connection or clout.

Vote No on “D”.
We now almost have more problems than we can handle. We don't want our city turned into another Chicago, wherefor for nearly half a century a corrupt political system flourished under Mayor Richard Daley.

John Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Andrew C. Casper
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

Keith P. Caldén
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

William F. Murray
Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Retired

We join San Franciscans for Fair Employment in opposing the Civil Service Initiative, Proposition D.

This measure will severely hamper the well-being of the San Francisco Fire and Police Departments. These departments are two of the finest in the Country and have consistently protected life and property in a professional manner. They must continue that tradition with a civil service system based on MERIT and not political patronage.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Our present Civil Service system was designed to keep corruption out of government. It has generally served that purpose well. This proposition would dismantle that system and in my opinion open the doors to nepotism, favoritism, patronage and corruption. Better a city government that is bureaucratic than one that is corrupt. Vote NO on D.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is an attack on the merit system and an attempt to return patronage to the Mayor's office by eliminating the authority of the Civil Service Commission and its built in checks and balances.

The present Civil Service system is not perfect, but corrections can be made within the Charter without destroying a system that has worked for over 50 years and has been free from fraud and corruption.

This proposition will do nothing to improve the caliber of police performance and could have the opposite effect.

I urge you to vote NO on PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by
The San Francisco Police Supervisors and Investigators Association

Don Goad, Captain SFPD
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D could be a dangerous first step toward weakening the independent, impartial administration of our City government.

Proposition D would transfer power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created Personnel Director appointed by the Mayor. The Director's decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline and certification would be final. The Commission would have no right to hear examinations or disciplinary appeals.

With the transfer of duties and responsibilities from the Commission to the Mayor's appointed Personnel Director, the Mayor would have control over personnel functions. Currently, commissioners have independent status and can be dismissed for cause. The Personnel Director could be dismissed at will.

The Merit System could be replaced by a patronage system. Proposition D could open the door to rules permitting the Personnel Director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his or her position on the list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Proposition D is NOT a reform package. The checks and balances for efficient City government would be lopsided, with too much power in the hands of unknown future Mayors.

We urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
John L. Molinari, President
Harry G. Britt
Richard Honigso
Willie B. Kennedy
Wendy Nolder
Nancy Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Beware of PROPOSITION D!

Powerful special interest groups are attempting to remove key City employees from the independent and impartial Civil Service system in the name of "reform".

They want instead to make these employees answerable directly to future Mayors and politically-appointed Personnel Directors and department heads.

PROPOSITION D got on the ballot because the Chamber of Commerce and such companies as Pacific Bell and PG&E paid a professional southern California campaign firm, $70,000 to collect signatures.

They're trying to destroy the merit system and replace it with an old-fashioned patronage system.

Department heads will be able to ignore examination scores and reward loyalty rather than competence in promotions and hiring.

Don't let the Chamber of Commerce, big business and their allies in the City bureaucracy dictate who's hired, fired and promoted among public employees.

PROPOSITION D is not just deceptive, it's dangerous!
Vote NO on PROPOSITION D!

Libby Denehein
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Ron Huberman
Vice-Chairman, Democratic Central Committee
Jim Wacob
Democratic Central Committee
Roberto Estevies
President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Rick Fleckner
President, Harvey Milk Lesbian Gay Democratic Club
Walter L. Johnson

Exec. Secy., S. F. Labor Council
Michael Bernick
Sal Roselli
John Mehring
Nancy Walter
Harry Britt
Carole Migden
Jack Morrison

Linda Past
Deborah Stein
Pat Norman
Gwen Craig
Louise Minnick
Agar Jaicks
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D places too much power in the hands of ONE. Proposition D will provide for a personnel director to be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Mayor. The Mayor now appoints five members of the Civil Service Commission who also serve at her pleasure.

You work for years to climb the civil service ladder and then somebody comes along with an idea to cut you off at the pockets.

Proposition D will lock in all the employees employed in the Mayor's office and will control the appointments of any new staff by the next Mayor elect in 1987 and years thereafter.

Like controlling your estate from the grave.

Vote NO on D.

Marguerite Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The Civil Service Merit System has served our City well, giving San Franciscans an equal opportunity. It has helped us obtain employment and earn promotions based on objective examinations.

The Civil Service Merit system replaced the old patronage system that rewarded political loyalty more than competence.

Now the supporters of PROPOSITION D want to create a new Personnel Director, accountable only to the Mayor, and give department heads the absolute power to decide who works for the City and who gets promoted.

If PROPOSITION D passes, equal opportunity would give way to opportunity based on membership in the bureaucratic "establishment".

Keep our Civil Service Merit System strong and free from the political abuses of the past.

Vote NO on D!

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly
Ben Tom
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
JoAnne Miller
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
A. Richard Cerbuto
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Dr. Sedonia Wilson
Member, S. F. Unified School District Board
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, President
S. F. Community College Governing Board
Julie Tang
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Alan S. Wong
Member, S. F. Community College Governing Board
Henry Der
Albert Chang
Rudy Meraz
Robert "Bob" Morales
Yori Wada

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Can you imagine studying for a civil service examination, being rated at the top of the eligible list and never receiving the promotion? That's exactly what Proposition "D" will do should the electorate adopt this amendment.

The civil service merit system has defects, but to totally eliminate the system and replace it with a patronage system where promotions are based on who you know, rather than what you know is scandalous.

Civil service was put into place to prevent scandal and the "favor seeking" individual from getting a paid position because he/she happened to support the right elected official.

Proposition "D" will allow one person, chosen by the Mayor, to decide who will be promoted, hired and fired. This is awesome power for one single individual to have at any level of government.

Our current Mayor may choose a fair person for this position, but will future Mayors be as careful? As each new Mayor assumes office, the civil service system will again change. The potential to favor one individual or group over others is great.

Proposition "D" has a great potential to diminish the quality of services we now provide to our citizens, as the future of how people are hired and promoted in the San Francisco Police Department is completely unknown.

It's true our promotional system is fraught with delays and delays frustrate us all, but Proposition "D" is not the answer. Proposition "D" will only add to our existing problems. Several years ago, our citizens elected a Charter Commission to streamline city government and make civil service work more efficiently. The voters eventually rejected those proposals. The checks and balances that make our government stable were no longer present. It simply went too far.

Proposition "D" goes even further. It brings about a system of patronage and should be defeated lest we want to engage in "free-wheeling and dealing" of civil service jobs and promotions.

We urge a strong No vote against Proposition "D"!

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry, President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The purpose of the Civil Service Commission is to ensure that the merit system would be the only criteria in any examination process.

If Proposition D passes, all authority concerning examinations would be taken from the Civil Service Commission and given to a Personnel Director, who is appointed by the Mayor. This Personnel Director would have the authority to hire and fire at his discretion, with no appeal available. This proposition is contrary to everything the Fire Department and all City employees have strived for over the years.

The Civil Service Commission in its present form was instituted to prevent any possibility of a patronage system, where one person has complete control.

This proposition would do nothing to improve your Fire Department. If you are satisfied with the work and make up of the San Francisco Fire Department in its present form, "Vote No On Proposition D". You will be doing a service for the San Francisco Fire Department, and the people of San Francisco.

Submitted by the San Francisco Fire Chiefs’ Association
John Flaherty, Battalion Chief SFFD President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D is bad government and bad politics, changing our independent civil service system into a system dominated by the Mayor:

. . By shortening the six year terms of Civil Service Commission to conform to the Mayor’s four year term of office.

. . By transferring most of the Commission’s powers to a Personnel Director who serves solely at the Mayor’s pleasure.

Keep politics out of employment services. Vote NO on Proposition D!

Alice B. Toklas, Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Roberto Esteves, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Proposition D fails to offer enough new and improved procedures to cure the current defects in the civil service system. Charter sections and civil service rules are repealed without specific known replacements.

Proposition D transfers power from the Civil Service Commission to a newly created personnel director appointed by, and to serve at the pleasure of, the Mayor. The director’s decisions regarding hiring, firing, discipline, and certification would be final. The commission would have no right to hear examination or disciplinary appeals.

There are hidden costs with Proposition D because the new Personnel Administration Department will employ a personnel director, and other employees “as may be necessary to carry out (its) functions and duties.”

The Merit System could be replaced by an old style Patronage System. Proposition D could open the door to rules which permit the personnel director to appoint anyone on a list of eligibles without regard to his/her position on the civil service testing list.

Charter sections which ensure fairness in the examination process would be repealed. Test takers could not discover errors in their scores and rankings. This could lead to unlawful manipulation of examination results.

Police and Fire Commissions would lose functions as a result of the personnel director’s new power. The director’s unlawful employment discrimination policy would be binding upon department administrators. The director’s procedure for employee dispute resolution must be used by all department heads and appointing officers.

Proposition D is not the answer. The checks and balances for efficient city government would be lopsided.

I urge a NO vote on Proposition D.

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker, 17th Assembly District
Sala Burton
Congresswoman
Art Agnos
9th Assembly District
Milton Marks
State Senator

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Balboa Reservoir Development Ban

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City deny or revoke any building permit for construction at Balboa Reservoir at Ocean and Phelan Avenues for the next three years? YES 292 NO 293

Analysis by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission declared Balboa Reservoir South (located across Phelan Avenue from San Francisco City College) surplus in 1984 and made the site available for low, moderate and market rate housing. In July 1985, a City-community advisory committee chose a developer to build 203 single-family homes on the 13 acre site. Construction has not yet begun.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would prohibit granting any new building permits and would revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site (Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1) between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit granting any new building permits and you want to revoke existing building permits for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to allow building permits to be granted for construction on the Balboa Reservoir site between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

How "E" Got on Ballot

On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for a three-year ban on development of the Balboa Reservoir site had qualified for the June ballot.

Sidney Kass and Jesse David Wall, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 12,430 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on December 23, 1985.

A random check of the petition showed that 10,012 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 77
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Having been responsible for providing leadership at City College from 1947 to 1977, we cannot stand by and see this site converted to housing. We must speak out. Such a move would preclude forever the logical and much needed campus expansion to what was once our West Campus. We left that site reluctantly to make way for water storage. If it is no longer required for that purpose, let us return it to City College.

Thousands of San Franciscans—high school graduates, dropouts, veterans, re-entering women—representing all of the city’s diverse ethnic groups, have been prepared for transfer to four-year colleges, profitable careers, and have had their lives enriched at the City College of San Francisco. Without City College’s open door and easy access, many would have been deprived of these opportunities.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION ‘E’

We question:
1. Why no EIR was required when the proposed development could have a substantial impact.
2. Whether the future needs of City College for classrooms, housing, and parking have been considered.
3. What the impact on taxpayers is with below market land sale and construction financing by bonds.

This moratorium will permit adequate study of these issues. Vote YES on Proposition ‘E’.

Bruce Bonacker, President
Board of Directors, Glen Park Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don’t let a developer make a mint on land across from the most overcrowded college in the Bay Area! Parking is already an impossibility for residents near City College... adding 200 homes to this land would make the situation much worse.

It’s simple: a college which can’t find room for more students at a time when more people are returning to education doesn’t serve the community.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Now imagine that the entire city block across the street from that overcrowded college has just been declared surplus by the Water Department. City Hall decides to sell that land, for a ridiculously low price, to a Redwood City developer who is going to plop down two HUNDRED wall-to-wall houses on the lot. The City ignores the traffic problems, ignores the wishes of nearby residents, ignores the needs of tens of thousands of students, all to provide subsidized housing for a couple hundred middle and upper income people.

You’d probably be upset. We certainly are. Please help us protect our neighborhood. Please vote YES on proposition E.

Westwood Park Residents:
Edna Tucker
Minnie Dorwin
Eugene Eden
Donna Nicoletti
Robert Armstrong
Pauline Armstrong
Joel Martinez
Richard & Lisa Patterson
David Bean
H. Bozzone
William Burke
Richard Robel
Clyde Theriot
Donna Manus
Emma Manus

Sunnyvale Residents:
Ellen Wall
Melissa Voluntad
David Wall
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Don't let the greedy developers take this potentially picturesque open space. A yes vote means you want more time to consider its future use. All we ask is time to think and plan.

John Barbagelata
Former member, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Suppose there was a publicly owned open space across the street from the main U.C. Berkeley Campus. Can you imagine for one moment that it would be passed into private ownership? Vote Yes on E for Equality and Excellence in Education

City College Students:
William Lew, Student
Tim McGuire, Student Council Member
Joseph Goldstein, Student Council Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

In 1952, the "Experts" said we needed reservoirs. They felt so strongly that they condemned the City College West Campus, destroyed the buildings, and constructed the reservoirs—all at taxpayer's expense.

Now, in 1986 with more demand for water, the "Experts" say the reservoir is no longer needed. What is the concerned taxpayer to believe?

When in doubt, the city should hold on to the expensive things already paid for.

Richard Patterson
Dorice Murphy
Lucille Carson
Daniel Gutierrez
Franz Witte
Bernhard Scholund
Ruth Hansen

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This is a Planning issue

We have been accused of trying to stop housing for poor people. Not true. In the first place, the price levels are certainly middle income and above, but our main objection is that this badly done plan is damaging to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as to the over-crowded community college across the street.

WHAT WE WANT

Even our critics point out that we originally SUGGESTED housing for that site, but they don’t talk about what else we suggested. We want two levels of parking under a City College Li-

brary, Bookstore, and Auditorium, with housing on top. Furthermore, let the housing be TRULY affordable—for students and seniors. We are trying to stop the bureaucrats' subsidized middle income housing project because it makes our dream impossible.

We ask for three years to give the neighborhood and the college a chance to produce a better plan.

SNaP (Sensible Neighborhood Planning Committee)

Helen Creger, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The West of Twin Peaks Central Council, representing 17 neighborhood associations in the area of the surplus reservoir property in question has voted to endorse the three-year stop of private construction on the old West Campus of City College. Dr. Louis Btmale, Chancellor of City College from 1970-1977, has persuaded us that City College needs the lands.

Juanita Raven, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Be a sport.
Give City College a vote of support.
City has 23,000 students and badly needs a library. The only place to put it is in the reservoir site. City College has walked closely with San Francisco for five decades. The reservoir site has always been understood to be reserved for City College.
Until now when someone wants it for housing. Housing is important, but it can be anywhere in town. But a City College library can only be located at the College.
Vote yes to support a book—and a reader.
Reading, studying, writing and research make up our town also.
It is hard to understand criticism of City wanting to keep this area for a library. Sure, housing sites are at a premium—but even more so a library site for City which is one of the largest schools in the Nation.
Some people blast City for wanting a library because of the need for housing. Housing is needed. But some of those very same people want a big battleship stationed here that will bring in 15,000 new family members.
The Educational and cultural growth of San Francisco mandates living space for the City College library.
If this measure gets a no vote, it means there will be no site for a Library. This is the last chance. Vote YES to help out a book—and a reader.
State financing, when approved, will construct this building. It is the top building priority at City College.
A YES vote here means there will be time to think about the use of the site. During that three year period, cooler heads may realize this is the only site for a Library. If the housing goes in there will be no library there.
Vote yes for a book, for a good school and a better City.

John Riordan, Board of Governors
San Francisco Community College District.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Sunnyside Neighborhood Association is not against housing, but we are trying to stop a hasty and shortsighted plan. We are asking for this moratorium to get time for a better plan that will answer a variety of needs and benefit the entire city as well as our community.

This is a planning issue.
The release of the reservoir property as surplus by the water department came as a surprise to our neighborhood. The June 1984 “Residence Element” of the city’s Master Plan did not even list the land as surplus. By 1985 major decisions were being made for use of the land without adequate neighborhood input.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

There were some meetings attended by a few people carefully selected for their zealous pro-housing views or potential financial gain. The resulting plan has gone out of control. Now it benefits only the developer and the lucky few who will get houses on free land.

Proposition E is not an attack on housing.
Please help us save our neighborhood against poor planning by voting YES on Proposition E.

Joe Mahoney, President
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION E

All the talk in the world can’t change the fact that City College has fewer acres of land relative to its student population than any college in the Bay Area.
Enrollment at City College is INCREASING, as is the enrollment of the San Francisco public schools from which City College draws most of its students. It is obvious that City College needs and deserves the reservoir land. The three year moratorium will give time to produce a better plan which will have input by faculty, students and alumni who know the college’s needs and want to support it.

Sid Kass
Susie Langdon Kass
Phil Kass
City College Student
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The homeowners of Westwood Park, a neighborhood adjacent to the Balboa Reservoir, support the ballot initiative calling for a 3 year development moratorium. We believe that the City and City College should take additional time to determine their needs and how they might be met by using the Reservoir. In the event that City College does not need this property, we support its development as open space or as single family detached housing.

Westwood Park Association
Don C. Swander
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Let's not aggregate the traffic problem around City College before we first develop solutions for the existing problems.
A three-year moratorium only buys our neighborhood and elected officials time to find solutions; it doesn't say no to housing. A YES vote is a vote for prudent development. A YES vote helps to preserve the family character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ken Hoegger
Realtor and community Activist

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

As representatives of the students of City College, we understand first-hand, the intense need to reserve a site for future school expansion.
Preservation of the Balboa Reservoir, a site directly adjacent to the campus, is particularly crucial. The facilities that CCSF requires, such as a library and an auditorium, are essential to the main structure of the campus. Unlike classrooms, it would be unreasonable to build an auditorium or a library on an off-campus site, since these facilities are integral to the main function of the school.

In short, opposition to the moratorium based on the notion that alternate sites could be secured, is misleading. Once a site near the college is taken, any hope of expansion would be eliminated.

Associated Student Council of City College
Jack Lee, Vice President of Associated Counsel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Local 2121 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, representing City College faculty, urges a yes vote on Proposition E.
While this project provides short-term employment for a few, we are more concerned about the thousands of students who would benefit from planning and development that would better serve the community and the college.

Yes on E for continued excellence in community college education.

Anita Martinez, President
San Francisco Community College District
American Federation of Teachers

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is twice as crowded as any community college in northern California. It needs a much larger library, bookstore and auditorium, and more parking.
The college has always expected to use the empty SOUTH reservoir for educational needs. That land is finally surplus. Neither the college Governing Board nor the Chancellor attended the Mayor's planning sessions for the property and the faculty was not informed. When the 12.3 acre site was offered to a developer for $36,900 for subsidized housing, the Chancellor said, "We are at a crossroad and the correct path is for the Board of Supervisors, with the Mayor's support, to deed this surplus land to City College so that the college may continue to serve the city effectively for the next 50 years as it has for the past half century." The Mayor refused. Now only Board member John Riordan supports the correct path.
The Water Department says it may need the NORTH reservoir now used for student parking. If that crisis occurs, the Chancellor says, "We'll deal with the situation then." How, if the south reservoir is gone?

(continued)
When land is available other community colleges finance large projects through alliances with civic, athletic and cultural organizations, and through property sales. New methods for public funding are being developed.

The faculty would like three years of careful study to unravel misunderstandings and poor management, and to find the best way to be a good neighbor.

Ken Crizer
Lene Johnson
Madeline Mueller
Julia Scholand
Steering Committee,
City College Faculty for Responsible Development

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College needs land now for desperately needed facilities, one of which is a library. City College has an enrollment of 23,000 students but our library has seating for 450. There are other possible locations for new housing, but City College can't be moved. Give us an opportunity to plan a development for the community and the college.

Annie M. Young
City College Library Faculty and Staff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty and staff members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Please help us keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation. The following faculty members from many departments believe that the adjacent reservoir land suggested for subsidized housing should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs.

Vote YES on Proposition E
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The San Francisco Water Department has begun a resource study of water use, due for completion in two or three years. The study may well indicate that one or both reservoirs will be needed. The American Water Works Association states that reservoirs should be used in pairs. This is particularly important because it is the only reservoir at an elevation of 305 feet.

The Mayor twisted the arm of the Water Department to declare one of these reservoirs surplus before the water resource study is completed. Don't let her get away with this kind of political manipulation.

Vote YES on Proposition E

Kurt Common
Ken Crizer
Ed Dierau
Herb Naylor
CCSF Engineering Professors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The South Balboa Basin has been unused since college leased buildings, including a large auditorium, were torn down on that site thirty years ago. We hope that three years of thorough planning would explore the possibility of returning a part of that property to the college for the development of a multi-purpose medium-sized auditorium which could be shared with community groups.

Joseph Alessi
Mary Argenti
Neyde Azavedo
John Bischoff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition E. This moratorium is necessary because there are too many worthy uses for this land to make a hasty and potentially very costly decision. Only through careful planning can the limited land available for development be best used.

Nicolas Alexander
Paul Hewitt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, as Physical Education Instructors, have always been committed to a diversified program for our students and community. The reservoir space is a natural land resource for a Multi Educational and Cultural Center.

Your YES vote on E will allow us the freedom to explore ways that this property could most constructively benefit all.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

We, full-time faculty of the Computer and Information Science Department of City College, urge a YES vote to postpone the decision until additional planning and surveys can be conducted. The current proposal would negatively impact the College's enrollment.

William Beaver
Ronald Cervati, Chairman
Kirk Gibson
Howard Granger
Frank Holden
Michael Kelly

George Lany
Norbert Ludkey
Charles Metzler
Charles Miller
Marilyn Schnake
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

A YES vote on Proposition E helps STOP a scheme to GIVE AWAY $12,300,000 worth of City land for $1,800,000 (or less) to a Redwood City real estate developer.

A YES vote will SAVE taxpayers $550,000 per year. The housing project will produce $240,000 in taxes, but supplying City services will cost $790,000 per year.

The Controller’s cost estimate does NOT account for the $12,300,000 land value, since land sale below value is NOT technically a cost of government. The Controller also is NOT permitted to assume that the housing project will be constructed, since construction has NOT yet been ordered by the Board of Supervisors.

The plan does NOT restrict housing sales to moderate-income first-time buyers. The plan only restricts use of tax-subsidized funds. Any person favored by the developer or politicians can buy these dwellings and get the benefits of the public land giveaway.

The houses are made “affordable” by giving away the land far below market value, by City-backed low interest, and by cutting construction corners.

The real beneficiaries of the subsidized housing project are the financiers (NOT the project dwellers). Bondholders receive 9.6% average tax-free interest, which is equivalent to 24.6% taxable interest at 61% maximum tax. The developer and bond establishment receive $5,340,000; this is $26,300 (or 22.40%) for each $117,400 unit.

The City loses $51,700 worth of land GIVEN AWAY for each unit.

Vote YES on Proposition E for good fiscal management.

William Marquardt
Financial Analyst, SNAp
Helen Crizer, Treasurer, SNAp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

City College is by far the most crowded community college in the Bay Area. With 22,600 students on a 56 acre campus, it is more than twice as crowded as any of the others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of College</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Campus (acres)</th>
<th>Area/1000 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City College of SF</td>
<td>22,624</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laney College, Oakland</td>
<td>9,805</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot College, Hayward</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa College</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of San Mateo</td>
<td>13,820</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>11.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Marin</td>
<td>6,663</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given these facts, why does the Governing Board not try to get the old West Campus back? Why don’t they support this moratorium to delay the land grab?

The Governing Board is under political pressure from City Hall: They have been threatened with the loss of the north reservoir parking lot and funding for special projects. Forgive them. Vote Yes on E.

Friends of City College
David Newton
Glen Simpson
Jack Baker
Thomas Velasquez
Tillie McCullough

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The student population at City College is increasing. This semester’s enrollment is up 1,265 students over last semester.

The enrollment in the San Francisco public schools has been increasing by 1,218 per year for the last three years. City College draws most of its enrollment from public schools in San Francisco.

Obviously, City College will have a larger enrollment in the future years, and will be in desperate need of space if we do not give it back its old West Campus. Please reserve this public land for the college.

Barbara Holman

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON E

In 1981, I launched a six-point program to expand San Francisco’s housing supply and the voters had approved a City policy to add 20,000 new housing units within five years. This Proposition would destroy a major portion of the effort to build affordable, single-family housing in our city.

The Balboa Reservoir Site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now a site for development of 203 new single-family homes, most with three bedrooms and two baths. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed as other homes built under the City’s program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom could not afford homeownership. It is believed that these new homes will sell rapidly.

The Balboa Reservoir site is one of the few sites large enough to accommodate a substantial number of new homes. Please do not let a few people stop a major opportunity for new housing. Vote no on Prop E.

Not only would Proposition E halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site, but the 9.8% fixed-rate, 30-year mortgage money set aside for the housing would also be lost.

Nothing constructive is accomplished by this measure—it does not provide additional land or facilities for City College. As a matter of fact, City College has neither plans nor money to use the property. Further, the Community College Board of Directors, the governing body for City College, has voted overwhelmingly to oppose the initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No on E.”

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the site of the unused Balboa Reservoir and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost.

These homes are desperately needed for San Franciscans who can’t afford to buy in the city where the average house is selling for over $160,000. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

The homes would be built on land that belongs to the City. Over two years ago, it was declared surplus and available for housing. It is not part of City College, and City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

We urge you to vote no on Proposition E if you want more affordable housing for San Franciscans.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

In 1980 San Franciscans voted overwhelmingly (63% yes to 37% no) to construct 20,000 housing units. Good progress is underway towards achieving the voter goal. A 1986 report by Mayor Dianne Feinstein states, “In the last five years 3,559 new housing units were completed with another 3,000 by 1988 and 20,000 more in 10 to 15 years”. Most of this housing will be built in underutilized commercial districts; not in existing residential neighborhoods.

The 203 affordable owner occupied single family units slated for the southern portion of Balboa Reservoir are part of the 1988 total. Our progress in addressing the City’s housing shortage will be curtailed if this ill-advised initiative is approved. SUPPORT OWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Housing production is essential to check rising prices and to maintain our social, economic, and ethnic population diversity. AS A SAN FRANCISCO VOTER, YOU CAN BE PART OF OUR HOUSING PROGRESS BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

Do not be misled. The Community College Governing Board opposes this initiative. The district does not have any future building plans for this housing site.

WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT THE CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY HOUSING BY VOTING NO ON PROPOSITION E.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would halt construction of affordable housing at Balboa Reservoir site. This surplus public property empty for 30 years was declared surplus by the City in 1984. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders. The housing is desperately needed. San Franciscans need affordable housing.

Proposition E would halt construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. We need more housing in San Francisco, not less. Please join me in voting "NO" on Proposition E.

Doris M. Ward, Member
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

A critical issue facing San Francisco today is the lack of housing middle class San Franciscans can afford.

That is why I have joined these neighborhood associations to support the Balboa Reservoir neighborhood housing proposal. Those participating in the development of the proposal includes:

- O.M.I. Community Association
- Dorado Terrace Association
- Outer Mission-Ingleside
- Political Action Committee
- Greater Ingleside Community
- Mount Davidson Manor
- Ocean Avenue Merchants Association
- Ingleside Terrace Association
- The San Francisco Open Space Committee
- City College of San Francisco

From early in 1985 I worked closely with these neighborhood groups in the discussions between city government and community leaders concerning the development plans for this desperately needed new housing at the unused Balboa reservoir site.

THESE ARE THE REASONS YOU SHOULD VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E.

1. The neighborhood housing proposal that this initiative seeks to stop is the result of months of hard work by the largest coalition of neighborhood associations ever to join together to plan a housing development in San Francisco.

2. The housing at the Balboa Reservoir site was designed with the involvement of the coalition of neighborhood associations to enhance the surrounding community.

3. The governing Board of the Community College District has made clear that they have no plans for the site and no ownership rights to it. City College does not oppose the construction of this development and opposes this initiative.

4. Self-proclaimed "Friends" of City College want to stop the proposal in order to preserve the site for future faculty parking. A clique of City College staffers involved in a neighborhood association pose as community opposition to this development even though a representative from this organization, the Sunnydale Neighborhood Association, had helped plan and support the proposal.

5. By masquerading as concerned neighbors these self-appointed "friends" of City College hope to prevent the construction of 204 critically needed units of housing and pull off one of the biggest land grab in San Francisco's history.

DON'T BE FOOLDED VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Residence Element of the Comprehensive Plan of the City and County of San Francisco assesses the City’s housing needs and lays out specific steps to meet those needs. This document was adopted by the City Planning Commission in 1984 after extensive public review at neighborhood meetings and public hearings, and consideration of the detailed Environmental Impact Report.

The first objective of the Housing Element is "to provide new Housing for all income groups" in locations appropriate for residential development. To meet this goal, development of housing is to be aggressively pursued and encouraged on surplus, underused and vacant public land.

Proposition E would halt construction of affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site. This public property, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City in 1984. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as $80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders.

If you want more affordable housing in San Francisco vote no on Proposition E.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Susan J. Bierman, City Planning Commissioner
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on E.

Proposition E deprives San Franciscans of one of their last real chances to become homeowners at an affordable price. At the South Balboa Reservoir we have City-owned land on which 203 units of three-bedroom, two-bath homes can be built at low prices which average San Franciscans can afford to pay. These homes need to be built now, not in three years. In three years the low interest rates on mortgages and the bond financing will be gone. Two hundred families will have lost the opportunity to become homeowners, and the City will have lost the opportunity to ease the tight market in rental housing.

Nor does this ill-conceived initiative help City College in any way. City College does not need this land. Speculation that the College may at some future date find a use for the land is not founded on fact. The College may never be able to build on the reservoir. Their enrollment has dropped by over 4000 students in the last few years.

This initiative is designed to confuse you. It will make our housing shortage worse for three long years. If you support affordable housing in our City, Vote NO on Proposition E.

Bill Maher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Balboa Reservoir site, empty for 30 years, was declared surplus by the City and is now planned for development of 203 new single family homes. These homes would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from $80,000 to $143,000. They are desperately needed—other homes built under this program have been quickly bought by San Franciscans, most of whom would not otherwise be able to afford home ownership.

San Francisco has the most expensive housing in the nation where last year the average home sold for over $160,000. Housing is difficult to produce because the obstacles are great—little land on which to build, high construction costs and uncertain interest rates.

Proposition E would halt the construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site and the 9.8% fixed rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would be lost. The initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional land or facilities for City College. The Community College Board, the governing body of City College, in fact recently voted to oppose this initiative.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then join me in voting “No” on Proposition E.

John L. Molinari

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

In 1980, the voters of the City and County of San Francisco approved a measure making it City policy to add 20,000 new units of housing within five years. In 1984 in an effort to satisfy this objective, the Board of Supervisors adopted a policy encouraging the expansion of the City’s housing supply. Making surplus City-owned land, such as the site at Balboa Reservoir, available for affordable housing was an important part of that policy. A proposal to build 203 homes on the unused Balboa Reservoir site was advanced to help implement the pro-housing policy.

Approval of Proposition E would HALT construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, please join me in voting “NO” on Proposition E.

The Balboa Reservoir homes would be built on land currently belonging to the City and County of San Francisco. The property IS NOT part of the City College, and City College has neither plans or money to buy the property and convert it for City College use.

The only debatable issue is the future of affordable housing on the Balboa Reservoir site.

As we are all aware, San Francisco has the most expensive homes in the United States. The average cost of a home is $132,000. Not many can afford such prices. However, the housing proposed for the Balboa Reservoir will give many more citizens the opportunity to become homeowners. The homes to be built will be sold to first-time buyers at prices ranging from $83,000 to $145,000.

Other homes built in San Francisco under the direction of similar affordable housing programs have been snapped up quickly by San Franciscans. Without the program, most would not have been able to purchase the home and become homeowners.

Again, if you desire to preserve the construction of more affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir site, vote “NO” on Proposition E.

Willie B. Kennedy
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Additional single family housing is undeniably San Francisco's most acute social need.

When some vacant surplus City land (12 acres) finally becomes available for 203 additional new private homes there will always be some selfish individuals who are in favor of new housing "just so long as it is not built across the street from me!"

This unused, vacant City reservoir land hasn't generated a dime of taxes for over thirty years! Let's add 203 NEW homeowner taxpayers to the City's rolls as quickly as possible.

Stop these self-serving no-growth obstructionists! Please vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco needs more affordable housing. Prop E would halt affordable housing construction at the Balboa Reservoir site. Many gay people need affordable housing, too, and we join with other community groups urging you to vote NO on Prop E.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Robert Esteses, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E, if approved, would block the construction of 203 badly needed single-family homes on the south portion of the Balboa Reservoir in San Francisco. Sixty percent of these homes would be available for purchase by moderate and middle income families at purchase prices between $80,000 and $120,000. They would be constructed on surplus public land and financed by the sale of mortgage revenue bonds to enable the developer to sell the homes at below market prices.

A neighborhood group headed by two city college faculty members is responsible for placing Proposition E on the ballot. The group contends that the land which is intended to be used for the project should be made available instead to City College for the construction of new teaching facilities even though enrollment at City College is declining and the City College Board has voted 6 to 1 to oppose the initiative.

Like many other areas of the country, San Francisco suffers from a shortage of housing. Purchase prices here are among the highest in the nation. The use of surplus public lands and revenue bond financing provide a means for making single family homes available to a broad spectrum of families at affordable prices.

The Balboa Reservoir project is supported by the leaders of 8 neighborhood groups in the area surrounding the location of the proposed project and by a majority of the members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, as well as by Mayor Dianne Feinstein. We urge you to encourage the construction of this type of housing in San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition E.

San Francisco Board of Realtors
William L. Jansen, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

SAVE OUR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS!
BERNAL HEIGHTS SAYS, "VOTE NO ON PROP E!"

We are residents of Bernal Heights in San Francisco. We've worked hard to build affordable family and senior citizen homes in our neighborhood.

We need more affordable housing in our City to survive. The real issue in Prop E is affordable family housing — a "yes" vote prevents the construction of 203 family homes. That's crazy!

Join us in preserving what's best in our City.

Vote "no" on Prop E!

Sylvia M. Yee, Bernal Heights Community Foundation Board of Directors***
Frank Hutchins, BHCF Board*
Mary Lou Bentolenti, BHCF Board*
Lela Havener, BHCF Board*
Elizabeth Egger, BHCF Board*
Sister Janet Simons, BHCF Board*
Stephen Antonaras, BHCF Board*
Lorenzo R. Dill, BHCF Board*
Barbara Bagot, BHCF Board*
Margaret C. Randolph, Northwest Bernal Block Club*
Maureen Lamb, NWBBC*
Tim Molinari, BHCF Planning & Dev't Committee*
Buck Bagot, BHCF P & D Committee*
***Organization for identification purposes only.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

San Francisco Needs Affordable Housing—
Vote No on Proposition E

Everyone agrees that San Francisco needs affordable housing. The questions are how and where that affordable housing can be built.

The Balboa Reservoir housing development, to be built on the site of a reservoir built thirty years ago and unused since that time, answers those important questions for more than 200 San Francisco first-time homebuying families by providing:
- 203 new affordable three-bedroom, single family homes
- 9.8% fixed-rate financing
- A mix of 30% low-income, 30% moderate-income and 40% market-rate first time buyers
- A convenient site that has been declared "surplus" by the City and "available for development of affordable housing"

The Balboa Reservoir housing development is a small but significant step in the effort to generate affordable housing in our City.

Thousands of San Franciscans from every community, neighborhood group and viewpoint agree that the Balboa Reservoir development is good for San Francisco. Virtually every elected official, including the Governing Board of City College also agree.

All these San Franciscans ask you to say "yes" to affordable housing and "NO" to Proposition E.

San Francisco Coalition for Better Housing
Barbara Kolesar, Executive Director

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The viable plan for affordable single family housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site is being threatened by Proposition E. If Proposition E passes, 203 single family homes will be lost to the citizenry of San Francisco at a time when they are greatly needed.

The facts about the proposed housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site argue strongly against Proposition E. All 203 homes will be for first time home buyers. One-third of the homes will be available to households earning $27,000. Another third of the homes will be available to households earning $36,000. Adequate parking will be provided within the development itself, thus answering any concerns that traffic in the area will be congested.

City College has no need or plan to use South Balboa Reser-
voir for its facilities. City College's priority is to develop its existing campus. South Balboa Reservoir should therefore be used for one of the City's greatest needs: increased and affordable housing which is available to lower and middle income families.

As homeowners who live in the vicinity of South Balboa Reservoir, we welcome its planned use for single family housing and feel it will become an integral and contributing part of the community. We therefore urge you to vote "NO" on Proposition E.

Submitted by:
Stephen Graham, Chairman of the Housing Sub-committee of the Citizen's Committee for Community Development
Roderick A. McLeod, Vice-Chairman of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing is a group of neighborhoods which consists of many of the renters of Westwood Park and Sunnyvale neighborhoods as well as owners and renters of Ingleside which are the closest neighbors to the Balboa Reservoir along with some of the students and teachers of City College.

We strongly support the Balboa Reservoir for housing. We believe that the Balboa Reservoir is an ideal spot for housing.

Our neighborhood wants homes in the South Balboa Reservoir:
Vote No On Prop. E.

Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughey
Submitted by Patricia Vaughey

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

As Merchants as well as residents of Ocean Avenue, Greater Ingleside and San Francisco, we support the Development of the Balboa Reservoir as housing.

A Traffic Survey has stated that there will be minimal impact on the existing patterns of traffic by this development.

Additional City College Parking is being considered on another location off I-280 to keep the college congestion away from the neighborhood's streets.

City College has 44 more acres in which to expand and existing buildings at City College have viable means to expand.
We believe that housing on the Balboa Reservoir is the most viable solution to develop a vacant piece of property that is directly adjacent to our stores on a Transpreferential Street. Affordable housing is in great need in San Francisco and is as much needed here as anywhere. We want to help provide this need. Vote No on Prop. E.

Ocean Avenue Merchants Assoc.
Principal Officer, Patricia Vaughney
Submitted by Patricia Vaughney

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction on much-needed affordable, single-family housing at the long vacant south Balboa Reservoir site. This proposition would also block a major housing development that would bring jobs into an area of the city that has little industry or private business.

Sale prices for these units are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the San Francisco housing market, where the average home is selling for $160,000. Construction of these homes will help all young, first-time home buyers and will require only 5% down, instead of the 20% down payment on houses bought with conventional home mortgages.

This plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by nine nearby neighborhood organizations. If Proposition E is approved and this project is blocked, more young adults will purchase their first home in Vallejo or some other outlying area, further draining San Francisco of the young families that every growing community needs.

San Francisco residents will gain apprenticeships, jobs, contracts and subcontracts from this development.

This plan calls for 2 and 3 bedroom, family-sized houses, with space for another bedroom which can be finished when needed.

Each house will have 2½ parking spaces in front and would not cause parking problems in the area. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

City College of San Francisco has no plans to buy the property, has no money for institutional expansion, nor any mention of this land in any master plan. Some supporters of this proposition are motivated by racist notions and have said they fear that this development will become another "Geneva Towers." This type of thinking is similar to support for apartheid practiced in South Africa and must be defeated by progressive San Francisco voters. Property values will increase, instead of a decrease as a result of this project.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition E.

Larry Udall Johnson-Redd — President, O.M.I. Pilgrim Community Center Inc.
Maria Campbell-Casey — Program Director, Bay Area Engineering Societies Committee for Manpower Training, Inc.
Clara Mills-Braudford — Program Director, O.M.I. Senior Center
John C. Jackson
Linda Rose-Gibson
Jon Still — Secretary, Young Adult Committee
Kenneth Butler

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom.

Generous parking is provided — 2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Adequate Housing Alliance — Mitchell Omerberg, Director
Bay Area Urban League — Gregory Best, Field Representative
Bernal Heights Community Foundation — Andre Lemuel Daye
Community Educational Services — Dorothy Chen, Executive Director
Japanese Community Youth Council St. Francis Square Apartments, Inc. — Sandra Mayor-Jenkins, Secretary
Minority Contractors Association of Northern California — James
Haugabook, Secretary, Board of Directors
National Community Congress — Dr. Eddie C. Webster
Purkemberg Residents Organization, Inc. — Ricardo A. Callejo, Esq.
Pitreco Hill Neighborhood House — Ethel Maxwell
San Francisco Building Trades Council — Sam Smith
San Francisco Housing & Tenants Council — Joseph Lacey
San Francisco Tenants Union — Jim Faye
Rev. Amos C. Brown — Local Pastor & Community Servant
Greg Day — Chairman, Citizens Committee on Community Development
Polly V. Marshall — Commissioner, San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
Regina A. Sneed
Jim Wachob — San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Michael E. Willis, AIA — Fleming Corporation
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided—2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Members of the Ocean Avenue Merchants Association
James Hayes
John Jung
B. C. Han
Jamalah Kanika

Neighborhood Coalition for Affordable Housing
Rev. Roland Gordon
Dr. S. Bergman
Patricia Vaughney, principal officer
Robert Muellbauer
Lillian Jackson
Monika Urbanske
Davy Tate
Ali Homran
Ah Aogota
Inez Pride
Bev Feihman
Shirley A. Keith
I. Hamilton
L. Robinson
Thomas Lien
Bung Xi An
Lou Dunalte
Wu Th

S.N.I.G.
Will H. Reno
Larry Daniels
Ted McReithan

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E would stop construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at $80,000, $120,000 and $142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over $160,000. If this initiative passes the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided—2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The proposed initiative would accomplish absolutely nothing constructive, and it would not as some of its proponents claim, provide any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote “No” on Proposition E.

Bayview Baptist Minister Fellowship — Rev. N. B. Mills; President
Breed of Life Missionary Baptist Church — Rev. S. A. Bailey
Cosmopolitan Baptist Church — Rev. A. Ray Gentle
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Raymond M. Howard Sr.
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Carole Nelson
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Cornelia P. O’Reilly
Ingleside District Pastors — Rev. Paul G. Theiss
Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee — Charles Gale, Chairman
St. Peters Housing Committee — Tessa Rowerd
Compensated Advocacy & Campaign Limits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City prohibit compensated advocacy by city officers and state legislators before any city commission, and limit the amount any person may contribute to a candidate for municipal office to $500?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: With certain exceptions, City officers, including elected officials and commission members, may represent clients before City boards and commissions other than their own, and be paid for their services. State legislators may represent clients before City boards and commissions, and be paid for their services. Any person may contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would prohibit City officers from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay. This proposition would prohibit State legislators from appearing before City boards, commissions and departments on behalf of clients for pay. City officers would be prohibited from discussing with these officers and legislators matters that the City is deciding. Proposition F would also prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to prohibit City officers and State legislators from representing clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to prohibit any person from contributing more than $500 to a candidate for a municipal office.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to allow City officers and State legislators to represent clients before City boards and commissions for pay, and to allow any person to contribute up to $1,000 to a candidate for a municipal office.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 77

How “F” Got on Ballot

On February 26 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative ordinance calling for limitations on compensated advocacy and campaign contributions had qualified for the June ballot.

Quentin Kopp, Marth Gillham and Cheryl Arenson, the proponents of the petition, had gathered 9,400 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,986 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The purpose of Proposition F is to cut campaign contributions by large contributors (and thus reduce campaign spending) and eliminate undue influence by officeholders retained as paid lobbyists for projects requiring City approval.

Let's take a minute to analyze the untrue arguments against Proposition F:

- The opponents claim that Proposition F will force half the City's Commissioners to resign. In fact, Proposition F does not force any Commissioners to resign. It simply says they can't be a paid lobbyist and a City Commissioner at the same time. Does a commissioner value making money by lobbying more than public service?
- Some have also alleged that Proposition F will prevent duly-elected union leaders from serving as City Commissioners. No it won't. Proposition F prohibits "compensated advocacy"—that means lobbyists hired by an organization, not members of the organization itself. Proposition F does not apply to salaried employees of labor unions, corporations, or non-profit agencies. Moreover, Section 8.105 of the Charter precludes it specifically from applying to any member serving as a representative of any profession, trade, business, union or association on any board or commission which requires membership of representatives of specific professions, trades, businesses, unions or associations.
- Another untrue argument against Proposition F is that it prohibits City officials only from discussing pending issues with other City officers or State Legislators who are also acting as paid lobbyists in a matter and doesn't stop those officeholding lobbyists from writing City officials about their clients' objectives. That's not so. Proposition F applies to all such lobbying, written or oral. (The dictionary defines "discuss" as "to examine by means of speech or writing.")

End government decision-making by "insiders" and reduce the influence of money on local campaigns.

VOTE YES ON F.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
San Franciscans for Good Government

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

In all our years of observing San Francisco City government, we have found one maxim to be true time after time: a good idea gets copied, especially among politicians.

For no sooner did Quentin Kopp promise to bring Proposition F to the voters than did Mayor Feinstein come up with an informal, administrative version of her own. Fine, you say (and the Mayor says), then why vote Yes on Proposition F?

(1) The Mayor's remedy of asking City Commissioners who also act as lobbyists before City agencies to resign is nothing more than a hand slap, and is good only as long as she is mayor. It's not binding on future mayors and could be changed without any vote of the Board of Supervisors, let alone the people of San Francisco. Proposition F prohibits this kind of conflict of interest, and it will be the law, no matter who is mayor.

(2) The Mayor's action did nothing to state legislators who can also act as lobbyists before City Boards and Commissions, nor did her action stop the law or business partners of City Commissioners from picking up the slack in big-money lobbying. Proposition F will stop these practices in their tracks.

(3) What about the other half of Proposition F, which reduced the campaign contribution limit to $500 so that all San Franciscans can enjoy equal access to City officials, not just the ones with the big bucks? The Mayor can't do anything about this, and she hasn't. Only a Yes vote on Proposition F will reduce the weight of big money and ensure our full voice in City elections and City government.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. If it's important enough for the Mayor to copy part of it administratively, it's important enough to do the job right and make it a law.

John J. Barbogelata
Harry Alco
June Cahn
Dorothy Partridge

Robert Arneson
Rudolph Luhnow
Janet Wentworth

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The worst and most persistent problem in American politics is that politicians and political races can be "bought". Reducing the size of campaign contributions will be a step forward in reducing the role of money in elections. Vote yes for more honest government.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

RESTORE to the people their rightful and equal power as individual voters by reducing the monetary clout and influence of private interests who make the laws and the policies as City officials and Commissioners or State legislators.

TELL the special interests that their money and influence can no longer interfere with representative government.

TELL the special interests that the voters will no longer tolerate the influence-buying which comes with large campaign contributions.

TELL the special interests that this measure will encourage highly talented citizens to serve San Francisco honestly and responsibly.

VOTE YES ON F.

Cheryl Arenson  Tom Hayes
Anne Renfrew   Dorothy Vukich
David Pacheco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

"Government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

These noble words from Abraham Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address, cast in bronze at the entrance to City Hall, seem to have escaped the attention of some City officials who pass by them every day. For in San Francisco City government, Lincoln’s simple formula for representative government would read quite differently: “Government of the powerful, by the lobbyists, and for the wealthy.”

Government of, by, and for the privileged few is bad government. Government of, by, and for all the people is good government. It’s as simple as that—as simple as Lincoln first put it.

Proposition F, the Good Government Initiative, will help San Franciscans maintain control of their government and will prevent undue influence by City officeholders.

To reduce undue influence, Proposition F outlaws the practice of City Commissioners and State Legislators representing special interests for pay before City Commissions and Boards. City Commissions should render their decisions deliberately and impartially, not be swayed by the political clout of the lobbyists appearing before them, or by any political favors those lobbyist/politicians might promise. “I’ll scratch your back if you scratch my back” bargains do not belong in government. And until such backroom bargains are made illegal, City government will not belong to the rest of us either.

Proposition F also reduces the maximum amount that anyone can give to a local candidate from $1,000 to $500. If large contributors and other special interests can’t give as much money, they can’t buy as much influence with elected officials. And the lower the contribution limit, the less campaign spending and the more City government will be responsive to all San Franciscans.

You can “buy back” City government from the privileged and powerful with the most precious of all political commodities: your vote.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Mary Lohneis  Babette Drefke
Peter Fatouh  Daniel Jordan
Judith Thorson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F, an initiative of the people, is needed to protect the voters and the integrity of the legislative process from being corrupted by the power of money and influence. It prevents City officials and State Legislators from lobbying the City on behalf of high-powered special interests. It also lowers the campaign contribution limit from $1,000 to $500, thus reducing the influence of those same special interests over our elections and elected officials.

The bogus argument that the Mayor won’t be able to find qualified people to serve on City commissions if Proposition F is adopted ignores the plain fact that there are 700,000 people in San Francisco, a pool of civic-minded citizens more than large enough to accommodate the 250 commission appointments available in our City government. For example, there are plenty of architects to fill the one architectural appointment on the Art Commission, just as there are plenty of non-lobbyist business people and lawyers available to serve on other commissions.

Thousands of San Franciscans, not just the “insiders”, are ready, willing, and able to serve the public.

Proposition F deserves your vote. Restore integrity to City government. Restore the confidence of the citizens of San Francisco in that government. Let’s have no more Wilkes Bashford situations.

VOTE YES ON F.

Oscar Satro  Leonel Monterey
Martha Gillham  Tony Kilroy
Marguerite Warren
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE "NO" ON F

This proposition disguises itself as "good government" but, in reality, would drive good people out of government. It is so crudely drawn — so sweeping in its implications — that it would bar from government almost anyone with even a remote business or community tie to government.

It would purge from City commissions anyone who "directly or indirectly" receives compensation from any "interests" with an issue before any City agency. Effectively, this could discriminate against employees from community and neighborhood groups, civil rights organizations, non-profit corporations, labor unions, merchant and business groups, as well as architects, lawyers and other professionals.

Actually, there currently are no commissioners who represent any clients before any City agency. All who are appointed in my administration sign a statement saying they will not advocate for any paying client before any official body of the City

while they are commissioners. This proposition simply is not necessary.

Proposition F also would lower the limit for any individual campaign contribution from $1000 to $500. Although this sounds good, it would permit a wealthy person with various businesses and numerous family members to contribute many thousands of dollars through different sources. This would encourage "hidden" contributions. We must strive for disclosure of contributions, not a system which drives contributions underground. Candidates must be able to raise funds enough to put their message before the voters. Reducing the contribution limit can be a tactic to discourage persons from challenging incumbents.

Vote no on Proposition F.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition F purports to achieve a noble objective: The removal of "influence peddling" from City Hall. In fact, Proposition F is so poorly-crafted, it may have exactly the opposite effect on City government. It is not a "good government" initiative. It is bad legislation.

Proposition F provides no definitions and no standards for the public to judge whether City officials comply with its restrictions. Its uncertainly will be chaotic and lead to endless, needless lawsuits.

A measure similar to Proposition F was rejected by the Board of Supervisors because no public hearings were ever held on the legislation. If the public had had a chance to comment on this initiative, it might not have the critical shortcomings, deficiencies and uncertainties that now warrant its rejection by responsible San Franciscans.

In the coming months, the Board will review good government measures that are comprehensible, effective and, most important, certain. Proposition F is a misguided disaster.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by:
Nancy G. Walker
Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

This should properly have been titled the "SINK WILLIE BROWN ORDINANCE"! The "meat of the coconut" is in Section 4.

 Supervisor Kopp's intentions are good, however this sloppily drafted and incomprehensible measure succeeds in "burning down the barn" to eliminate a couple of rats!

Under this proposal, to avoid any potential INDIRECT conflict of interest, (which is undefined!), one would have to be a destitute, unemployed welfare recipient to qualify for service on any City Board or Commission! The Mayor has already solved this "hired advocacy" problem with the "conflict of interest" affidavit she demands IN ADVANCE from any prospective appointee.

Quentin's proposed $500.00 campaign contribution limit is an "inside joke" and he, of all people, knows it! It merely obliges a heavy contributor to have his wife, children, business associates, or friends send in SEPARATE $500.00 checks if he wants to contribute more than $500.00 to a politician's campaign.

These proposals require additional City employees for enforcement and wind up doing far more harm than good. Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr., President
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Union members and labor officials have legitimate reasons for meeting with City officials. It is unfair and wrong to lump them in the same category as special interest lobbyists, yet that's exactly what Proposition F does. Working people deserve representation on City boards and commissions. VOTE NO!

Walter Johnson
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council
LeRoy King
James Elliot
Keith Eickman
Reeva Olson

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

If you want to ban business owners and executives from serving on City boards and commissions, then vote for Proposition F.

If you think board members of non-profit corporations and employees of community agencies have nothing to contribute to City government, then vote for Proposition F.

If you believe union members and labor officials should not have a voice at City Hall, then vote for Proposition F.

But if you share our belief that these individuals have legitimate concerns and expertise that is valuable in running major City departments, then join us in voting NO on Proposition F.

Proposition F is a simplistic, sloppily-drafted, meat-axe approach to a problem already resolved by Mayor Feinstein's ban on commissioners lobbying on behalf of private clients.

Proposition F is not good government and it is not reform. Proposition F is bad legislation. VOTE NO.

Hon. Douglas Engmann
Hon. Eugene Friend
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Phyllis Lyon

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

We're sympathetic to the need for political reform. But it's a complicated problem, and Proposition F just isn't the way to go.

Frankly, we can't tell who is and isn't affected by this measure. While a handful of people sometimes might abuse their positions, that's no reason to question the integrity of so many solid citizens who give tirelessly to public service. Proposition F is simply the wrong approach. Please join us in voting NO.

Hon. Amy Meyer
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Walter Jebb
Hon. Bruce Lilienthal
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Jean Kormann
Hon. Thomas Horn
Hon. Henry Berman
Hon. Robert McCarthy
Hon. Richard Guggenheim
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Hon. Patrick McGrew
Hon. Kirk Miller
Hon. Melvin Lee
Hon. Jerry Berg
Hon. Bonnie Gibson
Hon. Mary Noel Pepys
Hon. Mark Buel
Hon. Tim Carrico
Hon. Jo Hanson
Hon. Kevin Malone
John Sanger
Tom Moore

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Concerned about elected officials spending $400,000 to run for supervisor and $1 million on a mayor's race? Then vote NO on Proposition F.

That's right. NO.

Proposition F isn't going to do anything about campaign spending. Prop F simply limits the size of contributions, reducing the current limit from $1,000 to $500. Supervisors can and will continue spending outrageous sums on their re-election campaigns. With Proposition F they'll just spend twice as much time raising money from twice as many sources, and that makes special interests even more powerful. They can always find ways around campaign limits.

We need campaign spending reform, but Proposition F doesn't provide it. Please join us in voting No on F.

William E. McDonnell
Frances May McAteer
N. A. Saphir
Caroline and Michael Figoni

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

District 8 Democratic Club
Stephen L. Taber
Ruth Gravanis
Alan Rapnick
Miriam Blaustein

Linda Chapman
Dale Carleton
James Firth
Debra Barnes
Lev Sebrin
Debra Stein

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

When campaign contributions are limited, political freedom suffers. Your right to free speech includes not only your right to express your views, but also your right to support as much as you want, any candidate who speaks for you.

Minority viewpoints depend heavily on the contribution of a few dedicated supporters to get your message out. To limit your financial support of your beliefs is to silence your political voice.

Only incumbents, who have many opportunities for free media exposure benefit from this assault on free speech. The dangers of a campaign contribution limit far outweigh any possible benefit from this proposition. Defeat Proposition F!

San Francisco Libertarian Party
Michael R. Fowler, Secretary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

You may think Prop F only applies to big-time lawyers and a few legislators who represent developers. Think again!

Prop F would prohibit many community leaders from public service. If it passes, board members and employees of community and charitable organizations could be banned from serving on City boards and commissions.

We appreciate the public need for a government free of “influencing peddling.” But restrictions on “compensated advocacy” ought to be clearly and carefully crafted to protect the voices of community leaders who argue on behalf of the public interest, not private special interests.

Vote No.

Hon. Juanita Del Carlo
Mission Hiring Hall

Bob Ross
Publisher, Bay Area Reporter

Hon. Jeffrey Ken Mori
Japanese Community Youth Council, Inc.
Bill O'Callahan
American Red Cross
Hon. George Suncin
Horizons Unlimited
Hon. Jean Risa Alviar
Mission Education Project
Hon. Greg Day
Polk Street Town Hall
Hon. Naomi Gray
Hon. James Foster
Carol Mong
Marlena Marseille
Lee Woods
Jo Daly
Dennis Collins
Hon. H. Welton Flynn
(Organizations listed only for purposes of identification.)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will have no effect on developers' lawyers. None.

It won't make any difference to state legislators either.

Don't kid yourself. This is not "reform" and it isn't "good government." Proposition F will allow the special interests and influence peddlers to continue exercising influence over our elected officials. It has so many loopholes, lobbying will actively continue, untouched, in the back rooms of City Hall.

And developers will always find ways around campaign contribution limits. As Common Cause has noted, Prop F simply makes tracing their dollars more difficult for the public.

Real reform would directly attack the source of huge contributions—the developers and other special interests that employ the lobbyists to peddle their influence.

VOTE NO.

Sue Hestor
Calvin Welch
David Leemann
Michael Mason

Rich Waller
Susan Klugerman
Rene Cazeneuve
Margie O'Driscoll

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION G

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to boycott businesses having the greatest ties with South African apartheid?

YES 300
NO 301

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has adopted an ordinance prohibiting the City, with certain exceptions, from purchasing goods or services from companies doing business with South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a declaration of policy that says the City must try to avoid doing business with companies that significantly profit from or help maintain the Apartheid system in South Africa. It calls on other public bodies and private groups to adopt similar policies. It directs the Board of Supervisors to identify the companies which have the greatest ties to Apartheid so that the public can also boycott those companies.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to avoid doing business with companies that help maintain Apartheid, and you want a public boycott of those companies.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

“The proposed Declaration of Policy be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:
It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This measure calls for a public boycott of companies that aid apartheid.

Any claim of "conflict" between Proposition G and existing anti-apartheid legislation is imaginary: It is the legislative intent of supporters of this measure that it can be construed as a directive for making existing law tougher.

Personal attacks have no legitimate place in a ballot measure campaign. As proponent of this measure, I repudiate all such tactics.

Vote NO on apartheid. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Arlo Hale Smith

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Boycotts are grassroots politics. They've helped the farm-workers, they've helped win integration, and they can help end the legal racism called "Apartheid".

A Gallup poll found 77% of South Africa's black majority favoring international economic boycotts to force the Apartheid regime to accept reform peacefully.

After the Boycott Initiative made the ballot, the San Francisco Supervisors unanimously passed a similar city purchasing policy. The issue that remains is whether to call on the general public to join in, boycotting companies identified by the Supervisors as the worst offenders in each industry.

The companies that would be targeted consider profits to be the "bottom line". Economic pressure is all they understand.

The AFL-CIO, NAACP, and NOW have called a boycott of Shell Oil because of its profiteering from South Africa's oppressive economic conditions. Proposition G supports that and would put the same pressure on other industries as well.

This proposition is supported by the elected county central committee of the Democratic Party, the Peace-and-Freedom Party and the Humanist Party, and by leading attorneys, such as Terry Francois, Terence Hallinan, Tony Serra, Lewis Hope Lee, Marc Van Der Hout, Abby Ginsberg and Terence Redmond.

If South Africa were a democracy, its majority would long ago have voted to end Apartheid. We need to vote Yes — because they can't.

Atty. Arlo Hale Smith, Democratic Party County Central Committee
Paul Kangas, Peace and Freedom Party
Lois Salisbury, Public Advocates*
Dr. Kevin Danaher, Food First*
Jesse James, Mission Rebels
Terry Collins, Community Activist
Stony Gebert, Election Action
Robert McCall, Hotel & Restaurant Employees
Executive Board Member

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Attorneys speak out against Apartheid:

South African police can arrest anyone without charge. They can hold you incommunicado — no contacts with family, lawyers or press.

They regularly censor news, books, music. They have banned Christmas caroling, funerals and other peaceful gatherings. Groups which criticize the government are forbidden to hold meetings.

Blacks are subject to legal segregation; their property and employment rights are greatly restricted; often, they are simply murdered.

As attorneys, we help people who have legal rights that are being violated. But what can we do for those who have no legal rights?

Boycotts and other economic sanctions are the only way to make the Apartheid government accept reform peacefully.

In the Court of World Public Opinion, Apartheid has been convicted of crimes against humanity. By imposing a sentence of economic isolation, we can end Apartheid.

Vote Yes — take a stand for justice.

Terence Hallinan
Arlo Hale Smith
Terry Francois
Karen Anderson Ryer
Robert R. Bryan

Ann Menasche
Rachel Ginsburg
Leo Paoli
Gabriel Geisman
Ora Prouchovnick

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is a moderate, responsible but effective proposal to bring economic pressure on the South African government to establish constitutional rights for all of its citizens.

Vote Yes.

Terence Faulkner, Republican
Mike Garza, Republican

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

All decent Americans abhor apartheid. However, boycotting U.S. investment in South Africa is counterproductive; it only penalizes the actual victims of apartheid.

U.S. international firms have acted as progressive agents for change through the Sullivan principles. Their investments have improved the social and economic condition of the labor force. It is improper to penalize their positive contributions.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

We are individuals and organizations working actively to end the racist system of apartheid in South Africa. And we are voting NO on Proposition G.

Why?

(1) Because Proposition G will weaken San Francisco's present divestment law. This law requires companies doing business with the city to sign affidavits that they will make no new contracts with South Africa.

Proposition G has no such provision.

(2) Proposition G provides no mechanism or funding to carry out its declared purpose of "boycotting" South Africa.

Proposition G will not stop South African products from entering the Port of San Francisco.

Vote against this useless, confusing, and deceptive initiative.

Preserve the stronger divestment law San Francisco already has.

Vote NO on Proposition G!

Yvonne Golden
Geraldine Johnson
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
AFT 2121 Anti-Apartheid Committee
Artsists Against Apartheid
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Coalition of Conscience
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club Executive Committee
ILWU 10 and SEIU 250 Southern Africa Liberation Support Committees
National Conference of Black Lawyers
San Francisco Anti-Apartheid Committee
Southern Africa Freedom Committee/AI Peoples Congress

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submitted. A record was set in 1983 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!
AIDS Research

PROPOSITION H
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on all appropriate public and private organizations to establish and support an AIDS Research and Education Council?

YES 303  
NO 304  

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Several city and private agencies conduct various programs related to AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome).

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a declaration of policy that says San Francisco should support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council, consisting of a Committee on Education and a Fund-Raising Committee. The Research Committee would make recommendations on the most useful AIDS research projects and try to prevent duplication of efforts. The Education Committee would inform the public about the latest research and about ways to prevent AIDS. The Fund-Raising Committee would seek donations and grants for AIDS research and education projects.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to support or encourage the formation of an AIDS Research and Education Council.

Controller’s Statement on “H”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:
"The proposed Declaration of Policy for an AIDS research and education council and the formation of advisory committees of civic leaders would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, additional expenditure of public funds for AIDS research may result, the amount of which cannot be determined."

How “H” Got on Ballot
On January 9 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy calling for AIDS research had qualified for the June ballot.
Stony Gebert, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 10,540 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on December 6, 1985.
A check of each signature on the petition showed that 7,564 of the signatures were valid. This is more than 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We need a council to expose and address major AIDS issues without the impasse of present medical/political bias.

As taxpayers, we are subsidizing a treadmill of continual AIDS casualties. There are major oversights where AIDS is concerned. Only recently was it learned that CDC statistics suggest 79% of early AIDS cases appear drug-related. We hear AIDS is 100% fatal. Perhaps that is because death may also be drug-related in the way of immuno-suppressive antibiotic and radiation overloads to already compromised immunity systems. Prevailing medicine is both tunnel-visioned and high-profit motivated. Also well-funded. This solution may be part of the problem. Some physicians are beginning to feel where AIDS is concerned many current practices are ethically, medically bankrupt.

Remissions occur. Largely through immunity-enhancing, holistic medicine. Significantly, only 1% of AIDS cases occur among people at risk in the Asian community. Perhaps this is due to less drug abuse or use of an unfunded, ignored resource: herbology as part of diet. More options: homeopathy, acupuncture, etc.

If, as anticipated, upwards of 40% of those testing positive come down with AIDS, we may become overburdened. To ignore all of the above becomes part of the problem. Vote Yes on Proposition H.

Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Rich McKirkeby, Former Orderly,
Marketing Associate, Pacific Bell
Joseph P. Clady, AIDS Hospice, Shanti Counselor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There is great need for research and education about AIDS and related conditions.

We need to attack the disease, not its victims.
Knowledge is the only vaccine available today.
Vote Yes.

John Lorenzini, President,
People With AIDS Alliance
Ken Coupland, Editor, Sentinel
Jan Beck, Steven Russell, Eugene Ewins, ARC/AIDS Vigil

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

There are many possible treatments for AIDS and related conditions which are not being examined by the federal government, especially therapies based on natural substances and processes.

Vote Yes for an AIDS Research Council open to all viewpoints.

Scott Gregory, M.D.
Paul Kangas

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A tape recording (Talking Book) of the San Francisco Voter Information pamphlet is available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar’s Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name__________________________________________

Address_________________________________Apt. #________

Telephone No. (required)________________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:
I want to work in the following area(s): __________________________

Second choice locations (if any)_________________________________

Signature__________________________________________
PROPOSITION I

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?  

YES 307  NO 308

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the Freeway with a surface roadway.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City’s policy to remain as it is, and you want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to change the City’s policy, and you do not want the Embarcadero Freeway to be torn down.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a policy statement asking whether or not the Embarcadero Freeway should be torn down.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway demolished, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by at least $10.2 million in local funds. Potential private sector financing and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “I” Got on Ballot

On March 3 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative declaration of policy placing the question of demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway before the voters had qualified for the June ballot.

Richard Hingisto, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 11,119 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on February 19.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,720 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I
In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane Boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land now under the Broadway ramps is put back on the tax rolls, with low-rise buildings limited by restrictive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when united with Proposition J, recognizes these facts:
1) The Embarcadero Freeway is what is left of a never-completed elevated freeway that would have ringed the City through North Beach and Marina neighborhoods to the Golden Gate Bridge.
2) Today this massive freeway, which separates us from our waterfront, would never be built.
3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.
4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman's Wharf will be preserved.
5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked for this new system.
6) Only that portion of the Embarcadero Freeway east and north of the Main and Beale Street ramps—basically the portion directly on the waterfront—will be removed to make way for the new system. The removal cost, approximately $10 million to be paid for with privately-generated new revenues, is a relatively small part of the overall new system.

As for Proposition J, vote "YES, let's tear down the Embarcadero Freeway." Then turn to Proposition J and support the plan for a beautiful waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I
Removing the Embarcadero Freeway will allow San Francisco to:
• Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero.
• Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway.
• Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula.
• Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero.
• Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line.
• Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute.

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won't benefit San Francisco. Don't let outsiders determine our future. Vote YES on I.

Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Jack Whiteley
Roger Boyer
A. Lee Knight
Robert Bradford
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Donald A. Crosby, AIA
Raj Y. Okamoto
Robert Meyers
Ralph Hurtado
Hon. Susan Bierman
Hon. Yoshio Nakashima
Hon. Douglas G. Wright
Anita Sanchez

Clack Forester
Fitz Arko
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Dehart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones
Randall Russ
Karl Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
Jon Twitchell
Jane Winlow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

STOP GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON I
This is our chance to clean up the traffic mess on the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to replace an old, inefficient road with a new six-lane boulevard that will move traffic more quickly, end gridlock, and improve pedestrian access to the waterfront.

MAKE BEST USE OF TAX MONEY—VOTE YES ON I
Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside to improve traffic flow on the Embarcadero. That $90 million will generate another $80 million in additional state and federal funds—without costing San Francisco one dime.

The city's fiscal analyst shows any local cost can be collected from state matching monies and property owners in the area, not from city taxpayers in general.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Embarcadero Freeway Demolition

If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities. DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT—VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

Hon. Doris W. Kahl
Monica H. Hailorun
Lisa Klairemont
Jeffrey Heller
Nancy Katz
Robert Katt
Bob Isaacson
John Behanna
City Lights Books, Inc.
Kenneth R. Leck

Alan Labltnic
Norman Rolfe
Jerry Harrado
Gregory E. Jones
Marc Kasky
James W. Haas
Richard Reinhart
Mrs. Blund Platt
Donald Black
David M. Hartley

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to 15.7 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown, Fisherman's Wharf and the financial district would be reduced.

Travel within the city would be slowed down at all hours. Vote no to the destruction of the freeway.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
• Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
• Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $23.4 to $46.8 million.

The Absent Voter Ballot Application Application must be received by the registrar of voters no later than 5/27/86.

Election Date June 3, 1986

PLEASE PRINT REGISTERED NAME:

FIRST NAME MIDDLE NAME LAST NAME
RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX NUMBER)

NUMBER AND STREET DESIGNATE N, S, E, W CITY ZIP

X

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT (DO NOT PRINT)
DATE (AREA CODE) DAYTIME TELEPHONE
I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.

(AREA CODE) RESIDENCE TELEPHONE

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

MAIL COMPLETED FORM TO:
Registrar of Voters
Room 155 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

STATEMENT OF VOTER

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

CITY STATE ZIP

THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT PROPER SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

Voters with special needs can get information on how to register as a PERMANENT ABSENT VOTER. Contact the Registrar of Voters for further information.

Mary Sanders
Republican Committeeman

CONCENTRATE ON SOLVING OUR LOCAL PROBLEMS INITIATELY.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

In voting YES on Proposition I, keep your eye on the future. Your YES vote on Proposition I is the first step toward a plan to replace the present ugly Embarcadero Freeway with an at-grade, six-lane boulevard and a transportation system that really works.

Proposition I should be considered with Proposition J, which spells out the conditions under which the freeway would be replaced.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for ground-level improvements. The removal will pay for itself as land now under the Broadway ramps is put back on the tax rolls, with low-rise buildings limited by restrictive waterfront zoning.

Proposition I, when united with Proposition J, recognizes these facts:

1) The Embarcadero Freeway is what is left of a never-completed elevated freeway that would have ringed the City through North Beach and Marina neighborhoods to the Golden Gate Bridge.

2) Today this massive freeway, which separates us from our waterfront, would never be built.

3) For 20 years it has been the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco to remove the freeway.

4) For the first time, San Francisco now has the chance to replace this eyesore with a transportation system compatible with the downtown and the neighborhoods to the north and south. Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman’s Wharf will be preserved.

5) $88 million in federal highway funds is already earmarked for this new system.

6) Only that portion of the Embarcadero Freeway east and north of the Main and Beale Street ramps - basically the portion directly on the waterfront - will be removed to make way for the new system. The removal cost, approximately $10 million to be paid for with privately-generated new revenues, is a relatively small part of the overall new system.

As for Proposition I, vote “YES, let’s tear down the Embarcadero Freeway.” Then turn to Proposition J and support the plan for a beautiful waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

FROM:

_________________________

_________________________

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMÓ SU APLICACIÓN?)

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

STOP GRIDLOCK—
This is our chance to clear the Embarcadero. Vote YES on I to create a six-lane, transit-friendly new boulevard through the gridlock, and improve public transportation.

MAKE BEST USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS—
Nearly $90 million in federal highway trust funds has been set aside for the project.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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If San Francisco does not invest in these improvements, the federal highway trust funds will be given away to other cities.

DON'T LET SPECIAL INTERESTS BLOCK THIS PROJECT—VOTE YES ON I

The people of San Francisco support this plan. Neighborhood groups, business, labor, environmentalists, and city officials all agree—it will ease congestion, provide amenities for residents, and improve business on the northern waterfront. Don't let special interests decide our future. Vote YES on I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

About 70,000 cars a day now use the Embarcadero Freeway. Tearing it down will aggravate an already bad traffic problem. It will also be very expensive. Estimates range up to 15.7 million dollars of local funds. Access to North Beach, Chinatown, Fisherman's Wharf and the financial district would be reduced.

Travel within the city would be slowed down at all hours. Vote no to the destruction of the freeway.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
- Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
- Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
- If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
  - By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will in-

crease from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
- Queuing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
- MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
- Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City's plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Judith Torinese

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Tear it down? The concept is preposterous! There are 70,000 cars a day whizzing by on this high speed downtown elevated waterfront freeway! Where will they all go?

Aside from the outrageous demolition costs involved, (some engineers estimate $40,000,000 of taxpayer money!), eyeball observation, logic, and just plain "common sense" dictates that ground level "total gridlock" will result if this expensive freeway is now destroyed.

Nostalgic individuals must realize that the times have changed! We can't bring the Bay back up to Montgomery Street! On behalf of San Francisco's overburdened taxpayers, we urge a NO vote!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Do NOT be misled.
Freeway demolition does NOT solve traffic problems. NO current proposals justify spending our money.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

When traffic is increasingly congested in the Bay Area, closing the Embarcadero Freeway without proper study is folly. Prudence dictates that a temporary closure to study the effects of its unavailability is a minimum requirement. City officials should stop conducting foreign policy and concentrate on solving our local problems intelligently.

—LYN NOFZIGER REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to replace part of the Embarcadero Freeway, if it would increase public access to the waterfront and improve traffic?  

YES 310  NO 311

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated part of Route 480 along the waterfront, known as the Embarcadero Freeway. The resolution also calls for replacing the freeway with a surface roadway.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a policy statement that says that the City would replace the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt a policy statement which says that the Embarcadero Freeway would be torn down if and only if the replacement opens up the waterfront to the public, improves the tax base, and creates a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt a policy statement to replace the Embarcadero Freeway under these conditions.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

“The Declaration of Policy, in and of itself, will neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, should the policy be implemented and the Embarcadero Freeway replaced with a tree-lined six lane boulevard and other traffic and transit improvements, in my opinion, based on published studies and evaluations, the cost of government would increase by approximately $27.5 million. This includes a one-time freeway demolition cost of $10.2 million plus $17.3 million required to match potential federally-funded transit improvements. Potential financing by the State and private sector and additional tax revenues which might result from subsequent development of the available land could defray all or part of the cost.”

How “J” Got on Ballot

On March 5 a declaration of policy regarding the future of the Embarcadero Freeway was delivered to the Registrar from the Mayor and several supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows the Mayor or four or more supervisors to submit a declaration of policy to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

In addition to Mayor Feinstein, the March 5 document was signed by Supervisors Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker, Molinari, Kennedy and Nelder.

POLLS ARE OPEN
FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans now have a chance to remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with an at-grade, six-lane parkway, which will open our waterfront and restore views blocked for years by this large freeway.

The waterfront plan recently approved by the Board of Supervisors includes removal of a portion of the elevated structure in order to make way for traffic and transit improvements:

- New, shorter freeway ramps connecting directly with the Embarcadero;
- A tree-lined, at-grade, 6-lane Embarcadero Boulevard, with a new waterfront Muni line, a jogging and bicycle path from Fisherman’s Wharf to Mission Bay;
- Extension of Muni Metro south to the Caltrain station at 4th and Townsend;
- New ramps connecting I-280 with The Embarcadero;
- Changes in traffic flow and improvements to existing freeway ramps.

Access to Chinatown, North Beach and Fisherman’s Wharf will be preserved and enhanced.

The Board of Supervisors has specified that the Embarcadero Freeway will be torn down only if preliminary engineering during the next two years confirms—as traffic and environmental studies already have—that removal of the freeway will not result in more problems than it solves.

San Francisco became eligible for $88 million in federal highway funds for this new system when the Supervisors approved the plan in 1980. The $10.2 million cost of freeway demolition itself can be paid from revenues from low-rise development of the parcels now under the Broadway ramps and the increased values of nearby properties. Strict waterfront zoning limits the size of any development.

Traffic and environmental studies by the California Department of Transportation since 1980 clearly indicate that the new waterfront transportation system will be vastly superior to the existing situation, and that traffic congestion levels will not be notably different with the elevated structure removed.

Vote Yes on J and let’s remove the Embarcadero Freeway and replace it with a parkway and transit system—once again let us see our waterfront.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J gives the voters a chance to be heard on an important and timely issue. This issue is the replacement of a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway as one element of a comprehensive package of transportation improvements in the Waterfront area.

Last fall, the Board of Supervisors adopted for further study a set of traffic and transit improvements for the Waterfront. These improvements include:

- a new landscaped surface-level boulevard
- replacement of the Clay/Washington and Broadway on and off ramps with new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom
- removal of the unused stub of I-280 and construction of new ramps connecting the new waterfront boulevard to Route I-280
- a new light rail transit line linking Fort Mason with the Caltrain Depot
- extension of the Muni Metro to the train depot, improving

the Peninsula Commute Service

A YES vote on Proposition J does not allocate funds for these projects. It does allow for further design and engineering studies, including cost analysis, assessment of impacts on traffic, and other matters. The studies will then be presented to the Supervisors so that they can make an informed decision on the plan. If the studies prove positive, San Francisco will be able to transform its Waterfront for the benefit of all.

Proposition J will insure that the City will not proceed with the removal of any of the Freeway until all the studies are completed and all potential consequences are assessed. This is the responsible approach. Vote YES on J.

SPUR
League of Women Voters
Embarcadero Citizens Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SAN FRANCISCO’S NEIGHBORHOODS ASK YOU TO VOTE YES ON J.

REDUCE TRAFFIC CONGESTION—YES ON J!

Traffic backed up by the Embarcadero Roadway slows travel and creates congestion in North Beach and other nearby neighborhoods. J will speed traffic flow.

IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION—YES ON J!

Proposition J will provide regular streetcar service along the Embarcadero and extend Muni Metro service to the south, ultimately extending to Bayview-Hunters Point.

PROMOTE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY—YES ON J!

If Proposition J does not pass, San Francisco could lose $88 million in federal funds for traffic improvements.

(continued)
RESTORE THE WATERFRONT—YES ON J!
San Francisco's waterfront could become a focal point for the city, graced by a grand promenade, instead of the dismal, deteriorating eyesore it is now.

San Francisco's neighborhoods join together to ask your support for an improved Embarcadero. We guarantee the freeway will not be removed unless it is replaced by facilities that will assure a smoother, more efficient traffic flow. YES ON J!

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Robert Bradford
Ruth Gravanis
Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Anita Sanchez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

SUPPORT PUBLIC TRANSIT—VOTE YES ON J.
SAVE SAN FRANCISCO FROM GRIDLOCK—VOTE YES ON J.
The revitalization of the Northeastern Waterfront...as included in San Francisco's Master Plan and transit plans, as overwhelmingly approved by the Board of Supervisors and as urged by Mayor Feinstein...will allow almost $90 million in unused federal highway funds to be used for vital downtown and waterfront transit and street improvements which will be a key to reducing needless auto congestion in San Francisco.

PROPOSITION J SUPPORTS IMPORTANT TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS TO THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT. It will:
—extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific/CalTrain depot
—create a new rail line (possibly using historic streetcars) to connect the entire waterfront from Mission Bay to the Ferry Building to Fishermans Wharf and Fort Mason
—set the stage for a possible streetcar line along Third Street
Since the city of San Francisco adopted the Transit First policy in the early 1970's, transit investments in the Muni Metro, in new electric trolley an articulated bus service, and in BART and Golden Gate Transit, have saved downtown San Francisco from gridlock!

IF you are concerned about the future of transit in San Francisco, IF you are concerned about reducing needless auto congestion, THEN we urge you to join Mayor Feinstein and the majority of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in voting Yes on Proposition J.

Norman Rolfe
San Francisco Muni Coalition
California Transit League
Jack Whaley
Edward A. Green
Gail Bloom
Regina Sneed
Tony Kilroy
Hon. Jack Morrison
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Bay Area Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Hon. Amy Meyer, Recreation and Park Commissioner
Alan Lubliner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

A SOUND BUSINESS PROPOSITION—YES ON J!
Common sense and good business demand we make the most of our resources. San Francisco's waterfront is an economic and civic asset unrivaled anywhere—yet much of it is cut off by an ugly, noisy, elevated roadway. The traffic improvements called for by Proposition J will benefit workers, tourists, property owners, neighborhoods...and business.

—Traffic flow and transit will move quickly on a realigned, reorganized Embarcadero Roadway, allowing easier, more pleasant access to waterfront businesses.

—An improved and beautified Embarcadero will create new commercial opportunities and increase the value of existing property and businesses.

—New jobs and an expanded tax base will generate increased revenue for the city as several lots now covered by freeway ramps return to productive private ownership. Though limited to low rise development (40 to 65 feet), tax revenues from development will more than make up the city's share of the project.

Robert Meyers
Dennis F. Potts
Kenneth R. Lerch
M. Arthur Gonsier, Jr., FAIA
James T. Chappell, AICP
Robert Herman, AIA
Robert Berner
H. Grant Delhart, AIA, AICP
Bonnie B. Jones

Randall Rossi
Karl A. Limbach
Hon. Charlotte Berk
Hon. Anne Halsted
Hon. Arthur Coleman
Hon. James Bronkema
Jon Twichell
Pritz Arko
Michael J. O'Shea
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J OFFERS RESIDENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO A ONCE IN A LIFETIME OPPORTUNITY TO RECAPTURE THEIR WATERFRONT.

Converting the Embarcadero into a tree-lined boulevard and building a new streetcar line will make the waterfront more pedestrian and transit oriented, that is, more people oriented.

A freeway structure that is a source of objectionable noise and casts a pall over a large part of the waterfront will be removed. The waterfront will be opened up to sunlight and fresh air and made more inviting and cheerful to those who wish to walk on one of the world’s outstanding waterfronts. Air pollution that is now retained by the existing elevated structure will be dissipated.

The transit orientation of the new waterfront will encourage energy conservation. Proposition J will:
—Create a six-lane, tree lined boulevard with modern improvements to speed traffic along the Embarcadero
—Build new on and off ramps at Howard and Folsom for better access to the Bay Bridge and the Freeway
—Remove the unused stub of I-280 and streamline traffic from the Peninsula

—Provide bike paths and jogging trails along the Embarcadero
—Link Fort Mason to the Southern Pacific Depot with a new light rail transit line
—Extend Muni Metro to the Southern Pacific Depot to improve the Peninsula commute

Special interests want the federal money allocated for these improvements to be spent on other projects that won’t benefit San Francisco. Don’t let outsiders determine our future.

VOTE YES ON J FOR A BETTER SAN FRANCISCO.

Sierra Club
Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage
Willinda McCrea* Bob Cramer*
Rebecca Evans* Richard Livingston*
Marilyn Clemens* Jennie Len
Jeffrey Henna Jane Winlow* Roger Boyer
A. Lee Knight Hon. Toby Rosenblatt
Patrick S. Hobin Monica Halloran
Walter K. Morris Lisa Klairemont
Jeffrey Heller Bob Isaacson
George T. Rockrise, FAIA Jon Twitchell
Marc Kasky

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSITION J GIVES US A CHANCE TO CORRECT A COLOSSAL MISTAKE!

The Embarcadero Freeway should never have been built. The original plan was to build a freeway from bridge to bridge, destroying the Northern Waterfront, Fisherman’s Wharf, Fort Mason, and Marina Green in the process. When the people of San Francisco saw what was happening, they stopped it in mid-air—literally.

Walk under it. Hear the noise. Feel the gloom. See how it cuts out light.

It’s time to remove this mistake.

The new waterfront plan will give us a tree-lined boulevard, a new streetcar line, and a Muni Metro extension to the Southern Pacific/Caltrain depot. It will give us a transit and pedestrian oriented waterfront that will give us pride and pleasure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J!

San Francisco Tomorrow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, with a membership of 1700 working architects in San Francisco, urges a “YES” vote on Proposition J. In 1968 the citizens of San Francisco stopped highway planners from ringing our waterfront with freeways. Today voters have another opportunity to return the waterfront to our citizens. Removal of the Embarcadero Freeway is one part of a carefully researched transit plan for San Francisco. This proposition supplies an unique opportunity to carry out a broad range of transportation improvements that will have many positive effects on the City of San Francisco.

Removal of the freeway will:

1. Return the waterfront to the people by removing this barrier to access and view.
2. Facilitate needed MUNI improvements.
3. Encourage development of the Embarcadero as a grand civic boulevard uniting the City of San Francisco.

The members of the American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter, urge you to vote “YES” on Proposition I and “YES” on Proposition J.

Donald Kennedy, FAIA
President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Embarcadero Freeway Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Franciscans love Their City, the ambiance, the Bay, waterfront, the views, the healthy neighborhoods.
Freeway builders did their damnest to destroy the City and divide our neighborhoods.
Now we can remove that damned spot, the concrete dinosaur, the hideous barrier that destroys our scenic views, the fence that keeps us from the Bay, the conceiver of the Ferry Building.
Correct a mistake.

VOTE YES ON J.

Miriam Blaussein
Charlene Clark
Marie Cleasby
Zach Cowan
Dick Grosboll
Rick Hauptman

Tony Kilroy
Jean Kortum
Ira Karlander
Jack Morrison
Andy Nash
Norman Roif

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

NO ON PROPOSITION J.
“J” is for JOKE—a cruel joke on us. What will J really do?
Add traffic to every street east of Gough. Delay the construction of waterfront streetcar service. Cost millions in local dollars needed to improve MUNI. Create a ground-level freeway on the waterfront as big as Van Ness, with more cars.

I’m a private citizen who’s concerned about traffic and what it’s doing to our City. If you are too, vote NO on Proposition J.

Steve Colman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

The Embarcadero Freeway should not be torn down because:
- Teardown will cost $22.9 million, to be paid for by San Francisco residents as there are no federal or state funds for removal.
- Preparation of roadway and new traffic control signals will cost another $22 to $46.8 million.
- If the Freeway is removed, the Environmental Impact Report of the city shows that
  - By the year 2000 traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to 55 intersections—an increase of 161%. If the freeway remains, the traffic congestion will increase from the present 21 intersections to only 37 intersections—an increase of only 76%.
  - Queueing, or lining up for traffic congestion increases up to three hours in length on surface streets.
  - MUNI buses, trackless trolleys and Golden Gate Bridge buses will suffer a 6.3% increase in person hours of travel.
  - Person hours of travel time for commuters will be 75% greater under the City’s plan than if the freeway is allowed to remain.

Blair C. Pascoe

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:
1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.
4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.
5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION A

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by boldface type. Deletions are indicated by horizontal strike-out.

3.202 Office of Risk Management

There is established under the chief administrative officer an office of risk management which shall review, analyze and report to the chief administrative officer, the mayor and the finance committee of the board of supervisors the practices of the several departments, boards and commissions of the city and county regarding loss prevention and risk management, including the insurance requirements of the city and county. The office shall also establish and assist in the implementation of planning and operational guidelines regarding risk management and loss prevention for each department, board or commission. The chief administrative officer may appoint, at his or her pleasure, or contract with, a qualified individual or organization for the operation of the office. The qualifications of the individual or organization operating the office shall include relevant education, training and experience in insurance and risk management.

3.401 City Attorney

(a) The city attorney shall be an elective officer. He shall furnish an official bond in the sum of ten thousand dollars ($10,000). He shall appoint, and at his pleasure may remove, all assistants and employees of his office. He shall devote his entire time and attention to the duties of his office. He must, at the time of his election, be an elector of the city and county, qualified to practice in all the courts of the state, and he must have been so qualified for at least 10 years next preceding his election.

The city attorney must represent the city and county in all actions and proceedings in which it may be legally interested, or, for or against the city and county, or, any officer of the city and county in any action or proceeding, when directed so to do by the supervisors, except where a cause of action exists in favor of the city and county against said officer. Whenever any cause of action exists in favor of the city and county, the city attorney shall commence the same when within his knowledge or when directed so to do by the supervisors. He shall give his advice or opinion in writing to the city attorney, or otherwise requested by the city and county when requested. Except as otherwise provided in this charter, he shall not settle or dismiss any litigation for or against the city and county, unless, upon his written recommendation, he is ordered so to do by order of the city attorney.

The city attorney shall prepare, or approve as to form, all ordinances before they are enacted by the supervisors. He shall approve, by endorsement in writing, the form of all official or other bonds required by this charter or by ordinance before the same are submitted to the proper commission, board or office for final approval, and no such bonds shall be finally approved without such approval as to form by the city attorney. Except as otherwise in this charter provided, he shall prepare in writing the draft or form of all contracts before the same are executed on behalf of the city and county. He shall examine and approve the title of all real property to be acquired by the city and county.

He shall keep on file in his office copies of all written communications and opinions, also all papers, briefs and transcripts used in matters wherein he appears; and books of record and registers of all actions or proceedings in his charge in which the city and county or any officer or board thereof, is a party or is interested.

(b) The duties of the city attorney in connection with the bureau of delinquent revenue collection shall be transferred to and performed by the attorney for said bureau who shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

(c) There is established in the office of the city attorney a bureau of claims investigation and administration which shall have the responsibility of investigating, evaluating and processing for the several boards, commissions and departments all claims for money or damages made upon the city and county pursuant to section 7.703 of this charter or the general law of the State of California. Claims investigation functions of the bureau in existence on June 4, 1986, shall continue as an adjunct to the bureau established under this section. Claims functions of the public utilities commission shall remain under that commission unless transferred to the bureau of claims investigation and administration by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the bureau shall also have the power to investigate events and occurrences giving rise to potential civil liability against the city and county and adjust and settle demands, within dollar limits to be established by ordinance, prior to their presentation as claims. There shall be established by ordinance a revolving fund to satisfy such demands adjusted prior to their presentation as claims. The bureau shall be responsible for the investigation of all claims and the analysis of city policies and practices upon which the bureau shall report and advise the several departments.

The city attorney shall appoint a chief of the bureau who shall serve at his or her pleasure. The chief of the bureau may appoint, subject to confirmation by the city attorney, investigators who shall serve at the pleasure of the chief; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of civil claims investigator or any equivalent classification on the date of approval of this amendment by the electorate shall continue to have civil service status to said position under the civil service provisions of this charter.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by boldface type; deletions are indicated by horizontal strike-out.

7.100 Materials, Supplies and Equipment

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreements for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing departments shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract. All purchases in excess of one thousand dollars ($1,000) shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases and a permanent record of all such quotations shall be kept. All contracts and agreements for the purchase of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) or less shall be in writing. All contracts and agreements for the purchase of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) or more shall be in writing. All contracts and agreements for the purchase of fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) or more, for materials, supplies and equipment, and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) or fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases for materials, supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two or more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments. Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by police department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned and may advertise for
bids on the basis of such specifications, under condi-
tions permitting manufacturers of or dealers in other
articles bids sold for the same purpose to bid on
such specifications or on the specifications of their
own product. If the purchaser of supplies recom-
mends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stat-
ing his reasons in writing therefor, and if the
department head concerned recommends the ac-
teptance of any other of such proprietary articles,
stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall
determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require depart-
ments to make adequate inspection of all purchases,
and shall make such other inspections as he deems
necessary. He shall direct the rejection of all articles
which may be below standards, specifications or
samples furnished. He shall not approve any bill or
voucher for articles not in conformity with specifica-
tions, or which are at variance with any contract.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and
warehouses of the city and county. He shall also have
charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of
city and county equipment. All garages and shops
herefore maintained by departments for the con-
struction, maintenance, and repair of departmental
supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned
thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire
alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal mainte-
nance and repair operated by the department of
electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage
and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller,
maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and
equipment purchased for and in use in all depart-
ments and offices of the city and county. He shall be
responsible for the periodic check of such inventory,
and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be
due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the
mayor, the chief administrative officer and the con-
troller. He shall have authority to require the transfer
of surplus property in any department to stores or to
other departments.

7.103 Requisition, Contract and Payment

All purchase orders and contracts shall be based on
written requisitions, for, materials, or supplies in
inventory are in the various departments, on the pur-
chaser's records of average use by all departments.
Purchase orders and contracts in excess of fifteen-
thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) must be approved by the chief adminis-
trative officer. Beginning with the fiscal year 1987-88,
the board of supervisors shall be authorized to in-
crease or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of
contracts requiring approval of the chief ad-
ministrative officer under this section. The pur-
chaser of supplies shall approve all bids and vouchers
for materials, supplies, equipment, and contractual
services before the controller shall draw and approve
warrants therefor. All contracts for the purchase of
materials, supplies and equipment shall be made after
inviting sealed bids by publication. All sealed bids
received shall be kept on file. When an award of con-
tract is made, notice that the same has been made
shall be given by one publication, and any interested
person may examine the bids and records at the pur-
chaser's office.

The purchaser of supplies shall be guided and regu-
lations, approved by the chief administrative
officer and the controller, designate and authorize
appropriate personnel within the purchasing de-
partment to exercise the purchaser's signature
powers for purchase orders and contracts ap-
proved as provided in this chapter.

7.200 Public Works and Purchasing Contracts

The construction, reconstruction or repair of pub-
lie buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or
improvements, and the purchasing of materials, ma-
terials and equipment required therefor, in any case
shall exceed the sum of fifteen-thousand-
dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000),
shall be done by contract, except as otherwise
provided by this charter. It shall constitute official
misdemeanor to split or divide any public work or
improvement or purchase into two or more units for
the purpose of evading the contract provisions of this
section. In an emergency, provided an actual emergency
be declared by the board of supervisors to exist, and
when authorized by resolution of said board, any pub-
lie work or improvement may be executed in the most
expeditious manner. Notwithstanding any other pro-
vision in this section or any other provision of law,
the approval of the chief administrative officer
deciding the work to be emergency in character,
there may be expended by the department of public
works the sum not to exceed five hundred dollars
($500) for new construction of any type in or upon
improved or unimproved streets.

Any public work or improvement estimated to cost
less than fifteen-thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty
thousand dollars ($50,000) may be performed under
contract or written order or by the employment of the
necessary labor and purchase of the necessary ma-
terials and supplies directly by the city and county.
Any public work or improvement executed by the
city, other than routine repairs, shall be author-
ized by the chief administrative officer when the cost
exceeds fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thou-
sand dollars ($50,000), or by the heads of depart-
ments not under the chief administrative officer, only
after detailed estimates have been prepared and sub-
mitted by the head of the department concerned.
There shall be separate accounts for each work or
improvement so executed, and such accounting shall in-
clude all direct, indirect and supervisory elements of
cost chargeable to such work or improvement, and
each cost accounting shall be reported to the chief ad-
ministrative officer, or to the mayor when such work
shall have been performed by departments not under
the chief administrative officer, shall be reported by
the chief administrative officer when the cost
exceeds fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thou-
sand dollars ($50,000) and not performed by the use of
city and county labor, materials, and supplies, shall, if not performed under contract, be covered by written order or agreement
which shall be based on not less than three bids, for
sale of which shall be given by three days' posting.
Records of such bids shall be kept by the department.

When the expenditure for any public work or im-
provement shall exceed the sum of fifteen-thousand-
dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000),
the same shall be done by contract, except as other-
wise provided in this charter. The head of the depart-
ment in charge of the work for which a contract is to be let, or the purchaser of sup-
plies in the case of purchases of materials, supplies
and equipment, shall let such contract to the lowest
reliable and responsible bidder not less than ten days
after advertising by one publication for sealed pro-
posals for the work, improvements or purchase con-
templated. Each such advertisement shall contain the
reservation of the right to reject any and all bids. The
officer responsible for the awarding of any such con-
tact shall require from all bidders information con-
cerning their experience and financial qualifications,
as provided by general law relative to such investiga-
tions authorized by department of public works. The
award of any contract to the lowest responsible bidder
of the chief administrative officer for bids in excess of fif-
teen-thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand dol-
ars ($50,000), or the department head concerned,
with the approval of the board or commission to which
he is responsible, may reject any and all bids and
readvertise for bids.

The award of contract head or the purchaser of supplies,
as the case may be, shall have power to sign such con-
tact for the estimated expenditures thereunder not in
excess of fifteen-thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty
thousand dollars ($50,000). Any contract involving
the expenditure of more than fifteen-thousand dollars
($15,000) fifty thousand dollars ($50,000), if for the
purchase of materials, supplies or equipment, shall
require the joint approval of the purchaser of supplies
and the chief administrative officer. If such contract
is for any public work or improvement, it shall re-
quire the joint approval of the department head and
the chief administrative officer for amounts in excess
of fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000) fifty thousand
dollars ($50,000), relative to departments under his
jurisdiction, or the signature of the department head
and the approval by resolution of the board or com-
mission concerned for departments not under the
chief administrative officer.

The board of supervisors, by ordinance, shall es-

tablish procedure whereby appropriate city and
county department heads, or the chief administrative
officer, for the execution of any work to be performed
under contract. If such bid is the lowest, the contract shall be awarded to the
department. Accurate units costs shall be kept of all
direct and indirect charges incurred by the depart-
ment under any such contract, which unit costs shall be
reported to and audited by the controller monthly
and on the completion of the work ($50,000), in the event where the lowest gross price or unit cost
bid is not accepted, and a contract is entered into with
another bidder, written report shall be made to the
chief administrative officer, the mayor and the con-
troller by the officer authorized to execute the con-
tact, with the reasons for failure to accept such
lowest bid.

If any provision of this section is in conflict with
any provision of section 7.100 of the charter, the
provision contained in section 7.100 shall govern and
control.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of
supervisors shall be authorized to increase or de-
crease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in
any provision of this section.

7.201 Public Works Contract Procedure by Ordinance

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter
and, in particular, the provisions of section 7.200, the
board of supervisors shall by ordinance determine the
monetary limits not to exceed fifteen-thousand dol-
ars ($15,000), within which the construction, recon-
struction or repair of public buildings, streets,
utilities or other public works or improvements may
be done by contract or by written order or by the em-
ployment of the necessary labor and purchase of the
necessary materials and supplies directly by the city
and county, consistent, save as to monetary limits,
with the manner provided for in section 7.200 and
section 7.00.

Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of
supervisors shall be authorized to increase or de-
crease by ordinance the dollar amount set forth in
any provision of this section.
point two commissioners to terms of one year each, one commissioner to a term of two years, one commissioner to a term of three years and one commissioner to a term of four years. Therefore, the terms of the commissioners shall be for four years from the commencement thereof. Not less than one-fourth members of said commission shall be of the same sex, and one member shall have prior experience representing labor and one member shall have prior experience representing management. The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am appointed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this chapter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of one hundred dollars ($100).

Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of considering adopting examination questions shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission. After the regular meetings of the commission, persons in persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

In accordance with section 3.590, the commission shall have the power and it shall be its duty to appoint an executive assistant to be the administrative head of the affairs under its control who shall serve at its pleasure; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of assistant secretary to the civil service commission on the effective date of this section as amended shall continue to have civil service status in the position of assistant to the person in the civil service employment of said person.

3.661 General Powers and Duties

(a) The civil-service commission shall have the power to inspect the operation of the public system of the city and county to ensure compliance with the principles set forth in section 8.310. After such inquiry, the Commission may recommend to the personnel director, as established pursuant to section 3.661, the mayor or to any other officer of the city and county such action as the commission believes necessary to carry out the civil-service provisions of this charter. In any hearing conducted by the civil-service commission or by any hearing officer it appoints, the commission or the hearing officer shall have the power to subpoena and require the attendance of witnesses and the production of records as provided in section 3.661.

(b) The civil service commission may require periodic reports from the personnel director in a manner and form which it shall prescribe.

(c) The civil service commission may hear appeals from an action of the personnel director with respect to:

1. Allegations of discrimination. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the civil service commission regarding allegations of discrimination shall forthwith be enforced by every officer and employee;
2. Allegations of fraud; and
3. Allegations of conflict of interest, pursuant to section 8.105.

(d) No action by the personnel director which is the subject of any appeal shall be stayed during the appeal process except by the unanimous vote of the civil service commission.

(e) The commission shall be notified of the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal of personnel regulations and may comment on such proposals. The adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing fraud or allegations of discrimination shall be subject to ratification by the commission. In addition, the adoption, amendment or repeal of any personnel regulation governing merit system principles on classification, examinations, appointments, promotions, transfers, resignations and terminations shall be subject to ratification by the commission. The commission shall ratify or reject any such regulation within 60 days of receipt. The commission's failure to act shall be deemed approval.

3.662 Department of Personnel Administration

There is hereby established a department of personnel administration which shall consist of a personnel director and such other officers as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the civil service commission and whose job function is placed under the department of personnel administration shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job function had not, by amendment to this charter, been placed under the jurisdiction of the department of personnel administration.

The department of personnel administration shall be the personnel department for the city and county and shall provide a means to recruit, select, appoint, train, evaluate, promote career development, classify positions, administer salaries, administer employee discipline, discharge and other related personnel activities in order to maintain an effective and responsive work force.

3.663 Personnel Director

(a) A personnel director shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the mayor; provided, however, that the personnel director shall be selected from candidates nominated by an civil service commissioner and confirmed by vote of the board of supervisors. The mayor may appoint the personnel director by virtue of the following confirmation: "I am appointed to opposition to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of personnel director in the spirit of this charter.

(b) The personnel director shall conduct appropriate examinations for employment, establish eligible lists based on their results and provide for certification of eligibles. The action of the personnel director on examination matters including,
but not limited to, announcements, minimum qualifications, classes of applicants, components, construction, weighting, content, type, list length, duration and certification shall be final.

(c) The personnel director shall adopt personnel regulations which, except as otherwise provided in this charter, shall govern both the administrative aspects with which the decision of the department of personnel administration and the exercise of the authority granted in this section, including, but not limited to, recruitment; applications; examinations; eligibilities; duration of eligible lists; certification of eligibles; permanent, temporary, and provisional appointments; regular performance evaluations; and layoffs or reduction in force due to lack of work or lack of funds, reorganization, retraining or completion of work; and classification. No personnel regulations shall be adopted, amended or repealed without a prior public hearing upon at least two weeks public notice by the personnel director and after meeting and conference sessions with recognized employee organizations as required by state law. All civil service commission rules relevant to the foregoing as well as the provisions of former sections 8.232, 8.323, 8.326, 8.328, 8.329, 8.330, 8.331, 8.332 and 8.340 of this charter shall become personnel regulations on the effective date of this section.

(d) The personnel director shall conduct the salary surveys for the civil service commission as set forth elsewhere in this charter.

(e) The personnel director by personnel regulation shall establish procedures to review and resolve allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, ethnicity, age, physical handicap, political affiliation, sexual orientation, ancestry, marital status, color, medical condition or other non-merit factors. Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter except the fiscal provisions hereof, the decision of the personnel director shall forthwith be enforced by every employee and officer, unless the decision is appealed to the civil service commission in accordance with personnel regulations.

(f) The personnel director shall investigate all employee complaints concerning job related conduct of City and County employees and shall promptly report to the source of the complaint.

8.328 Promotional Examinations for Employees on Military Leave.

—Employees under permanent civil service appointment who, because of absence on duty authorized military leave after June 27, 1950, did not participate in a promotional examination held after June 27, 1950, and during time of war as defined in section 8.328 of this charter, and in which examination the employee would have been otherwise eligible to compete had the war not intervened, and which examination is hereinafter referred to as the original promotional examination; shall be treated with respect to participation in such examination as though the employee were otherwise eligible to compete in the examination.

—with the specific qualifications noted, as set forth in the rules and regulations governing such examinations.

8.323 Personnel Regulations.

(b) The personnel director by personnel regulations shall provide effective and efficient management through personnel programs that encourage high productivity and exemplary performance.

(b) The personnel director by personnel regulations shall provide a procedure for resolution of employee disputes which shall be consistent with other provisions of this charter and shall be utilized by all department heads and appointing officers upon the expiration of the existing term of any otherwise binding agreements.

(i) Consistent with the foregoing and other applicable provisions of this charter, the personnel director shall delegate to the various appointing officers the provisions of appropriate responsibilities, including but not limited to appropriate disciplinary procedures, and consult with appointing officers with respect to personnel regulations affecting their operations.

(j) Personal services contracts shall be reviewed and approved by the personnel director in accordance with the provisions of appropriate regulations. Personal services contracts reasonably expected to involve payment by the city and county of more than twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000) shall also be reviewed and approved by the Commission. Failure of the Commission to act within 30 days of submission of the contract by the personnel director shall be deemed to constitute approval by the commission.

(k) The personnel director shall establish a system of job classification. The provisions of section 8.200 shall govern whenever new classifications are created or existing positions are reclassified. The personnel director shall be the judge of such classification determinations.

(1) For the purpose of a departmental or other classification, the department of personnel administration shall determine whether a position within a classification is, "in character", temporary or permanent. Appointments may be made on a permanent, temporary or, where confirmation is required, a provisional basis.

(m) For the purpose of classifying positions, section 8.105, 8.107, all but the second to the last paragraph of section 8.341, section 8.346, the last sentence of section 8.400, all but the last three words in the first sentence of the third paragraph of section 8.401, sections 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.406, 8.407 and this section, wherever the words "civil service commission" or "commission" appear in the personnel provisions of this charter, they shall be replaced by the words "department of personnel administration", "department", "personnel director" or "director" as the context permits, the words "rule" or "rules" shall be replaced by the words "personnel regulation" or "regulations," the words "commission chairperson" and the words "secretary of the civil service commission" shall be replaced by the words "personnel director" and the words "section 3.661" shall be replaced by the words "section 3.662" or "section 3.663," as appropriate.

The clerk of the board of supervisors, after consultation with the city attorney, is hereby directed to continue the language of the charter as herein amended when next the charter is submitted for publication.

8.322—Protest of Written Questions and Answers.

—After the written portion of a civil service examination has been held, the questions and the answers thereto shall be available for review by the participants. The board of supervisors may adopt questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance and promotional written test. During the review period, participants shall have an opportunity to protest questions or answers they believe to be incorrect or improper. After all protest items have been acted upon and all protests have been resolved, any identification sheets have been opened, further changes in the rating key shall not be made.

8.323—Protest of Tentative List of Eligibles.

—Following the completion of any examination, a tentative list of eligibles shall be posted for the inspection of the public and of participants. The posting period shall be for a minimum of three (3) working days for the entrance-examinations or five (5) working days for promotional or combined entrance and promotional examinations. During this period a fee for the inspection of the papers of each eligible shall be charged by the civil service commission. The amount of such fee shall be established by ordinance of the board of supervisors. The fee shall be waived for eligibles who wish to inspect their own papers. Inspection of papers shall include all documents supporting the eligibles rank and score except neither the identity of the examinee giving any mark or grade, in an oral examination nor the questions and answers on any continuous or standardized entrance or concurrent entrance examination shall be provided. Only participants in the examination may review the questions used in the examination. If no protests are received during the posting period the eligible list is automatically adopted. If protests are received during the posting period the investigation and action of the general manager personnel shall be expedited so that final adoption of the eligible list is not delayed beyond sixty (60) days after the date of posting. Eligibles who, as a result of their ranking, would receive a notice of appointment regardless of the outcome of the protest may be offered employment from adopted lists pending the resolution of any appeals and amendment to the adopted eligible list.
more than the minimum passing mark established by the civil service commission for inclusion on the list of eligibles resulting from the original promotional examination. His name shall therupon be entered on the eligible list. He shall be placed on the original promotional examination in accordance with the relative excellence obtained by all the qualified participants in the original and similar promotional examinations. Such employees shall be eligible for appointment from such list of eligibles in accordance with civil service rules to any vacancy thereafter occurring, and subsequent to the expiration of a probationary period as provided in section 8.340 hereof, for a period of four years after the date on which their name is entered on the eligible list and before eligible procurement standing through examinations held subsequent to the original promotional examination.

If it is determined by the civil service commission that the name of such person would have been reached for permanent appointment from the list of eligibles established as a result of the original promotional examination during his term of military service had the name of such person appeared thereon, then such employee, upon appointment to a permanent position as herein provided, shall be granted seniority in such appointment from the date his name would have been reached on the eligible list if he had been employed thereon. Such seniority shall be used only for the purpose of determining salary increments and calculating city and county service credits in other promotional examinations held subsequent to the similar promotional examination herein authorized. For all other purposes, seniority of service shall date from the date of appointment, resulting from the original promotional examination as herein authorized.

Such employees who qualify for appointment as a result of a similar promotional examination as herein provided, and who are appointed to permanent positions, as herein provided, shall be permitted to participate in other promotional examinations for which they are otherwise eligible, while serving under probationary appointment in the positions in which they are so appointed as a result of the similar promotional examination, provided that certification from lists of eligibles established from such other examinations shall not be made until the employee has satisfactorily completed the foreseen probationary appointment.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules to govern the nature of other similar promotional examinations herein authorized, and appointments and other matters resulting therefrom.

8.329 Certification of Eligibles: Rule of Three

Whenever a position controlled by the civil service provisions of this charter is to be filled, the appointing officer shall make a requisition to the civil service commission for a person to fill it. Thereupon, the commission shall certify to the appointing officer the names and addresses of the three persons standing highest on the eligible list for such position. In case the position is promotive, the commission shall certify the names of the three persons standing highest on such list. If there are fewer than three names on the list from which certification is to be made, there shall be certified the number thereof.

The appointing officer shall fill the position by the appointment of one of the persons certified. If the provisions of this section as herein amended at the election of November 2, 1976, shall be applicable only to lists of eligibles finally adopted by the civil service commission pursuant to the provisions of section 8.323 of this charter on or after the effective date of this amendment. In making such certification, sex shall be disregarded except where the position is such that the commission or the appointing officer specifies sex.

From the requisition of the appointing officer or otherwise, the commission shall determine whether the position is, in character, temporary, seasonal or permanent; and shall notify the candidate in accordance therewith to the end that the candidate may have knowledge of the probable duration of employment. The commission shall provide for such waiver of temporary or seasonal employment as it may deem consistent with the requirements of the service. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this or any other provision of this charter, an employee who has been certified from a regularly adopted eligible list to a non-permanent position in a civil service classification shall be entitled to appointment to a permanent position within that same classification, provided that the commission certifies to the appointing officer the names and addresses of persons standing higher on the list of eligibles who are not then current employees, subject to a demonstration of satisfactory job performance in the non-permanent position for a period and in the manner provided by rule of the commission. The provisions of this section as herein amended shall only be applicable to requirements for permanent positions filled from and after January 1, 1990.

8.330 Duration of Lists of Eligibles

The civil service commission may remove all names from the list of eligibles after they have remained thereon for more than two years and all names thereon shall be removed at the expiration of four years. The commission may, however, provide in the examination announcement that the list of eligibles be replaced by a new list to be automatically expire at a date not less than two or more than four years after the adoption of such list.

8.331 Limited Tenure Appointments

When in-time of war declared by the Congress of the United States eligible are not available for appointment from registers established through the regular examination procedure as provided under sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof, the civil service commission may certify applicants for appointment to positions through informal and non-competitive tests. Such tests and appointments resulting therefrom shall be governed solely by the provisions of this section and by rule of the civil service commission adopted pursuant hereto and the tests shall be adequate in the judgment of the civil service commission to determine the capacity of applicants to perform the duties of the positions to be filled pending the production of lists of eligibles through the regular examination procedure as provided in sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof. Appointments made under the provisions of this section shall be designated "limited tenure appointments" and may continue only until registers of eligibles are established through the regular examination procedure as provided in sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof. Limited tenure appointments may be terminated by the appointing officer at any time for lack of work or funds. Limited tenure appointments may be terminated by the appointing officer for good cause at any time with the approval of the civil service commission or its delegate, subject to the procedures governing removals set forth in section 8.342 hereof. Persons serving under limited tenure appointments as in this section provided shall be reemployed under such conditions as defined elsewhere in this charter or by rule of the civil service commission and shall be reemployed from lists of eligibles established through the regular examination procedure as provided in sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 of this charter. Service after January 1, 1951 under limited-tenure appointment, by platform employees of the municipal railway, shall not be included in the calculation of service of such employees for the purpose of determining-assignments of runs when such assignments are made on the basis of seniority of service.

Non-civil service appointments in the absence of civil service eligible as provided in sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 of this charter shall not be authorized if an applicant qualified for limited tenure appointments are available. The civil service commission shall make examinations consistent with current conditions to maintain a supply of eligible officers established through the regular examination procedure provided in sections 8.320, 8.321, 8.324 and 8.330 hereof.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules to carry out the provisions of this section and to govern the appointment of limited tenure appointments.

In time of national emergency declared by the President of the United States or by the Congress or while any act authorizing compulsory military service or training in effect, the provisions of this section may also be made operative upon recommendation of the civil service commission and approval of the board of supervisors by ordinance enacted by two-thirds vote of the board. Authority for limited tenure appointments, if established pursuant to the authority of this paragraph, shall cease six months after repeal by the board of supervisors of the ordinance which authorized such appointments.

8.332 Temporary and Emergency Appointments

When no list of eligibles exists or no eligible is available on an existing list for a position in the class to which the appointing officer, and immediately in the position in which the appointing officer and another list exists which is deemed by the civil service commission to be suitable for temporary service, the commission shall certify for civil service temporary appointment an eligible from such list; if no such list deemed suitable for the position exists, the commission pursuant to its rules may authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment therefor for a period not exceeding one hundred and thirty working days. Non-civil service or emergency appointments extended beyond ninety days must be approved by the civil service commission. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall be limited to the employment of such one hundred and thirty working days at the time a civil service eligible report for duty as provided in section 8.329 of the charter.

If a list of eligibles exists for the position requisitioned, but immediate service is deemed necessary, the appointing officer pending the time an eligible from such list is certified, may certify an eligible, as provided in section 8.329 of the charter, the commission may not authorize the appointing officer to make a non-civil service or emergency appointment therefor for a period not exceeding thirty working days. Such non-civil service or emergency appointment, however, shall cease prior to the expiration of such thirty working days at the time a civil service eligible report for duty as provided in section 8.329 of this charter.

No person shall be compensated under any non-civil service or emergency appointment or appointment as authorized under the provisions of the foregoing paragraphs of this section for a period exceeding thirty working days in any fiscal or calendar year, and no claim for compensation for such service shall be approved, allowed or paid for any compensation in excess of such one hundred and thirty working days in any fiscal or calendar year.

If no eligibles are available for appointment to a position in the class requested by the appointing officer, the civil service commission shall hold an examination and establish an eligible list therefor in such position. If its annual appropriation is insufficient to meet the cost of said examination, it shall report to the mayor the estimated cost thereof, and the
mayor shall request and the supervisors shall make supplemental appropriation therefor in the manner provided herein for such purposes and applications.

8.340 Dismissal During Probation Period

Any person during a probationary position shall serve a probationary period. The civic-service-commission personnel director shall by rule establish a probationary period of not less than six months’ service and up to a maximum of twelve months’ service for each classification, provided that the probationary periods for certain positions in the uniformed ranks of the police department, fire department, sheriff’s department and San Francisco International Airport police force shall be for twelve months except that, with respect to members of the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve months’ service from the day following completion of the prescribed department field training officer program, but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment, provided further that probationary members of the uniformed ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in section 8.343 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four months may be established for executive and management classifications. At any time during the probationary period the appointing officer may terminate the appointment upon giving written notice of such termination to the employee, and to the civic-service-commission, specifying the reasons for such termination. Except in the case of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments the civic-service-commission shall review the termination. The civic-service-commission shall by rule establish the procedures for such review. If the appointment results from an entrance examination the commission may declare such person dismissed or may return the name to the list of eligibles. If such conditions for further appointment as the commission may deem just; if the appointment resulted from a promotional examination the employee shall have the right of appeal and hearing before the civic-service-commission. The commission shall render a decision within thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person dismissed; or (b) order such person reinstated to the position without prejudice; and the commission may in its discretion order that the employee be paid salary from time of the termination of the appointment; or (c) order the return of the name to the list of eligibles. Any termination from that person was promoted and may reestablish the employee’s eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same promotional classification under such conditions as the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall be final. Immediately prior to the expiration of the probationary period the appointing officer shall report to the civic-service-commission as to the competence of the probationer for the position, and if competent, shall recommend permanent appointment. Nothing in this section shall preclude the civic-service-commission from establishing terminations for the purpose of future employability including terminations in the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments.

8.407 Definition of Generally Prevaling Rates of Wages

Notwithstanding any provision of section 8.401 or any provision of any other section of this chapter to the contrary, generally prevailing rates of salaries and wages for those employees covered by section 8.401 of this chapter shall be determined by the civil service commission as set forth below.

The civic-service-commission personnel director shall cause to be made an investigation and survey of basic pay rates and wages and salaries in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment for like work and like service, based upon job classification provided in section 3666.3 and 3662 of this chapter and shall make its findings, based on facts and data collected, as to what are the generally prevailing basic pay rates for each benchmark class of employment solely in the manner hereinafter provided. A benchmark class is defined as a "key class" within an occupational group or a collective class for which a representative sample of data will be collected.

Basic pay rate data for public and private employment shall be collected solely from the Bay Area counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, and Santa Clara; provided, however, that for any benchmark class of employment for which the civic-service-commission personnel director determines there is insufficient data from Bay Area public jurisdictions the commission-personnel director shall survey major public agencies in the state employing such class, major public agencies to be defined as those employing more than 3,000 persons.

The commission-personnel director shall collect basic pay rate data for like work and like service from Bay Area public jurisdictions as follows:

(a) The counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara.

(b) The ten most populous cities in these five Bay Area counties based on the latest federal decennial census.

(c) Agencies of the state and federal governments and from school districts and other special districts in the six Bay Area counties as determined by the civic-service-commission personnel director. The commission-personnel director shall collect private basic pay rate data from recognized governmental Bay Area salary and wage surveys of private employers in the city and county of San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. The data collected shall be limited to basic rates of pay and salaries actually being paid by public and private employers for like work and like service.

The term "prevailing rates of wages" for employers governed by chapter section 8.401 and this section shall be defined as the rate ranges developed from the weighted average of the midpoint of the basic pay rates, excluding fringe benefits, for surveyed public employers and the median of the pay rates for private employers for like work and like service. The term shall be defined as follows:

(1) multiply the medians from the private and the midpoints from public employments data by the number of employees in the given classification from each data base;

(2) add the products of (1);

(3) divide the same in (2) by the total number of employees surveyed for that classification; and

(4) extend this figure by 10 percent to establish the maximum of the range and reduce this figure by 10 percent to establish the minimum.

When fixing rates of compensation the board of supervisors shall fix basic pay rates as close as reasonably possible to prevailing rates, provided, however, that the board of supervisors shall not set the maximum rate of pay for any class in excess of the maximum prevailing rate for that class; provided further, however, that the employee shall have his basic pay rate reduced to conform to prevailing rates except as provided for in section 8.406. For those classifications of employees in which the practice is customary, the schedules of compensation shall provide for minimum, not less than three intermediate, and maximum salaries and in the case of advancement, the salaries of employees from minimum to intermediate to maximum with due regard for seniority of service.

The term "basic pay rate" as used in this section is hereby defined as applying only to the basic rate of wages, with included range scales, and does not include any other benefit of employment or working conditions.

It is the declared intent of the qualified electors of the city and county that neither the board of supervisors nor the mayor have any base to power to provide any benefits of employment except those enumerated above. In addition or deletion or modification of benefits of employment enumerated in the charter shall be submitted, as a charter amendment, to the qualified electors of the city and county. The qualified electors expressly state that they understand that benefits of employment have sometimes referred to as "fringe benefits" of employment and the qualified electors expressly reserve the right to either grant or deny such benefits except those conditions of employment commonly referred to as "working conditions." Any reference to "working conditions" shall mean those compensations which must necessarily be provided in order for the employee to perform his job description duties efficiently and safely, and shall include but not be limited to such working conditions and benefits as are typically included in the administrative provisions of the salary standardization ordinance and the salary survey.

The board of supervisors, mayor, in its discretion, may provide working condition benefits for employees covered under this section and section 8.401 of this charter only in accordance with the following provisions:

(a) The civic-service-commission personnel director shall determine, certify and recommend to the board of supervisors, mayor that the working condition benefit is equitable or necessary for the efficient and safe performance of the employee's duties as enumerated in his job description.

(b) The working condition benefit, as recommended by the civic-service-commission personnel director, is substantially comparable for like work and like service to that provided for the job classification and is provided to not less than 50 percent of the employees of the class in the jurisdiction covered by the salary survey.

9.08 Initiative, Referendum, and Recall

(a) The registered voters shall have power to propose by petition, and to adopt or reject at the polls, any ordinance, act or other measure which is within the power conferred upon the board of supervisors to enact, or any legislative act which is within the power of the city and county; and to propose upon any other matter, or to adopt, or any amendment to the charter. Such ordinance, act, charter amendment or other measure may be so proposed by filing with the registrar a petition setting forth said measure in full, signed by registered voters of the city and county as number in the percentages hereinafter required of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor cast at the last preceding regular municipal election.

Any declaration of policy may be submitted to the electorate in the manner provided for the submission of ordinances; and when approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting on said declaration, it shall thereupon be the duty of the board of supervisors to enact an ordinance or ordinances to carry such policies or principles into effect, subject to the referendum provisions of this chapter.

Any ordinance which the supervisors are empowered to pass may be submitted to the electorate by a majority of the board at a subsequent election called for the purpose of such an election called for the purpose, said election to be held not less than thirty days from the date of the call. Any such ordinance may be proposed by one-third of the supervisors, or by the mayor, and when so proposed shall be submitted to the electors at the next municipal election. Provided, however, that by the supervisors granting any public utility franchise
or privilege, shall go into effect until the expiration of sixty days from the date it becomes final. At the end of such sixty days such ordinance shall be in force and effect, unless within such period there shall be filed with the registrar a petition signed by registered voters equal in number to five percent of the entire vote cast for mayor at the last preceding regular municipal election, requesting that such ordinance be submitted to the electors. In case such petition is filed, such ordinance shall not go into effect until approved by a majority of the voters voting thereon at a general or special election.

If, before the time any other ordinance involving legislative matters becomes effective, there shall be filed with the board of supervisors a petition signed by qualified electors of the city and county equal in number to at least ten percent of the entire vote cast for all candidates for mayor at the last preceding general municipal election at which a mayor was elected, protesting against the passage of such ordinance the same shall be suspended from going into operation, and it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to reconsider such ordinance, and if the same be not entirely repealed, said board shall submit the ordinance to the vote of said electors either at the next general municipal election or at a special election to be called for that purpose, and such ordinance shall not go into effect or become operative unless and until a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon shall vote in favor thereof. The provisions of section 9.109 and 9.110 of the charter shall apply to and govern the verification and certification of such petition.

Annual budget and appropriation ordinances, supplement appropriation ordinances, the annual salary ordinance, or ordinances amending the same, the ordinances levying taxes, any ordinance appropriating money from the emergency reserve fund, ordinances authorizing the city attorney to compromise litigation, and ordinances necessary to enable the mayor to carry out any of the powers vested in him in the case of public emergency as defined in section 3.300 of the charter, ordinances enacted pursuant to section 8.410 of the charter, as well as ordinances relative to purely administrative matters, shall not be subject to referendum.

Any elective official, the chief administrative officer, the controller or any member of the board of education or public utilities commission may be recalled by the electors. The procedure to effect such recall shall be as follows: A petition demanding the recall from office of the person sought to be recalled shall be filed with the registrar. Said petition shall contain a statement of the grounds on which the recall is sought. Any insufficiency of form or substance in such statement shall in no way affect the validity of the election and proceedings held thereunder. No recall petition shall be filed against a supervisor until he has held his office for at least six months.

(b) In the event the representative of the board of supervisors mayor and the representatives of recognized employee organizations do not reach an agreement through the meet-and-confer process on matters contained in the annual salary standardization ordinance, which is effective by March 15 of any year, the mayor shall recommend and the board shall approve or reject a schedule of compensation which reflects current prevailing rates for the classifications covered by Section 8.401 of this Charter the last good faith offer presented by the mayor or his or her representative.

In any year when an agreement on matters contained in the salary standardization ordinance has not been achieved, the civil-service commission personnel director, upon receipt of a written demand from a recognized employee organization made upon the mayor and the personnel director shall prepare, prior to April 1, a schedule of compensation and administrative provisions which reflect additional rates that would be payable, and working conditions, based upon the last demands made by the recognized employee organization(s) which participated in the meet-and-confer process.

Said schedule shall be transmitted to the registrar of voters for submission to the electors of the city and county at a general election or a special election called for the purpose, and said special election shall be held no less than sixty (60) days from the date of the call. No such schedule shall be withdrawn after it has been received by the registrar of voters. At said election, the ballot shall contain the following two alternatives:

(1) Approval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.
(2) Disapproval of the schedule of compensation based upon the employee organizations last demands.

If a majority of the valid votes cast in the election favor paying the additional rates set forth in the schedule of compensation based upon the last demands of the recognized employee organizations which engaged in the meet-and-confer process, it shall be the duty of the board of supervisors to amend the salary standardization ordinance to reflect said increased continued on page 78

NOTE: All sections are now.

Be it ordained by the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. This ordinance may be called the "City College Public Lands Preservation Ordinance."

Section 2. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall disapprove or deny, WITH NO EXEMPTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS, any building permit application for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, located across Phelan Avenue from the presently occupied campus of City College and consisting of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted, between June 3, 1986 and June 3, 1989.

Section 3. The City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works shall revoke or rescind, WITH NO EXEMPTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS, any building permit application previously granted for construction of any building or structure of any character within the City College Public Lands, which consist of Assessor's Block 3180, Lot 1, as presently constituted.

Section 4. The term "building permit" includes building permits, site permits and any other permits for the performance of construction work.

Section 5. Should any part of this ordinance for any reason be held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of the ordinance shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect. No provision of this ordinance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent implementation of the policy stated above.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE PROPOSITION E

NOTE: All sections are now.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The People of the City and County of San Francisco desire and are entitled to a local government whose officers do not engage in, assist or promote compensated advocacy on behalf of private interests before City and County commissions and boards while also serving as City and County officers.

Section 2. No officer of the City and County may, during the term of office, engage in compensated advocacy before any City and County board or commission, or any member of the board or commission or its staff, in order to represent any private interest, for which representation the officer receives, directly or indirectly, any compensation, reward or gift.

Section 3. Officers of the City and County shall not discuss matters pending before their commission or department with other City and County officers or state legislators when those other officers or state legislators are acting as compensated advocates for a private interest.

Section 4. No member of the California State Legislature shall appear before any City and County board, department or commission as a compensated advocate representing a private interest.

Section 5. In the financing of city and county campaigns: (a) No person other than a candidate shall make, and no campaign treasurer shall solicit or accept a contribution which will cause the total amount contributed by such person with respect to a single election in support of or opposition to such candidate, including contributions to political committees supporting or opposing such candidate, to exceed $500.00. (b) If any person is found guilty of violating the terms of this section, such campaign treasurer who received part or all of the contribution or contributions which constitute the violation shall pay promptly, from available campaign funds, if any, the amount received from such person in excess of the amount permitted by this section to the City and County Treasurer for deposit in the General Fund of the City and County. (c) This section shall not apply to any in-kind contribution of television or radio airtime to any candidate or committee granted to said candidate or committee pursuant to the "Fairness Doctrine" articulated in Cullinan Broadcasting, 40 FCC 576 (1963).

Section 6. Any person violating the terms of this ordinance shall be subject to the penalties set forth in San Francisco Charter Section 8.105. Such penalties shall include, but not be limited to, removal from office.

Section 7. If any provision of this ordinance, or its application to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, it is the expressed intent of the people of the City and County of San Francisco that the remainder of the ordinance, or the application of such provision, or any other provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE PROPOSITION F
rates and the same shall be in lieu of said annual compensation, and notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, said rates shall become effective and be payable as if adopted prior to April 1, of any year.

The provisions of sections 3.100 and 3.100-1, relating to the emergency powers of the mayor, shall not be applicable to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

11.05 Effective Date of Amendments
The effective date of the amendments, additions and deletions to the civil service provisions of the charter shall be ninety (90) days after the acceptance and filing thereof with the Secretary of State.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION G

We the people of San Francisco declare this to be our policy:
1) IT IS IMPROPER TO PROFIT FROM OR PROVIDE SUPPORT TO THE RACIST POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SYSTEM IN SOUTH AFRICA, KNOWN AS APARTHEID.

Therefore it is necessary to sever commercial ties to South Africa, until people of all races obtain equal rights in that country, including equal voting rights.

2) COMPANIES HAVING SUBSTANTIAL INVOLVEMENT WITH APARTHEID MUST BE CONSIDERED IRRESPONSIBLE.

(a) The Board of Supervisors must determine which companies doing or seeking business with the City have the greatest ties to Apartheid. Companies that have a significant involvement in profiting from or maintaining the Apartheid system, may, on that basis, be deemed "irresponsible bidders."

In purchasing goods and services and awarding other contracts, the city must give priority to avoiding such companies; the degree of the preference must be in proportion to the company's complicity with Apartheid, according to the following criteria:
— how much business the company does in or with South Africa;
— how much the company profits from that business;
— how much support the company provides the Apartheid government in taxes, loans, payments or other funding;
— the nature of the company's South Africa business;
— the degree of the company's cooperation with South African political censorship or secrecy agreements;
— the degree to which the company provides the South African government with the technology, materials and other means to maintain and reinforce Apartheid.

(b) City funds must not be deposited or invested with any bank or other company which does business in or with, or makes loans to, South Africa.

(c) If any exception to the above policies is found to be necessary or appropriate, the responsible official must promptly and publicly report it to the Board of Supervisors, clearly describing the exception and the reasons for it.

(d) The term "city" includes all agencies, departments, officials, employees, units and subunits of the city and county of San Francisco, and all funds administered by or on behalf of the city or county.

3) WE CALL ON ALL OTHER PUBLIC BODIES AND PRIVATE OR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS TO ADOPT SIMILAR POLICIES.

4) WE CALL A GENERAL PUBLIC BOICOT, FOCUSING ON THOSE COMPANIES HAVING THE GREATEST TIES TO APARTHEID.

The Board of Supervisors must determine and announce which company or companies are the worst offenders within each major industry, so that the public can focus its boycott on those companies.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION H

SUMMARY: THIS INITIATIVE STATES THAT THE AIDS EPIDEMIC IS A MAJOR PUBLIC HEALTH PROBLEM OF CONCERN TO EVERY ONE, REQUIRING INCREASED SUPPORT FOR RELATED MEDICAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION. IT CALLS FOR A COUNCIL FOR AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION OR SIMILAR UNITED EFFORT TO STOP AIDS.

We the people of San Francisco hereby adopt the following policy:

The AIDS epidemic has rapidly become a major public health problem, costly both in human lives and in general community resources.

The first steps in dealing with such a crisis are:
— the scientific research needed to discover and understand the nature, causes, co-factors, prevention, diagnosis and treatment of the disease; and
— the education of the public about the lessons of that research;

A proper program of research and education pays for itself in the long run:
Prompt action is urgent, because of the rapidly growing number of persons affected, increasing not only the suffering but also the difficulty of eradicating the disease;

The leadership and support of such an effort is everyone's responsibility;

While San Francisco's role in the overall effort against AIDS has been viewed as a positive example to other areas, the continued rapid increase in the spread of the disease means that we cannot afford to rest on our laurels or leave further responsibility to others.

THEY ARE BE IT RESOLVED:
We call on all appropriate government bodies as well as medical, professional, charitable and community organizations and concerned individuals to join together in an all-out effort to stop AIDS;
We call for support to an organized united effort along the lines of an AIDS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION COUNCIL, including, in some form:
— A COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, to provide informed evaluations as to priorities among research projects and proposals, recommending those which are most cost-effective and most likely to produce early results useful in the prevention or treatment of the disease, to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort or neglect of promising approaches, and to provide the council with complete and up-to-date information regarding comparative results of experimental treatments, prevention programs and other existing research;
— A COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, to inform the public regarding prevention and other research findings, and to inform relevant government officials and the general public, concerning the factual basis for a re-ordering of current public funding priorities toward an increased war against disease, including research and education against AIDS and related conditions;
— A FUND-RAISING COMMITTEE, to solicit donations, lobby for grants, organize benefits and other fund-raising projects spreading the financial burden by appealing to many sources;

We ask the council and committees to be responsive and accessible to public input, to include representation of all interested groups, to consider all viewpoints, and to be capable of prompt action;
We ask appropriate city officials to determine whether a suitable form of such a council already exists; if it does, we wish the city to support it actively; if not, we wish the city to seek to encourage its formation by such means as may appear proper.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION I

SUMMARY: This initiative asks "Shall we tear down the Embarcadero Freeway?" The Board of Supervisors has approved and the Mayor has signed a resolution calling for the removal of the elevated portion of Route 480 known as the Embarcadero Freeway. This initiative declaration of policy will give the voters the opportunity to establish the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco regarding the proposed teardown of the Embarcadero Freeway.

THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE WAS PRINTED ON THE PETITION WHICH INITIATED PROPOSITION J

Shall the City replace a portion of the Embarcadero Freeway if and only if such replacement would open up the Waterfront to its citizens, improve the tax base, and create a tree-lined 6-lane boulevard and a new waterfront transit route to assure the smooth flow of traffic?
Candidates

FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER
JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City & County of San Francisco
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: The Bill of Rights guarantees that every person accused of a crime shall have the effective assistance of counsel. Whether an individual is rich or poor, that person is entitled to a competent and dedicated attorney. In San Francisco it is the duty of the Public Defender to uphold this sacred right. In every case, we provide the client with the best defense under the law.
In the last 7 years, my outstanding staff has done this work with the highest degree of professionalism. In the next 4 years, that same strong, professional, independent and ethical representation will continue.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John D. Bardis, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Ying Brown, 830 40th Ave., Housewife
Sala Burton, 8 Sloan Blvd., Representative In Congress, 5th District
Manuel Caballos, 2827 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
George Christopher, 110 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1035 14th St., Clerk
Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Artist/Community Organizer
Brian Getz, 55 22nd Ave., Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson, Sheriff of San Francisco
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Matti J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., International Vice President, ILGWU
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for Children & Youth
Susan Kelly Keeneby, 3070 26th Ave., Executive Assistant to Sala Burton M.C.
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
Carole Migen, 501 28th St., Community Health Director
Linda Ann Post, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative
Jim Rivaldo, 430 Steiner St., Political Consultant
Julie Tung, 788 18th Ave., Member, SF Community College District
Governing Board
Yori Wada, 565 44th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel W. Walker, 562 Campbell Ave., President — Local 250A Transport
Workers Union of America
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister
Benny Y. Yee, 531 Marina Blvd., Realtor
C. R. Zanea, 1966 Pacific Ave., Auto Repair Proprietor

FOR ASSESSOR
SAM DUCA

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor
My qualifications for office are: I was elected your Assessor in 1978 and re-elected in 1982. My years in the Assessor’s Office were spent in a professional appraisal capacity personnel and administration. I have two university degrees, the coveted MAI designation, and am the recipient of a special Congressional Advisory Board award from the United States Congress. I have served in an advisory capacity, both nationally and internationally, in property tax administration and will continue to serve the taxpayers of the City and County of San Francisco in dealing with Article XIII A of the State Constitution. My community involvement includes participation in cultural, civic business organizations.

Sam Duca

The sponsors for Sam Duca are:
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1340 Broadway St., Investor
Eugene L. Fried, 2910 Lake St., Investor
Nancy Pelosi, 49 Presidio Ter., Housewife and volunteer in politics
Walter H. Shorestein, 740 El Cerrito del Mar., Chairman, Milton Meyer & Co.
Stanley Smith, 15 Urwood Ave., Union Official
Emma W. Louie, 1257 Jackson St., Housewife
Alfred S. Wilsey, 2590 Jackson St., Ch. of Exec. Comm. of Diversified Holding Co.
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arthur H. Coleman, II Eneklewalk, Physician
Gerson Bakar, 2310 Hyde St., Investor
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management
Jane Mckaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired
Joseph C. Orongo, Sr., 866 Paxton Ave., Publicity Dept., F.F. Giants
James A. Scatena, 101 St. Elmo Way, Chairman of the Board, Scatena York Co.
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher
Frances May McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Recreation & Park Commissioner
Ferber C. Campagnoli, 2609 Larkin St., Attorney
Betty Brooks, 1738 26th St., Field Representative
Jess Turell Esteva, 285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Businessman
Cyril L. Magnin, 594 California St., Merchant
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
John H. Swanson, 145 Lake Merced Hill South, Bowling Alley Owner
Frances G. Goldman, 745 El Camino Del Mar, Child Guidance
Irma M. Bernardte, 2182 34th Ave., Housewife
Leo J. Murphy, 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Charles M. Cunningham, 735 Connecticut St., Self Employed
Lawrence V. Eppinette, 815 Felt St., Conf. Secretary
Mary M. O'Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Volunteer & Homemaker
Elizabeth R. Duca, 16 Wawona St., Homemaker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Application for Absentee Ballot
is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

Name ____________________________________________

Residence Address ________________________________________

Mailing Address ________________________________________

Signature ____________________________________________

If the person to whom this pamphlet is addressed no longer resides at this address, please draw a diagonal slash (/) through the address label and drop the pamphlet in the mailbox.

**POLL WORKERS NEEDED**

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods. Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

**WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:**

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible. This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.